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Abstract

Improving *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* as a biofuel production organism

by

Stephanie Anne Davis López

Doctor of Philosophy in Chemistry

University of California, Berkeley

Professor Danielle Tullman-Ercek, Co-Chair
Professor David Savage, Co-Chair

It is widely accepted that using petroleum-based fuels and chemicals is unsustainable, both in terms of their limited supply and hazardous greenhouse gas emissions. One alternative is to replace petroleum-derived liquid fuels such as gasoline with biofuels. Biofuels are energy-dense compounds such as medium-chain alcohols or fatty acids produced by microbes from plant-based feedstocks. Replacing fossil fuels with biofuels will have multiple beneficial impacts on the environment and economy, including carbon sequestration, greenhouse gas reduction, and generation of a renewable industry.

Here, we engineer the model yeast *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* to enhance its potential for biofuel production. Yeast are promising host organisms for many reasons. A sophisticated genetic toolkit is available, which allows for simple manipulation of metabolic pathways and strain characteristics. Industrial fermentations are well-established: *S. cerevisiae* are currently used to produce a variety of compounds, including bioethanol, amino acids, and therapeutics. In order for yeasts to become commercially viable production organisms for a range of biofuels, some challenges need to be overcome, from limited production to product toxicity. Here, we used protein engineering methods to address some of these challenges and improve *S. cerevisiae* as a production organism.

It is important to consider transport at the commodity scales relevant to fuel production. Biofuel efflux is particularly important because it drives production forward, reduces cellular toxicity, and is necessary for continuous process schemes. We therefore set out to understand how medium chain fatty acids exit the cell. We characterized the transporter Tpo1 for activity on the fatty acids octanoic and decanoic acid, and identified two fatty acid substrate binding residues. Moreover, we showed that the native promoter gives the optimal expression level for fatty acid efflux. We also found that localization to the plasma membrane is sufficient for fatty acid tolerance and vacuolar localization is not necessary. We anticipate that this transporter will make an excellent target for increasing efflux of desired non-native substrates such as butanol.
We also investigated the use of transporters to improve cytoplasmic acetyl-Coenzyme A (AcCoA) levels. As many heterologous bioproducts are constructed from AcCoA by cytosolic enzymes, increasing cytoplasmic AcCoA concentrations should improve product titers. Our long-term goal is to use the AcCoA transporters AT-1 and YBR220C to transport AcCoA directly from the mitochondria into the cytoplasm. To this end, we found that the AT-1 transporter is active in yeast and draws AcCoA into the endoplasmic reticulum. We have designed a suite of mitochondrial targeting tags to direct the transporters to the mitochondria, and are currently testing their effectiveness. We anticipate that the mitochondrially-located transporters will raise cytoplasmic AcCoA levels, and concomitantly improve product titers.

Finally, to address potential issues from product toxicity, we explored the cellular effects of medium-chain alcohols on *S. cerevisiae*, and used protein engineering to reduce a toxicity response. Specifically, we found that medium chain alcohols, including \( n \)-pentanol, \( n \)-hexanol, and \( n \)-heptanol, inhibit translation initiation. Two mutations in translation initiation factors, Gcd1 D85E and Sui2 D77Y, both reduce inhibition of translation initiation, producing a stable, dominant medium chain alcohol tolerance phenotype. Interestingly, a range of mutations at positions 85 in Gcd1 and 77 in Sui2 improve medium chain alcohol tolerance. These findings will be important for generating efficient medium-chain alcohol production strains.

Through these projects, we have advanced the potential of *S. cerevisiae* for commodity-scale biofuel production.
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Chapter 1
Improving S. cerevisiae as a biofuel production organism

Yeast and Biofuels

Climate change and pollution are global issues and scientists world-wide are working on solutions. Fossil fuels are not a sustainable energy source, due to pollution from use, production of greenhouse gases, and limited global supply [1]. Dependence on fluctuating oil market prices and politics of producer nations are risks for national energy security [1-2]. Future population increases will increase energy demands, necessitating alternative energy sources [3]. Biofuels are one solution to these problems [1]. The use of biofuels can reduce greenhouse gases [5] and sequester carbon [4]. Additionally, biofuel usage is a way to invest in US technologies [5] and create new local industries [6]. Kopetz finds that biofuels can be used for up to a quarter of world energy [2]. In short, biofuels are promising new technologies that will become an important part of world energy usage.

There are many different molecules that can be produced in cells and used as biofuels. One example is alcohols, which have been well studied. Ethanol is commonly added to the fuel sold at gas stations, but it is corrosive and has a low energy density [7]. The major selling point to ethanol is its high production level, up to 18% v/v [8], which is more than 140 g/L. A medium-chain alcohol such as n-butanol has a much higher energy density, 22% more than ethanol, and is much less corrosive [9]. It can be added to gasoline directly and used with good results in cars on the road today. n-Butanol can be produced in E. coli at yields of 30 g/L using the Clostridium pathway [10]. Si et al. can produce 242 mg/L n-butanol in S. cerevisiae using Adh1 and an amino-acid dependent pathway [11]. These yields are still far below ethanol yields, and butanol is not currently a cost-effective fuel additive or stand-alone biofuel. Longer-chain alcohols such as n-pentanol and n-hexanol have even higher energy densities and are expected to be a next-generation biofuel. n-Pentanol can be produced in E. coli at 750 mg/L [12]; n-hexanol has been produced at 47 mg/L (along with 5 g/L butanol) [13]. While microbial production of medium-chain alcohols has been demonstrated, significant improvements are required before commercialization could be feasible.

Outside of alcohols, several other classes of potential biofuel molecules are being explored. One type is fatty acids, which can be chemically converted to fatty acid methyl esters (FAME) or fatty acid ethyl esters (FAEE) [9]. Synechocysitis can produce 197 mg/L fatty acids [14]. E. coli can even directly produce FAEE [15]. Terpenoids, such as farnesene, are also promising biofuel molecules. [16] Unsaturation (such as the multiple carbon-carbon double bonds in farnesene) is undesirable in fuels, but chemical conversion can improve fuel properties [10]. A variety of other terpenoids including limonene can be produced in cyanobacteria [17] or E. coli [18]. Even alkanes such as nonane and dodecane can be produced in cells [19]. The range of potential biofuels may be overwhelming, but this range makes it very likely that at least one compound can be produced at a cost-effective level.

For biofuels to replace petroleum as the major fuel source, many issues need to be addressed, through a combination of engineering the feedstocks, production pathways, production strains, and extraction processes. To keep costs low, high biofuel
titers and efficient extraction processes are required. Additionally, there is a need for biofuels that can be produced from marginal lands, to avoid competing with food supplies [2]. From the chassis side, the major roadblock to bioproduction of fuels is toxicity of the fuel molecules.

Many alcohol compounds have both general and specific toxic effects in the cell. For instance, membrane fluidity and corresponding function are affected by butanol [21]. Alcohols permeabilize cell membranes, which can deplete proton gradients and disrupt gradients of ions and other small molecules [22-24]. Ethanol can cause diffusion of water across the yeast membrane and inhibit active transport of water [25]. The terpenes ß-pinene and limonene have been shown to inhibit H⁺ and K⁺ translocation and respiration in yeast [26-27], likely due to membrane effects. In addition, solvents increase denaturant sensitivity and decrease thermotolerance of proteins, with effects proportional to carbon chain length [28]. These solvents can also specifically inhibit protein function. For example, n-butanol has been shown to inhibit the ATPase of Clostridium acetobutylicum [21] and more recently, n-butanol and n-hexanol were found to inhibit the multidrug resistance pump Pdr5 in yeast [29]. Understanding these effects is the first step toward engineering solutions to improve tolerance.

Biofuels can be produced in a variety of different organisms, each with advantages and disadvantages. E. coli are easy to engineer due to genetic tractability and a rapid doubling time. One major disadvantage of bacteria is susceptibility to phage infections, which seriously disrupt fermentations [30]. Clostridia naturally produce butanol and ethanol, though these organisms have limited genetic tools and are also susceptible to phage [30]. Cyanobacteria and algae are promising organisms, as they use carbon dioxide as a carbon source, eliminating the need for sugar or cellulosic feedstocks [20]. Inefficient growth and processing systems and somewhat limited genetic tools are holding back cyanobacteria and algae from becoming a feasible biofuels solution [20]. Yeasts such as S. cerevisiae are an excellent production organism, with sophisticated genetic toolkits and well-established industrial fermentation strategies. Longer doubling times and more complicated biology have delayed successes in engineering S. cerevisiae for biofuel production relative to E. coli, but these organisms are nonetheless most likely to produce the world’s biofuels in the future.

S. cerevisiae can produce a variety of compounds, including commodity chemicals such as amino acids and lactic acid, and specialty compounds such as insulin and hydrocortisone [31-33]. In terms of biofuels, yeast are best known for ethanol production, with up to 2 M intracellular ethanol at the end of fermentations [33]. S. cerevisiae produces other biofuels such as farnesol [35], n-butanol [11, 36], and isobutanol [37]. Higher alcohol production in yeast is lagging behind E. coli production [38]. Even though S. cerevisiae has a higher n-butanol tolerance than E. coli (approximately 2% vs. 1% maximal concentration), toxicity is nonetheless preventing higher production levels in the yeast. With some metabolic and chassis engineering, this low yields and toxicity can be overcome.

In order for yeasts to become the preferred production organism, some challenges need to be addressed. Most importantly, low yields of biofuels are problematic, as low cost is important for commodity chemicals such as biofuels. The lower yields in S. cerevisiae are largely due to the toxicity from feedstock impurities [39], metabolic intermediates [40-41] and end-products [21-29] that inhibit cell growth and production.
titers. In addition, metabolic flux is hindered by other processes and pathways in the cell. A metabolic sink is needed to enable increased yields even for nontoxic fuels, by driving reactions forward. Secretion to the extracellular space is desirable, as it simplifies extraction and allows for continuous processing while simultaneously providing a route to enhanced tolerance.

There are several strategies for improving tolerance to potential biofuels such as n-butanol and n-hexanol. One solution is to re-engineer the membrane for biofuel tolerance, since membrane toxicity is a limiting factor for biofuel production. Another method is to engineer transporters to directly remove biofuels from the cell, thereby reducing toxic concentrations and allowing for higher production. Finally, evolutions allow the cell to overcome specific mechanisms of toxicity, many of which are as yet unknown. Used alone or in conjunction, these approaches can reduce toxicity of biofuel molecules and improve yeasts as production organisms.

**The Plasma Membrane**

The plasma membrane and organelle membranes are an important part of yeast physiology. Nicolau et al. note that in recent years, there has been widespread interest in increasing tolerance to fuel products by changing membrane composition [42]. As the interface and exchange site between the cell and the environment, the membrane often limits growth rates [43]. In the presence of toxic alcohols, membrane disruptions further limit growth rates. Concomitantly, changes in the membrane can affect activity or function of transporters in the membrane [27], which are required for cell health and proliferation. Understanding the plasma membrane’s role in both transporter function and biofuel toxicity will be a crucial step for engineering the most effective transporters and optimizing biofuel tolerance.

The plasma membrane has been studied extensively, and many of the lessons learned are directly applicable to organellar membranes as well. Cyclohexane and β-pinene have been shown to disrupt mitochondrial membranes [26,44]. It is known that the sterol composition of the plasma membrane is important for thermotolerance [45]. As higher temperatures increase membrane fluidity, increased sterol concentrations help to stabilize the membrane, so that it can function properly. The membrane is also affected by alcohols, which can easily enter and remain in the membrane. There, the alcohols can increase both fluidity [46] and permeability [22], which disrupts membrane function. Huffer et al. observed that S. cerevisiae maintain membrane fluidity even in toxic alcohol concentrations [46]. Surprisingly, lipid composition and rigidity do not directly correlate to alcohol tolerance [46]. While it is clear that membrane composition and properties are important, scientists have yet to deconvolute how membrane changes lead to tolerance (or lack thereof). In addition to membrane changes in response to alcohols, the cell wall increases in hydrophobicity when yeasts were subjected to hydrophobic solvents [47].
Transporters Drive the Efflux of Biofuels and Direct Precursors

A key problem of biofuel production in yeast is the undesirable retention of the fuel product within the cell. Most classes of biofuels, from alcohols to long-chain hydrocarbons, are toxic at industrially relevant levels. The exception seems to be terpenoids such as farnesene [16], which are produced at high titers. Notably, farnesene is secreted at high levels as well. Therefore, it is expected that active mechanisms for the secretion of fuel products from the cell can improve or solve a host of problems, including product toxicity, creating a metabolic sink, and allowing for continuous processing of extracellular fuels.

Yeasts have evolved a variety of secretion devices to expel compounds from the cytoplasm. Multidrug resistance efflux pumps are a major class of devices that actively secrete unwanted chemicals to the extracellular space (48). ABC (ATP Binding Cassette) transporters such as Pdr5 are well characterized, yet have the disadvantage of high basal activity, regardless of substrate availability. The PDR (Pleiotropic Drug Resistance) pumps are major ATP users; when inhibited, cellular ATP levels will increase [49]. Use of these pumps would direct significant ATP away from biofuel generation, reducing yields. Another type of multidrug resistance efflux pump, the major facilitator superfamily (MFS) pump, has a natural, often metabolic, substrate and also acts on drug molecules [50]. MFS pumps are antiporters powered by the proton motive force, pumping substrates out of the cell in acidic environments and taking up molecules in basic environments [50]. The mechanism is an alternating “rocker-switch” movement with a single substrate-binding site [51-52]. This is a simpler design compared to Pdr5, which is thought to have multiple binding sites [53]. Yeast have dozens of multidrug resistance pumps with varied substrate specificities, and scientist are still discovering new pumps and new functions of known pumps.

There are many examples of native pumps that act directly on biofuel molecules. For example, the \textit{S. cerevisiae} drug:H+ antiporter Tpo1 effluxes octanoic and decanoic acids [54], (See Chapters 2 and 3). Snq2 and Pdr5 can efflux decane and undecane [55], and Pdr18 [8] and Fps1 [56] efflux ethanol. In \textit{E. coli}, AcrB effluxes geraniol [57].

Despite the plethora of pumps in yeast and ever-expanding research, many potential biofuels do not have a known transporter. Since most production organisms are derived from laboratory model organisms, they are unlikely to encounter toxic biofuel-like molecules during their normal lifetimes. “Wild” organisms that are exposed to a variety of conditions and toxins may have specialized transporters for novel compounds. Environmental isolates are a valuable source of pumps not normally found in laboratory model organisms. Heterologously expressed transporters from \textit{Salmonella enterica} MsBA can improve efflux of zeaxanthin [58], and the \textit{Pseudomonas putida} transporters TtgB and MexF efflux α-pinene and farnesyl hexanoate [57]. Other yeasts and fungi, and even eukaryotes such as humans have a wide variety of transporters that can potentially be useful for \textit{S. cerevisiae}. Chen et al. used the transporters Abc2 and Abc3 from \textit{Yarrowia lipolytica} to improve \textit{S. cerevisiae} tolerance to decane and undecane [59]. The use of heterologous transporters in yeasts for biofuel applications has great potential and remains an interesting direction for research.

When a natural transporter does not exist, one can be engineered. Fisher showed that AcrB can be engineered to efflux \textit{n}-butanol and other short-chain alcohols [60]. AcrB has also been engineered to efflux \textit{n}-octanol [61]. While examples of transporters
engineered for biofuels are scarce, transporters for other compounds including glutamate have been created [62]. Transporters have also been engineered to have reverse directionality [63] and to use different ion gradients as an energy source [64]. Transporter engineering is a growing field of research, one with the potential to make biofuel production a feasible alternative to conventional fuel sources.

Transport is not just important for recovery of product. Kell hypothesizes that transporters can significantly contribute to fluxes of metabolites and products [65]. Transporters can also fix problems caused by the biofuels. For example, alcohols disrupt K\(^+\) and H\(^+\) gradients in yeast cells [66]. Overexpressing the K\(^+\) pump Trk1 and the H\(^+\) pump Pma1 in the normal lab strain S288C corrects this problem, even improving ethanol production beyond that of industrial ethanol strains such as Ethanol Red [22]. On the flip side, transporters, particularly high-copy multi-substrate drug efflux pumps can impose huge metabolic and energy burdens on the cell. Such pumps include Pdr5 from *S. cerevisiae* [50] and AcrB from *E. coli* [60]. Knocking out these transporters can improve growth rates [60,67-68]. Unfortunately, this also means that the expression levels of beneficial transporters can only be increased to a certain limit. Clearly, optimization of transporters in the cell is crucial for achieving high biofuel titers.

**Engineering Yeasts Strains via Evolution**

While scientists have collectively amassed a staggering amount of knowledge about cell biology, there is even more that remains unknown. For example, many details of yeast cellular function are far from “solved”. Without all of the information, we cannot always make accurate predictions as to how a biofuel molecule affects the cell nor how to improve tolerance to the toxic biofuel. Compounding the situation, phenotypes such as tolerance are not the result of a single mutation or overexpressed transporter, but rather the synergistic effect of alterations to multiple genes, including efflux pumps, cell wall and cell membrane properties, metabolism and cell structure adaptations [22,42]. Yeasts do not normally encounter high concentrations of butanol or hexanol, so they do not naturally have a high tolerance toward it. However, yeasts are highly adaptable, so natural evolutions can be used to identify systems affected by biofuel molecules and improve tolerance.

The simplest way to evolve strains is to let them grow in increasing amounts of a given biofuel. Any naturally arising mutations that confer a fitness advantage will be enriched in the culture over time, as the faster growing strains out-compete the wild type. This method has been used to improve yeast strains for thermodurability [45], xylose utilization [63], hydrolysate tolerance [69-70], and many other phenotypes. The downside to this method is that point mutations may not be sufficient to improve tolerance when more complex adaptations are required [71]. Strains with general fitness improvements, or reductions in genome size can also overtake the culture [72] even though these may not be useful in production strains. Sikkema points out that changes accrued during evolution may be part of an adaptive response and not necessarily improve tolerance [27]. When analyzing genomic or transcriptional changes post-evolution, it is important to re-create mutations in wild-type strains in order to prove that they are functional. Natural evolutions are a valuable tool for improving tolerance, often successful where modern technologies fail.
Even with a high success rate, sometimes natural evolutions alone cannot reach a desired phenotype. The native mutation rate is fairly low for \textit{S. cerevisiae}, with 1.13-2.43 mutations per cell per 100 generations [45,73]. Increasing the number of mutations per cell can lead to faster evolution times. UV mutagenesis or chemical mutagenesis with nitroso-methyl guanidine (NTG) are commonly used [74]. Ethyl methane sulfonate (EMS) can also cause deletions and rearrangements [74], and is often used in conjunction with other mutagens for alternating rounds of mutagenesis. This method is problematic in that many non-tolerance enhancing mutations will be found in any tolerant cells, thus requiring a lot of post-evolution cloning to determine causative mutations. Stanley and colleagues used chemical and natural mutagenesis in parallel, and interestingly found that the spontaneous mutations improved ethanol tolerance more than the chemical mutations [75]. Despite accessing more sequence space than natural evolutions, the chemically-induced changes were less capable, for reasons that are not yet understood.

Other large-scale, untargetted methods have proved useful for finding genes for tolerance improvement. In \textit{E. coli}, \textit{n}-butanol tolerance has been improved via overexpression and deletion libraries [76]. In yeast, Hong \textit{et al.} used a library of overexpressed genomic fragments and a plate-based selection to find genes responsible for isobutanol and ethanol tolerance [77]. Gene deletion libraries have been used to find genes necessary for \textit{n}-butanol tolerance, including genes involved in protein degradation [78]. Transcriptomics studies and microarrays have also proven useful in looking at ethanol tolerance genes [79-80]. While such big data methods are undeniably useful, we cannot solely rely such broad studies to dissect all aspects of tolerance. Intricate mechanisms require elegant experiments to comprehend. For example, a genome-level experiment highlighted Fps1 as having a role in ethanol efflux, but it was the focused experiments that showed how the osmolarity-triggered pump only effluxed ethanol once sufficient sugar was consumed, thereby activating the transporter [56].

Despite thousands of years of domestication and ethanol production, simple laboratory evolutions continue to improve ethanol production in \textit{S. cerevisiae} [75,81]. Such successes showcase how powerful evolution is as a tool for strain engineering. Recently, evolutions for butanol tolerance were also carried out. \textit{E. coli} have been evolved for higher ethanol and isobutanol tolerance [82-83]. The Kao group has also reported an evolution of \textit{E. coli} for improved \textit{n}-butanol tolerance [76]. In \textit{S. cerevisiae}, strains have been evolved for \textit{n}-butanol tolerance, with the final OD$_{660}$ about 0.2 for the wild-type and 0.5 for the evolved strains in 1.5\% \textit{n}-butanol [77]. This tolerance extends to \textit{n}-butanol, 2-butanol, isobutanol, and propanol [77]. The genes identified as important for tolerance included Rpn4, a transcription factor that increases proteasome gene expression and Rtg1, another transcription factor involved in inter-organelle communication [77]. Another evolution of \textit{S. cerevisiae} in 2-butanol showed that overexpression of glycerol-3-phosphatase improved 2-butanol tolerance [84]. This study also looked at expression level changes, and found that a majority of upregulated genes were associated with the mitochondria, likely because alcohol-induced membrane permeability decreases efficiency of energy production [84]. In 1.9\% \textit{n}-butanol, the final OD$_{600}$ (at 38 hours) was $\sim$0.35 for the wild type and $\sim$0.6 for the evolved strain [84]. Such tiny improvements hint at the extreme toxicity of the molecule.
Along with multiple toxicity mechanisms come multiple tolerance mechanisms. Single mutations can drive a population to a local tolerance solution [74,85], which may be well below the global tolerance maximum. Each tolerance study seems to find a new piece of the puzzle, yet combinations of these diverse mutations have yet to be studied. Fortunately, yeast have excellent genetic tools available. Haploid yeasts with varying tolerance levels can be mated to produce tolerant diploids. These diploids can be sporulated, and daughter cells with tolerance genes from both parents can be selected. Genomes from set of somewhat tolerant diploids can be shuffled to generate more tolerant strains in this way. Genome shuffling has been successfully used to improve tolerance toward alternative feedstock medias [86].

Above, we outlined several methods for improving yeast strains for biofuel production. Using transporters, fuel products can be actively removed from the cell, decreasing intracellular levels and consequently decreasing toxicity. Additionally, extracellular biofuels can be recovered more easily, simplifying extraction and downstream processing. Using evolution, mechanisms of toxicity and tolerance can be uncovered. The beauty of an evolutionary approach is that the unexpected or unknown is often brought to light. Using both of these approaches together is an excellent strategy for engineering strains for biofuel production. In the following chapters, we detail how we characterized a transporter, Tpo1, for fatty acid efflux (Chapter 2) and used another transporter, AT-1, to control intracellular acetyl CoA flux (Chapter 6). Unfortunately, attempts to engineer an efflux pump for butanol were unsuccessful (Chapter 3). We also used evolutions to improve medium-chain alcohol tolerance in yeast (Chapter 4), and characterized the resulting mutations in translation initiation factors (Chapter 5).
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Chapter 2
Characterization of transporter of polyamines (Tpo1) of S. cerevisiae for activity on medium-chain carboxylic acids

ABSTRACT
Since Maxwell’s demon does not exist, cells employ transporters to control small molecules and metabolites across membranes. The yeast drug:H+ antiporter transporter of polyamines (Tpo1) transports polyamines, fatty acids, and drug molecules out of the cell. Tpo1 has been well-characterized with respect to its activity on polyamines, but less work has been done on its carboxylic acid substrate activity. We set out to further characterize Tpo1 with respect to fatty acid substrates. We have identified two substrate binding residues responsible for fatty acid efflux, a serine and a leucine located in the central pore of the transporter. A re-assessment of acidic residues in the pore hints at their involvement in proton relay. Additionally, we found that an N-terminal truncation which removed multiple regulatory sites did not affect Tpo1 activity on fatty acids. Thus the Tpo1 transporter can act on both fatty acid and polyamine substrates with different regulatory requirements. In a larger context, this work highlights the importance of engineering proteins at the amino acid level, in addition to modulating expression level.

INTRODUCTION
Medium chain fatty acids (MCFAs) are promising potential biofuels and biochemical precursors [1,2]. To this end, fatty acid production has been explored in Escherichia coli [3] and Saccharomyces cerevisiae [4,5,6], as well as algae [7] and cyanobacteria [8]. Yeast are a preferred production organism because they have high tolerance levels and industrial fermentations are well established. Optimizing MCFA production in yeast requires an understanding of toxicity and resistance mechanisms. In yeast, MCFAs are fermentation inhibitors [9], and when fatty acid production enzymes are overexpressed or MCFAs otherwise accumulate in the cell, they are actively secreted into extracellular media [10].

Transporters are important parts of cell physiology and play a crucial role in biochemical production. Notably, by exporting compounds of interest, transporters can improve product titers. For example, overexpressing the yeast transporter Pdr18 enhances ethanol yields [11]. Secreting the biochemical product enables use of the extracellular space as a metabolic sink, in turn reducing intracellular concentrations of toxic, growth-limiting molecules and decreasing product inhibition that can reduce the throughput of the production pathway [12]. Additionally, removing products to the extracellular media simplifies downstream processing by eliminating the need for cell lysis [13]. As S. cerevisiae do not require high levels of fatty acids and thus do not accumulate and store them as do oleaginous yeasts [14], exporting MCFAs is an elegant solution to increase titers. Understanding the transporters involved in fatty acid efflux is a key step in utilizing these molecules as biofuels.

In yeast, the transporter of polyamines (Tpo1) is known to export MCFAs with eight and ten carbons [15], though the transporter of longer-chain MCFAs is as-yet unknown.
Tpo1 has a broad substrate range, acting also on drugs such as cycloheximide, quinidine, and ibuprofen [16,17,18,19]. Yet it is best-characterized for its activity on polyamines, for which it was named. Tomitori et al. identified the gene and showed that the transporter acts on spermine, spermidine, and putrescine [20]. Polyamine export via Tpo1 is activated during the oxidative stress response [21].

Tpo1 has 12 transmembrane helices (Figure 2.1) and is a part of the major facilitator superfamily (MFS). MFS pumps are antiporters powered by the proton motive force, actively moving substrates out of the cell in acidic environments and taking up molecules in basic environments [17]. In addition to plasma membrane localization, Tpo1 is also found in the vacuole, where it pumps substrates in both directions depending on the pH gradient [18].

Crystal structures of several Tpo1 homologues have been solved, including that of the *Escherichia coli* transporter EmrD, which effluxes amphipathic drugs and detergents [22]. This pump has two loops that extend into the cell membrane and bind substrates, allowing it to remove lipophilic compounds directly from the membrane [22]. Another Tpo-like *E. coli* transporter, GlpT, secretes glycerol-3-phosphate and has the same overall structure and mechanism as EmrD [23]. These transporters have a single substrate-binding site and an alternating “rocker-switch” mechanism [22,23]. Tpo1 is thought to function by the same mechanism.

**FIGURE 2.1.** Tpo1 has twelve transmembrane domains and an N-terminal regulatory domain. Red indicates regulatory phosphorylation sites, blue indicates substrate binding residues, purple indicates acidic residues, and green indicates truncation start sites. Putative transmembrane domains of Tpo1 were predicted using MEMSAT3 [37,38,39,40] and the residues of these domains shown in rectangles.
FIGURE 2.2. Tpo1 is the main transporter for decanoic acid efflux but not octanoic acid efflux. Growth curves of strains expressing Tpo1 and GFP under the control of various promoters in the ΔTPO1::KANMX genetic background. Tpo1-expressing strains are shown in solid lines; control strains expressing GFP are shown in dotted lines. Cultures were grown in SD-Leu media containing either A) 0.10 mM decanoic acid, B) 0.30 mM octanoic acid, or C) no fatty acids.
A detailed knowledge of structure-function relationships is critical for protein engineering and design to make use of Tpo1 and related transporters for biochemical production. Here we identify the residues involved in MCFA substrate binding for Tpo1, and demonstrate that two residues previously indicated in polyamine binding are more likely involved in the proton relay. We also show that the N-terminus, known to regulate Tpo1 function on polyamines, does not impact efflux of MCFAs. We conclude that Tpo1 has at least two sets of substrate specificity residues for multiple substrate classes and that differential regulation enables the cell to employ them as required.

RESULTS

Tpo1 enables growth in inhibitory concentrations of decanoic acid, but not octanoic acid. We monitored the effect of Tpo1 on log-phase growth rates in the presence of decanoic and octanoic acids. A ΔTPO1 strain (TPO1Δ::KANMX)[24] was complemented with plasmids encoding TPO1 or, as a negative control, the green fluorescent protein GFP, under three medium-strength promoters. We chose the native TPO1 promoter (pTpo1, 700 base pairs upstream of the start codon), the native promoter from another multidrug efflux pump, pPdr5, and a constitutive medium strength promoter, pRnr2 [25]. In 0.10 mM decanoic acid, strains containing a plasmid encoding TPO1 under the control of these medium-strength promoters recovered to about half the growth rate of unstressed cells (Figure 2.2A). Strains lacking a plasmid-borne copy of TPO1 showed no detectable growth. In contrast, strains bearing TPO1-expressing and control plasmids had approximately the same growth profile when exposed to 0.3 mM octanoic acid (Figure 2.2B). Other transporters, particularly Pdr12, can be upregulated enough to compensate for loss of Tpo1 [11]. To isolate the effects of Tpo1 mutations, we used a TPO1Δ::his3 PDR12Δ::KANMX strain for subsequent experiments.

S163 and L393 are fatty acid substrate binding residues. We used the Clustal Omega multiple sequence alignment tool [26] to align Tpo1 with well-characterized MFS transporters including GlpT, EmrD, and PotE (Table 2.1). The substrate binding residues from GlpT, R45 and R269 [23], align with S163 and L393 of Tpo1. We mutated Tpo1 residue S163 to G163, Y163, D163 and V163, and mutated residue L393 to G393, N393, F393 and D393 in order to examine mutations with varied size and polarity. In ΔTPO1 ΔPDR12 strains complemented with plasmids encoding TPO1 variants, we monitored growth rate in the presence of 0.10 mM decanoic acid and 0.20 mM octanoic acid. None of the mutated Tpo1 alleles supported growth comparable to the wild-type TPO1 expressed from a plasmid (Figure 2.3A). Only the strain expressing the Tpo1L393N mutation was able to grow significantly faster than the negative control, although the full growth rate was not recovered. The Tpo1L393N mutation has the least dramatic difference in amino acid residue size, which may explain why some measure of growth was retained.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transporter</th>
<th>Sequence</th>
<th>Length</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TPO1</td>
<td>LAIQTTRTMNAAESEVNITRRLT61 KILTGSVNEPDREVDYNTCAPMGDDPFPSSR120</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLPT</td>
<td>GSpFQGMSLQGKLWAKQTFKFMCRVGPWAINWVCGRPAAGKTVGADF234</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EmRd</td>
<td>TQIFCRFEEGIAAPAMAVPAFAAFMDDTNVRKAIALFSLGGEVPLSPVMGSYIA294</td>
<td>294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PotE</td>
<td>VLITMN42 MGGSIMLPTKLAEVGITISIIISWLVTAVGSMALAWAFK60</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPO1</td>
<td>VVAILGITFLYFGPAAFSVPIYAP--LSELYRGKVGLVLS----AFGFALEFGAFVATEAEN233</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLPT</td>
<td>AWFNWDHALYMPACAILVALFAFMAMDTPGSCGLPPIEYKN--------DPFDYNE233</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EmRd</td>
<td>TMWNRAVCYFLLLVCACAG----VTFSMARNWPETR----PVDAKRT--------RLTSEY--200</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PotE</td>
<td>VQIGLATIGVLWCTVANFGGARITGQISSITYWGIPVIIPVGLCIGFGLFWSPTLY---V177</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPO1</td>
<td>QRTTWRELYVYVFPCAASFVIAVLFTEE87HHTTILVNTKNKAMQRMQSNWGIIHAAEDEVE354</td>
<td>354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLPT</td>
<td>AWFNWDHALYMPACAILVALFAFMAMDTPGSCGLPPIEYKN--------DPFDYNE233</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EmRd</td>
<td>TMWNRAVCYFLLLVCACAG----VTFSMARNWPETR----PVDAKRT--------RLTSEY--200</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PotE</td>
<td>DSWNPHAPFFASVGGSIAMTLWAFLGLESACANTDVENPERV--------IAVLGGTTLG232</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPO1</td>
<td>LS1KDVQK38TRPIIMLFVEFLPPLLPPVTYNSFYVCILYLLEAYPLVFVEGYPEF141</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLPT</td>
<td>KAEQELTAKQFQMYQLPANL--LWYIAANVVFVIVLLYQILDWSPTYKEVKHFLDR291</td>
<td>291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EmRd</td>
<td>---KTFPGNSGFNCYLL---------MLFIGLAGIAAEFGACSVGLM---------AVGLS241</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PotE</td>
<td>AAVYIVSTVNIAGIVPN-----MELANSTAPFLAGAFQMTPEVGVKINHALVMSCCGS156</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPO1</td>
<td>LPHYIALGVMCAAFIYWMNDYLVK35RCRAGKGKLVPEEARLYAMVIAGTFVPFPGILWCFW474</td>
<td>474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLPT</td>
<td>SWAYFLYEA9PIPTGLCNGMSQKVRG----------NRRGATGVFMTLVTTIYIVYM341</td>
<td>341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EmRd</td>
<td>SMFTSILFILPIAPAAFFGANFG--------RPKRFSTLWQSVSICLLAGLMI290</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PotE</td>
<td>LLGWQFTIAQVFKSSSDKETFPKIFSRV--------TKVDAVPQGMLTVIIVGSLAM338</td>
<td>338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPO1</td>
<td>GYHPH1KHWMTVGGAFICFGIFGLMGFLPCNLYIESYLLAASAAVAANTFMRSAFGACF534</td>
<td>534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLPT</td>
<td>NPAGNPTVDCMVIMIV5FLGYIPVMGLVHLE1AP--KKAAAGTAAGPTGFFG-YLLGSS398</td>
<td>398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EmRd</td>
<td>PFWFGNNVNTTLQAPALQFFGACQGMFPLATSGAMEPPFPLAGVAGLQGQ-NIGSGV438</td>
<td>438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PotE</td>
<td>TISPSLNSQPNVNLAVTVNIIPYLSMALVIQKVAQVPSKAKVANFAC--FVGAM396</td>
<td>396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPO1</td>
<td>PLFAGYMRFGMGIGWAGLLGLFALMAFVLPVFLLFYGESIRKSSKYWAYA------585</td>
<td>585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLPT</td>
<td>AASAIYVGTVDFGQWGGPGGGMGILGLGILVAVLIIIIVNMIGEKRHEOLL542</td>
<td>542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EmRd</td>
<td>LASLSMLPQGGSLGLMLMTLMG---LLLWCLWPLATRMSHQCQPV------394</td>
<td>394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PotE</td>
<td>YSFAYLYSSQEEAMLGVSIVTFGL64GWTLYCVSFRFELKNSHG--------438</td>
<td>438</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FIGURE 2.3. The fatty acid substrate binding and proton relay residues of Tpo1. Growth rates were calculated for Tpo1 point mutations in the presence of 0.10 mM decanoic or 0.20 mM octanoic acids. Tpo1 alleles and GFP were expressed from plasmids in the ∆TPO1 ∆PDR12 strain. Error bars signify standard deviation of n=8 replicates. A) Mutations to the carboxylic substrate binding residues of Tpo1. B) Mutations of various Asp residues to Asn and Glu residues to Gln.
Three glutamines in the transmembrane helices may be part of the proton relay. As an H+:drug antiporter, Tpo1 is powered by the proton motive force, though it is not known which residues are a part of the proton relay. In order to assess the effect of acidic residues in the transmembrane domains, we mutated the residues to their polar but uncharged counterparts. We individually mutated six glutamic acids and one glutamic acid pair to glutamines, and one aspartic acid to asparagine. We then assessed growth rates in the presence of 0.10 mM decanoic and 0.20 mM octanoic acids (Figure 2.3B). While most mutations only slightly decreased fitness under acid stress, the Tpo1<sup>E207Q</sup> and Tpo1<sup>E323Q/E324Q</sup> mutations significantly decreased growth rates. These findings indicate that E207 and E323/E324 glutamates may be important in the proton relay of Tpo1.
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**FIGURE 2.4.** A long N-terminal region is not necessary for Tpo1 activity on fatty acids. A) Growth rates were calculated for Tpo1 point mutations in the presence of 0.10 mM decanoic or 0.20 mM octanoic acids. Tpo1 mutations and GFP were expressed from plasmids in the ΔTpo1 ΔPdr12 strain. Error bars signify standard deviation of n=8 replicates. B) FLAG-tagged Tpo1<sup>145-586</sup> (53.3 kDa), Tpo1<sup>108-586</sup> (57.1 kDa), from plasmids. Whole cell lysates were separated via 15% SDS PAGE and transferred to a PVDF membrane. Membrane was probed with mouse anti-FLAG primary and HRP-conjugated anti-mouse secondary antibodies, then imaged with chemiluminescent substrate. M: Marker; S: Supernatant; P: Pellet. C) Cells expressing FLAG-tagged Tpo1 and truncations from plasmids were grown to exponential phase and fixed with formaldehyde and adhered to cover slips. Coverslips were incubated with mouse anti-FLAG primary and FITC-conjugated anti-mouse secondary antibodies. Slides were imaged as described in materials and methods.
FIGURE 2.5. Tpo1 expression is a balance between pump toxicity and the acids it acts upon. A) Growth rates were calculated for Tpo1 under control of a small promoter library in the presence of 0.10 mM decanoic or 0.20 mM octanoic acids. Tpo1 mutations and GFP were expressed from plasmids in the ∆TPO1 ∆PD12 strain. Error bars signify standard deviation of n=8 replicates. B) Fluorescence was measured from stationary phase cultures of the ∆TPO1 ∆PDR12 strain expressing GFP under the control of various promoters. Error bars signify standard deviation of n=3 replicates. C-D) Tpo-GFP fusions were expressed from plasmids under the pRev1 and pTdh3 promoters in the ∆TPO1 ∆PDR12 strain. Exposure times were 10 sec for pRev1 promoter and 2 msec for the pTdh3 promoter.
The N-terminal region of Tpo1 is not required for function on decanoic acid. We examined two methods of regulation for Tpo1: promoter strength and removal of the N-terminal regulatory domain. C-terminally FLAG-tagged Tpo1 migrates more quickly in a denaturing polyacrylamide gel than expected for a 68.4 kDa peptide, as judged by Western blots (Figure 2.4B). This led us to suspect possible truncation of the protein. We generated two constructs with genetically encoded N-terminal truncations and C-terminal FLAG tags, in order to confirm that the band corresponding to the smaller fragment was not an artifact of our method or due to the unpredictable behavior of membrane proteins run in SDS-PAGE [27]. Surprisingly, the full Tpo1-FLAG construct migrates similarly in a gel to the Tpo1^{145-586}-FLAG construct, which is a full 15 kDa smaller at 53.3 kDa. This truncation removed the entire N-terminal region up to the transmembrane domains, but all of the subsequent domains are likely intact. Western blotting also indicates that the truncation is expressed at lower levels than the wild-type Tpo1 (Figure 2.4B). We tested the activity of the Tpo1 truncations by measuring growth rates in the presence of the fatty acids. Overexpression of Tpo1^{145-586} was unable to rescue yeast from fatty acid toxicity, while overexpression of Tpo1^{108-586} resulted in nearly wild-type growth against decanoic acid (Figure 2.4A). The large error in the octanoic acid growth rates precluded analysis. Immunofluorescence shows that wild-type Tpo1 is localized in the plasma membranes and the vacuole. Tpo1^{145-586} has a similar localization pattern, though the fluorescence intensity appears lower. Tpo1^{108-586}, however, only localizes to the plasma membrane (Figure 2.4C).

The native Tpo1 promoter outperforms several constitutive promoters to optimize Tpo1 expression levels in stressed conditions. Overexpression of a transporter is a simple way to increase efflux of toxic compounds. Optimizing Tpo1 expression for toxic levels of MCFAs will be required for most efficient production in yeasts. We therefore tested the ability of a range of promoter strengths [25] to optimally express Tpo1 in the ΔTPO1 ΔPDR12 strain (Figure 2.5A). There is a slight downward trend in growth rates in the absence of fatty acids correlating with increasing promoter strength, as seen in the unstressed growth rates of Figure 2.5A. The promoters are not affected by decanoic or octanoic acid, as seen in Figure 2.5B. Microscopic analysis of Tpo1-GFP fusion localization shows that high expression of TPO1 under the pTdh3 promoter leads to a buildup in vacuoles and saturation of the plasma membrane (Figure 2.5D). In the presence of fatty acids, the native TPO1 promoter is likely dynamically regulated and optimizes expression to confer maximal growth rates, balancing toxicity of transporter overexpression with necessity of expressing enough transporters to remove the fatty acids. The Rnr2 promoter best mimics the native Tpo1 promoter level (Figure 2.5A).

DISCUSSION

Octanoic and decanoic acids have overlapping yet different responses in the cell, as previously explored by Legras [15]. That study showed that Pdr12 is also responsible for octanoic acid response while Tpo1 is the main exporter of decanoic acid [15]. Our experiments confirm this, as expressing Tpo1 in a ΔTPO1 strain confers a significant increase in growth rates as compared to the negative control expressing GFP, which is unable to grow in the presence of toxic concentrations of decanoic acid. In contrast, strains expressing Tpo1 and the negative control had similar growth profiles when
grown in 0.30 mM octanoic acid. Even so, there is significant variance in growth in octanoic acid, which may be attributable to the utilization of other tolerance mechanisms.

We identified the likely key residues for fatty acid substrate specificity of Tpo1 transporter based on homology to the *E. coli* transporter GlpT (Table 2.2). We expected polar and hydrophobic residues to bind to the carboxylic group and hydrophobic tail of the fatty acids, respectively. The GlpT substrate binding sites R45 and R269 align with S163 and L393 of Tpo1 (Table 2.2). Mutating these residues conferred a greatly reduced growth rate in the presence of both octanoic and decanoic acids, but Tpo1L393N conferred an intermediate growth rate as compared to the wild-type and the negative control, so the transporter likely retains some activity upon mutation. Leucine and asparagine residues are of comparable size, so it is possible that in this part of the pore, substrate selection is driven more by steric interactions than polarity, or that this residue is not as exclusive as S163. Both S163 and L393 are undeniably important for fatty acid efflux by Tpo1.

Tomitori et al. proposed that three glutamate residues are involved in substrate binding of polyamine substrates [28]. These residues were identified based on homology to the PotE polyamine binding sites [28,29]. Interestingly, we mutated these residues and several other acidic residues in Tpo1 and found that mutation of two of the glutamates identified by Tomitori also reduces tolerance toward MCFAs, as shown in Figure 3B. This suggests that these residues also have a role in MCFA transport. Negatively charged glutamates are more likely to bind positively charged substrates such as polyamines than negatively charged carboxylic acids, so it may be that these residues are involved in proton relay rather than substrate specificity. Additionally, it was shown by Kashiwagi et al. that tyrosine, tryptophan, and cysteine residues have the greatest involvement in putrescine transport, rather than acidic residues [29]. We hypothesize that acidic glutamates at positions 207, 323, and 324 of Tpo1 are in fact part of the proton relay rather than involved in substrate specificity. Other glutamate residues and an aspartate residue, when mutated to glutamine or asparagine, did not decrease growth rate as dramatically, so are unlikely to be involved in proton relay.

The N-terminal portion of Tpo1 includes a long segment that is not part of the transmembrane domains. It contain many potential regulatory sites, including an S19 and T52 that increase polyamine transport activity when phosphorylated, and an RRTL motif that is involved in vacuolar sorting [30] (See Figure 2.2). A 108 residue N-terminal truncation (Tpo1108-586) that removes these regulatory sites supports growth at nearly the wild-type level (Figure 2.4A), though localization is limited to the plasma membrane (Figure 2.4C). A more dramatic 145-residue truncation (Tpo1145-586) does not appear to be active (Figure 2.4A), though the localization and size as judged by Western blot is more similar to the wild type (Figure 2.4B). Tpo1145-586 seems to have a much lower expression level than the wild-type or Tpo1108-586, which may account for lower activity and inability to support growth in the presence of toxic levels of fatty acids. Future investigations could explore the effects of expressing the truncated Tpo1145-586 under a stronger promoter, to determine whether it is merely an expression deficit.

We hypothesize that different regulatory mechanisms exist for Tpo1 depending on whether the critical substrate is a polyamine or a fatty acid. In the case of the fatty acids, efflux to the extracellular space immediately removes a toxic compound that is not
otherwise useful for the cell [14]. This is how Tpo1108-586, which is only detected in the plasma membrane, is able to support growth in media with fatty acids. On the other hand, polyamines are essential in low amounts for translation, so sequestration in the vacuole is a way to store the compounds until they are needed. The balance between beneficial and toxic levels of cytoplasmic polyamines is a delicate one, which necessitates careful regulation by phosphorylation.

In addition to post-translational regulation, regulation of Tpo1 expression level is critical. As with many membrane proteins, overexpression of Tpo1 is toxic to the cell. We tested a range of promoter strengths and found that medium-strength promoters are best for mimicking the native Tpo1 promoter and expressing appropriate levels of Tpo1 (Figure 5A). There is a small decrease in the growth rate under normal media conditions as the promoter strength increases. We expect that the transporter has saturated the already-crowded plasma membrane and is depleting the proton gradient, as well as posing a metabolic burden through excess protein production. High expression levels of Tpo1-GFP fusions show a high density in the vacuoles and plasma membrane (Figure 2.5D), which is likely impairing function of these membranes by packing them with multiple copies of Tpo1. Even in the presence of toxic levels of octanoic and decanoic acids, high expression of Tpo1 is deleterious to the cell, as evidenced by the drop in growth rate with increasing promoter strength in Figure 5A. Previous work by Marks et al. has shown that many commercial strains have “amplification” of Tpo1, and it is upregulated as fermentation progresses [31]. However, in our lab strain, improving fatty acid efflux must be balanced carefully against the stress of overexpression. The native regulation must balance the multiple roles of Tpo1: high expression level for Tpo1 is necessary in the presence of toxic MCFAs, which are produced during normal growth; however, excess Tpo1 works to deplete essential polyamine concentrations, thus hindering translation and concomitantly lowering growth rates. More study on the differential regulation of Tpo1 for its multiple substrate classes is needed to clearly link its regulation mechanisms and various intracellular effects.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Strains and media

*S. cerevisiae* strains ΔTPO1 and ΔPDR12 were obtained from the Yeast Deletion Project BY4741 library (MATa his3Δ1 leu2Δ0 met15Δ0 ura3Δ0) [24]. A ΔTPO1ΔPDR12 strain was generated by replacing the *TPO1* gene with a *his3* cassette in the ΔPDR12 strain and confirming by PCR of the junctions. Strains were transformed with plasmids containing the *LEU2* auxotrophic marker and selected and grown on synthetic dropout media without leucine (SD-Leu: 0.67% Yeast Nitrogen Base (BD Chemical), 2% α-Dextrose (Amresco), 0.2% amino acid mix without leucine from US Biological).

Genetic Methods

The *TPO1* gene was amplified from the BY4741 genome using primers 5’-TAAATCGATACTGCAATTTCTAGGCATATCCAGCGAGATCTatgtcggatcattctcccat-3’ and 5’-AAATCATAAATCATAAGAAAATTCGCTCAGGtatGGATCCtaagcggcgaagctac-3’ and homologously recombined [24] into plasmid pSD279 [25]. *TPO1* mutations were generated using two-step PCR and homologous recombination. The promoter library
was a gift from Dueber lab [25]. GFP fusions and FLAG-tagged TPO1 were generated by PCR amplifying the GFP or 4X FLAG sequence (gattataagatgacgatgacaag) and using homologous recombination to append it 3' of the TPO1 gene with a linker sequence (ggtgacggtctgttta). The TPO1 promoter (pTpo1) was generated by cloning 706 base pairs upstream of the TPO1 start codon into the pSD279 vector. The PDR5 promoter (pPdr5) was generated by cloning 698 base pairs upstream of the PDR5 start codon into the pSD279 vector.

**Growth Curves**

Single colonies were inoculated into 5 mL SD-Leu in culture tubes. Cultures were grown 36 hours at 30°C with 280 rpm shaking. Stationary phase cultures were diluted to an optical density at 600 nm (OD$_{600}$) of .30-.33 a.u. as measured with a Nanodrop 2000c spectrophotometer, and 5 mL dilute culture was aliquoted into screw-cap tubes. 5 mL SD-Leu with 0 or 0.2 mM decanoic acid (Sigma), or 0.6 mM octanoic acid (Sigma) was added. Each sample was run in triplicate. Screw-cap tubes were grown at 30°C with 280 rpm shaking and measurements were taken *in situ* every 2 hours using a Genesys-20 spectrophotometer.

**Growth Rate Calculations**

Single colonies were used to inoculate 3 mL SD-Leu in a 24-well culture block. Cultures were grown 36 hours at 30°C with 280 rpm shaking. Stationary phase cultures were sub-cultured 1:50 into 3 mL SD-Leu, SD-Leu + 0.1 mM decanoic acid, and SD-Leu + 0.2 mM octanoic acid, and grown 4 hours at 30°C with 280 rpm shaking. At 4 and 10 hours, OD$_{600}$ was measured for 100 μL of culture using a Molecular Devices SpectraMax M2 plate reader. The growth rate was calculated as $\ln(10\text{hour } OD_{600}/4\text{hour } OD_{600})/6\text{hr}$. Reported growth rates are averages of two samples per day on three different days.

**Fluorescent protein measurements**

Strains containing plasmids expressing Tpo1 or GFP were grown 24 hours at 30°C with 280 rpm shaking in SD-Leu + 0.0 or 0.05 mM decanoic acid or 0.1 mM octanoic acid. Cell density (OD$_{800}$) and fluorescence (a.f.u.) were measured using a Biotek Synergy HTX plate reader. Fluorescence measurements were divided by the corresponding OD$_{600}$ for each sample, and background fluorescence, measured as the fluorescence from strains expressing only Tpo1, was subtracted.

**Microscopy**

Images were captured using an Andor Clara-Lite digital camera and a Nikon Ni-U upright microscope with a 100x, 1.45 n.a. plan apochromat oil immersion objective. Images were acquired at room temperature. Immunofluorescence images were taken in 90% glycerol, live cell images were taken in SD-Leu media. Fluorescence images were collected using a C-FL Endow GFP HYQ band pass filter. Images were captured using the Nikon NIS Elements software.

**Immunofluorescence**

*S. cerevisiae* BY4741 ΔTPO1 PDR12 containing plasmids expressing Tpo1 and truncations with C-terminal 4X FLAG tags were grown to stationary phase in SD-Leu.
The cells were then subcultured 1:100 and grown 4 hours. Cells were fixed in 3.7% formaldehyde (Sigma), washed with 100 mM potassium phosphate, pH 6.5. The cell wall was digested with zymolyase (Zymo) and cells were adhered to coverslips with polylysine (Sigma). Coverslips were incubated in 4°C methanol for 6 min and 4°C acetone for 30 s. PBS-BSA (PBS {1.37 M NaCl (Sigma), 27 mM KCl (Spectrum), 100 mM Na₂HPO₄ (Fisher) 18 mM KH₂PO₄ (Fisher) pH 7.4}+ 5 mg/ml BSA (Sigma)) was used to block. Coverslips were incubated in a 1:500 dilution of mouse anti-FLAG (Sigma) overnight. After three washes with PBS-BSA, a 1:100 dilution of a goat anti-mouse FITC conjugated antibody (Sigma) was added and incubated two hours at room temperature. Coverslips were washed three times with PBS-BSA, then three times with PBS and dried. Coverslips were placed on 90% glycerol on slides and sealed with nail polish. Images were taken as described above.

**Westerns**

Whole cell lysates were prepared by resuspending 2 mL of stationary phase cells in 200 uL Homogenization Buffer (50 mM Tris (Sigma), pH 7.5, 1 mM EDTA, 1 mM β-mercaptoethanol (Amresco), 10% glycerol (Fisher), 17.4 µg/ml PMSF (Sigma)). Cells were lysed by vortexing 2 minutes with glass beads. Lysed cells were pelleted by spinning at 10,000 x g for 2 minutes. Supernatants were separated and pellets resuspended in 200 uL Homogenization Buffer. 4X SDS running buffer (200 mM Tris, 4% β-mercaptoethanol, 8% SDS (Fisher), 0.04% bromophenol blue (Acros Organics), 40% glycerol, pH 6.8) was added and samples were boiled 95°C for 5 minutes. 10 uL of sample were run through a 15% SDS-PAGE gel. Proteins were transferred to polyvinylidene fluoride (PVDF) membrane (Millipore) using a semi-dry blotting protocol. Membranes were blocked in 5% milk in TBST (50 mM Tris, 150 mM NaCl, 0.05% Tween-20 (Fisher), pH 7.5) for 30 minutes at room temperature. Membrane was incubated in a 1:7,000 dilution of mouse anti-FLAG antibody (Sigma) in TBST + 1% milk overnight, washed 3X 5 minutes with 10 mL TBST, then incubated 2 hours at room temperature in a 1:1000 dilution of HRP-conjugated goat anti-mouse antibody in TBST. Membranes were imaged using the SuperSignal West Pico Chemiluminescent substrate (Pierce) and Chemidoc Imager.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plasmid</th>
<th>Promoter</th>
<th>Insert</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pSD350</td>
<td>pTpo1</td>
<td>Tpo1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pSD359</td>
<td>pTpo1</td>
<td>GFP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pSD303</td>
<td>pRev1</td>
<td>Tpo1-link-GFP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pSD301</td>
<td>pTdh3</td>
<td>Tpo1-link-GFP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pSD417</td>
<td>pTpo1</td>
<td>145-586 Tpo1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pSD418</td>
<td>pTpo1</td>
<td>108-586 Tpo1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pSD409</td>
<td>pTpo1</td>
<td>Tpo1 S163Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pSD410</td>
<td>pTpo1</td>
<td>Tpo1 S163V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pSD411</td>
<td>pTpo1</td>
<td>Tpo1 S163D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pSD415</td>
<td>pTpo1</td>
<td>Tpo1 S163G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pSD412</td>
<td>pTpo1</td>
<td>Tpo1 L393N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pSD413</td>
<td>pTpo1</td>
<td>Tpo1 L393F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pSD414</td>
<td>pTpo1</td>
<td>Tpo1 L393D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pSD416</td>
<td>pTpo1</td>
<td>Tpo1 L393G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pSD419</td>
<td>pTpo1</td>
<td>Tpo1 E207Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pSD630</td>
<td>pTpo1</td>
<td>Tpo1 E323Q/E324Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pSD631</td>
<td>pTpo1</td>
<td>Tpo1 E574Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pSD646</td>
<td>pTpo1</td>
<td>Tpo1 D155N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pSD647</td>
<td>pTpo1</td>
<td>Tpo1 E233Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pSD648</td>
<td>pTpo1</td>
<td>Tpo1 E398Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pSD649</td>
<td>pTpo1</td>
<td>Tpo1 E415Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pSD650</td>
<td>pTpo1</td>
<td>Tpo1 E452Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pSD401</td>
<td>pPdr5</td>
<td>Tpo1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pSD406</td>
<td>pPdr5</td>
<td>GFP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pSD575</td>
<td>pTpo1</td>
<td>Tpo1^{145-586}-FLAG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pSD576</td>
<td>pTpo1</td>
<td>Tpo1^{108-586}-FLAG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pSD657</td>
<td>pTpo1</td>
<td>Tpo1-FLAG</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Chapter 3
Engineering Tpo1 for the Efflux of Medium-Chain Alcohols

INTRODUCTION
Worldwide, people are looking toward greener, more sustainable energy sources. Biofuels are one attractive energy source. However, most desirable fuel molecules are toxic to the production organisms, which limits biofuel titers. A promising strategy for combating this toxicity is to use transporters to actively remove biofuels from the cell. Removing biofuels has the dual advantage of decreasing toxicity within the cell and increasing extracellular concentrations, which can simplify recovery processing. The efflux process also permits the use of the extracellular space as a metabolic sink, reducing intracellular product such that the pathway is pulled forward and inhibition is minimized.

In general, there are few native pumps known to act on biofuel-relevant molecules. Solvents such as toluene can be effluxed by the Ttg and Mex transporter families in Pseudomonas putida [1]. Transporters for molecules such as geraniol [2] and zeaxanthin, a biofuel-like molecule [3] were identified and can be heterologously expressed in E. coli. Medium-chain alcohol substrates are particularly underrepresented, either by lack of necessity on the part of organisms or because such pumps are yet to be discovered. Nonetheless, there are some examples; for instance, the srpABC pump from P. putida can efflux octanol [1]. Recently, it was shown that over-expression of the yeast ABC pump Pdr18 increases tolerance to ethanol [4]. The RND pump AcrB has been successfully engineered to remove n-butanol from E. coli [5]. To our knowledge, there are not any native S. cerevisiae pumps that act upon the biofuel molecules n-butanol or n-hexanol, nor have any been engineered to efflux these substrates. We chose to re-engineer an S. cerevisiae pump for biofuel specificity.

The pump we chose as a basis for engineering, Tpo1, has been studied in the context of tolerance toward polyamines, drugs, and medium-chain fatty acids [6,7]. Recently, it was shown that overexpression of Tpo1 and related antiporters Tpo2, Tpo3, and Tpo4, did not improve S. cerevisiae tolerance to ethanol [5]. Medium-chain alcohols such as n-butanol and n-hexanol are more structurally similar to native substrates than ethanol. Both polyamines and fatty acids have medium length hydrocarbon tails with polar “handles,” very much like medium chain alcohols. Thus, the Tpo1 transporter is a good basis for engineering medium-chain alcohol specificity.

For this work, we went beyond simply over-expressing or creating knock-outs of Tpo1. We attempted to modulate substrate specificity of the Tpo1 transporter, in order to increase activity upon n-butanol and n-hexanol. Unfortunately, we were unable to achieve this goal.
RESULTS

A model competition establishes how fast tolerant strains overtake competition cultures. Our strategy for engineering a transporter for butanol was to generate libraries of mutated transporters using error-prone PCR, then compete strains expressing these transporters in media containing alcohols, as shown in Figure 3.1. To determine how fast tolerant strains would overtake cultures, we set up a model competition, using strains with varying levels of hexanol tolerance. The development of these strains is detailed in Chapter 4. We started with a wild-type transformed with an Emerald plasmid, and added in varied-tolerance strains containing mKate at $10^4$, $10^5$, and $10^6$ dilutions. We used strains with growth rates of 0.12 (wild-type), 0.17 (sSD009) and 0.27 (sSD002) in 0.12\% $n$-hexanol, to show the effects of different tolerance levels. The results of this competition are shown in Figure 3.2.

Figure 3.1. Strains can be improved via competitions of libraries generated by error-prone PCR. A library of Tpo1 mutations is generated with error-prone PCR. The library is transformed into wild-type $S. \text{cerevisiae}$. This library is competed under selective conditions, such as in 1.0\% $n$-butanol or 0.12\% $n$-hexanol. The competition is sub-cultured daily into fresh media with alcohols until the most fit strains take over the culture by virtue of their higher growth rates. The competition enriched in fast-growing strains is plated, and single colonies are selected and characterized.
By day 5, the highly tolerant strain easily overtakes the culture at all dilution levels (Figure 3.2, middle panel). The low tolerance strain comprises approximately 75% of the culture of the $10^4$ dilution, approximately 50% of the $10^5$ dilution, and is now detectable in the $10^6$ dilution. On day 9, the results vary significantly from the expected trend. It seems that the wild-type strains expressing Emerald have begun to re-take the cultures at the expense of the tolerant strains expressing mKate. This is likely due to beneficial genomic mutations arising in the Emerald-expressing strains.

**Figure 3.2. Model competition shows that tolerant strains can quickly take over a culture.** *S. cerevisiae* strains with high and low tolerance (described in Chapter 4) were transformed with RFP expressing plasmids and diluted 1:10^4, 1:10^5, or 1:10^6 in wild-type *S. cerevisiae* transformed with an Emerald-expressing plasmid. Cells were grown in 0.12% *n*-hexanol with daily subculturing to 1:100. After 5 and 9 days, competitions were plated to single colonies, and counts of RFP and Emerald expressing colonies were recorded.
Tpo1 does not improve tolerance toward n-butanol. We tested whether the overexpression of Tpo1 under the low-strength Rev1 promoter or the high-strength Tdh3 promoter could improve growth rates in the presence of n-butanol. Wild-type S. cerevisiae strains expressing Tpo1, Emerald (a yeast-optimized GFP version), or empty vector had approximately the same growth rates in SD-Leu media, as seen in Figure 3.3A. The exception is the strain harboring Tpo1 under the Tdh3 promoter, which had a lower growth rate. We hypothesize that this is due to toxic effects of the transporter at these high expression levels, and is not surprising given the characterization work we did on Tpo1 overexpression in Chapter 2. In 1.0% and 1.2% n-butanol (Figure 3.3B and 3.3C), the the strains expressing Tpo1 failed to improve growth rates above the Emerald and empty vector controls. Overexpression of Tpo1 did not confer improved growth rates in the presence of n-butanol, though this does not preclude an engineered version from improving butanol tolerance.
Strains expressing a library of variants of Tpo1 did not improve tolerance toward n-butanol. We generated three libraries of approximately $10^4$ colonies using the non-optimal dNTP method, with varying mutation rates. Using Mutazyme, we generated two small libraries of about 500 colonies each, at low and high mutation rates. After 14 days of competition in 0.1% $n$-hexanol and 1.0% $n$-butanol, we plated competitions to single colonies and screened colonies for alcohol tolerance. Figure 3.3 shows an experimental outline. Unfortunately, none of the colonies had consistently better growth rates in the presence of alcohols. In Figure 3.4, we show that one hexanol competition winner is reproducibly more tolerant, though the improvement is extremely slight. None of the butanol competition winners were significantly more tolerant.

![Graph showing growth rates of TPO, GFP, Empty Vector, and TPO Evolved in 0.1% n-Hexanol](image)

**Figure 3.4.** Hexanol competition winner has slightly improved growth in 0.1% $n$-hexanol. *S. cerevisiae* transformed with a mutated Tpo1 plasmid from the competition was grown in SD-Leu media + 0.1% $n$-hexanol alongside control strains expressing empty vector, Emerald, and unmutated Tpo1.
Competitions selected for strain improvements rather than Tpo1 improvements. We back-transformed plasmids from hexanol competition winners into wild-type yeast and found that any tolerance improvement was lost. We show in Figure 3.5 that 9 different strains carrying back-transformed plasmids have approximately the same growth rates as strains carrying an unmutated Tpo1-expressing plasmid or control plasmids expressing Emerald or empty vector. Next, we compared a larger sample of competition winners to back-transformed plasmids, as shown in Figure 3.6. We screened 93 colonies from both butanol and hexanol competitions at both 7 and 14 days against back-transformed plasmids. After the butanol competition, back-transformed plasmids are less tolerant than original library or unmutated Tpo1 after 7 days, but the large error bars on the samples makes interpretation tenuous. The data from the hexanol competition is similarly plagued with large error bars. The trends, however, are toward back-transformed plasmids having lower tolerance than the strains that went through the competition.

Figure 3.5. Backtransformed plasmids do not help growth in 0.1% n-hexanol. S. cerevisiae were transformed with mutated Tpo1 plasmids miniprepped from competition winners. Strains were grown in SD-Leu media + 0.1% n-hexanol alongside controls expressing empty vector, Emerald, and unmutated Tpo1.
DISCUSSION

Tpo1 overexpression did not increase growth rate in the presence of \( n \)-butanol. Moreover, at high overexpression levels the transporter itself was detrimental to growth even in the presence of toxic concentrations of butanol. This follows what we learned in Chapter 2: namely that Tpo1 overexpression is detrimental and the native promoter has established an optimal expression level. González-Ramos et al. recently screened a yeast deletion library for \( n \)-butanol activity. They did not report any significant Tpo1 involvement in butanol tolerance [10]. Additionally, Tpo1 does not affect ethanol tolerance [5]. Taken together, we conclude that wild-type Tpo1 is not active on short-chain alcohols.

With such a varied group of substrates, we expect Tpo1 to have flexible and accommodating substrate binding sites, so that we could easily introduce mutations without reducing activity. As we learned by engineering AcrB for \( n \)-butanol specificity,
whole-genome mutagenesis is effective [4]. We used both error-prone PCR with non-optimal dNTPs and a polymerase engineered to make mutations, Mutazyme II, to generate several small libraries of the gene encoding Tpo1. It is likely that our small library sizes was too limiting, as we did not find any Tpo1 variants that improved tolerance to alcohols.

Interestingly, we did see a trend of increased tolerance to \(n\)-hexanol, though back-transformation showed that it was not due to the mutated Tpo1 plasmid. When we further examined the tolerance levels of strains that had been through the competition versus those harboring the back-transformed plasmids, we found that the strains apart from the Tpo1 plasmids had some improved tolerance. We reasoned that genomic mutations were likely obscuring any improvements due to the Tpo1 library, resulting in our competition strategy being biased toward the more effective genomic mutations. The rapid response of the yeasts to \(n\)-hexanol was intriguing, prompting us to explore the phenomenon further. We will discuss these results in Chapter 4.

We set up model competition experiments in order to look more closely at tolerance evolution, so we could design more effective competition protocols. We competed Emerald-expressing wild-type \(S.\ cerevisiae\) against mKate-expressing strains with three tolerance levels. mKate strains were diluted into a population of Emerald strains at 1:10\(^4\), 1:10\(^5\), or 1:10\(^6\) ratios, to mimic a variety of library sizes. These cultures were grown in 0.12\% \(n\)-hexanol and diluted 1:100 daily, as would be done for a library competition. At days 5 and 9, we plated samples of each culture, then counted the red vs. green populations. We saw that the highly tolerant strains easily overtook the cultures at all dilution levels by day 5. Any Tpo1 mutations that increased solvent tolerance to this extent would easily be uncovered from a library after such a competition. The low tolerance strains were successful in taking over the cultures as well, though the percentages varied depending on the starting dilutions. It is interesting to note that while the day 5 trends correlate with the starting dilution, the actual values do not match what would be predicted mathematically: ie, the 10\(^5\) dilution is not 1/10th that of the 10\(^4\) dilution. By day 9, the experimental results were noticeably different than would be expected. In the 10\(^6\) dilution of high-tolerance strains, the wild-type strain increased in prevalence, which suggests that some of the originally wild-type yeasts had acquired mutation(s) that conferred a high level of tolerance as well. In competitions with the low-tolerance strain, the wild-type strains are also gaining back lost ground. For competitions of plasmid-based libraries in highly-evolvable solvents such as \(n\)-hexanol, it is necessary to back-transform plasmids every 5 days, in order to prevent genomic mutations from skewing results. Another option is to execute the competitions in a strain that has been evolved for solvent tolerance. The Tpo1 library competitions were done over a 14 day period, so it is likely that any tolerance improvements from Tpo1 mutations were obscured by genomic mutations that improved tolerance. This may explain why they were unsuccessful.

To our knowledge, medium-chain alcohol tolerance, apart from butanol, has not been explored in \(S.\ cerevisiae\). The wild-type strains were extremely amenable to tolerance-improving mutations. We took this unexpected opportunity to develop strains of \(S.\ cerevisiae\) that are tolerant to medium-chain alcohols, which will be discussed fully in Chapters 4 and 5. Though evolutions of Tpo1 for medium-chain alcohol efflux were unsuccessful, we learned a great deal about competition design. The importance of
back-transforming competition libraries was clear, especially under evolution-friendly conditions. Future directed evolutions will include back-transformation steps.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Strains and Media
Saccharomyces cerevisiae strain BY4741 (MATa his3Δ1 leu2Δ0 met15Δ0 ura3Δ0), derived from strain S288C was used for all experiments. Yeasts were transformed with plasmids containing the Leu2 auxotrophic marker and selected and grown on synthetic dropout media without leucine (SD-Leu: 0.67% Yeast Nitrogen Base, 2% alpha-Dextrose, 0.2% amino acid mix without leucine from US Biological).

Genetic Methods
The Tpo1 gene was cloned out of the genome using primers SDa27
5'-TAAATCGATACTGACATTTCTAGGCAATCCAGCGATCTagtcggatcattctcccat-3'
and SDa28
5'-AAATCATATAACTCATAAGAAATTCGCCTGAGGATCCGCTtaaagcggcgaagcatact-3'
and homologously recombined into plasmid pSD279, a gift from the Dueber lab.

Error-prone PCR: Non-optimal dNTP
Each reaction contained 2.5 μL each forward and reverse primers at 10 mM, 10 μL 5X GoTaq buffer, 2 μL dNTP mix (5 mM dATP, 5 mM dGTP, 25 mM dCTP, 25 mM dTTP), 11 μL 25 mM MgCl₂, 1 μL GoTaq, 1 μL template at 100 ng/μL, and 20 μL H₂O. The PCR cycle was: 95°C 2', 32X[95°C 30", 53°C 30", 72°C 2'], 72°C 10'. PCRs were run in a Bio-Rad C1000 and S1000 thermocyclers. For the Tpo1 library, primers were SDa27 and SDa28, and the template was pSD266.

Error-prone PCR: Mutazyme
Each reaction contained 1 μL each forward and reverse primers, 5 μL 10X Mutazyme buffer, 1 μL 10 mM dNTP mix, 1 μL Mutazyme II, 1 μL template, and 40 μL H₂O. Templates were at 10, or 100 ng/μL to give varying mutagenesis levels. PCR cycle was: 95°C 2’, 32X[95°C 30”, 52°C 30”, 72°C 2’], 72°C 10’. PCRs were run in a Bio-Rad C1000 and S1000 thermocyclers. For the Tpo1 library, primers were a27 and a28, and the template was pSD266. For the Tpo1 library, primers were SDa27 and SDa28, and the template was pSD266.

Library generation
PCR products were cleaned up using the DNA Clean & Concentrator-5 kit from Zymo Research. Vector pSD266 was digested with BgIII and BamHI, vector band was excised from a 1% agarose gel (1% agarose, 40 mM Tris, 20 mM acetate, 1 mM EDTA, pH 8.0) and extracted using the DNA Clean & Concentrator-5 kit from Zymo Research. 1000 ng PCR product and 500 ng vector were transformed into wild-type yeast using the LiOAC method [8]. Ten transformations were done simultaneously and plated on SD-Leu plates. Plates were resuspended in SD-Leu and aliquots were saved as glycerol stocks.

Competition
Libraries were grown overnight in SD-Leu media. Cultures were subcultured daily by 1:10 dilution into SD-Leu media containing 1% or 1.2% n-butanol, or 0.10% or 0.12% n-hexanol for a total of 14 days. Cultures were grown in a 30°C water-bath shaker at 200 rpm. At the end of the evolution, glycerol stocks were made and culture was streaked to single colonies on plates.

Model competition
Strains BY4741 (wild-type), sSD002, and sSD009 were transformed with plasmids pSD270 or pSD268, and plated on SD-Leu agar plates. Single colonies were picked and grown 2 days in 5 mL SD-Leu media in culture tubes. Saturated cultures were diluted to an OD$_{600}$ of 0.300 using the nanodrop. 5 mL of sSD001-pSD270 was aliquoted into a screw-cap tube. Strains sSD001, sSD002, and sSD009 containing pSD268 were added at a 10$^4$, 10$^5$, or 10$^6$ ratio. 5 mL SD-Leu + 0.24% n-hexanol was added to each tube and cultures were grown in a 30°C water-bath shaker at 200 rpm. Cultures were subcultured daily 1:10 into fresh SD-Leu media + 0.12% n-hexanol. At days 5 and 9, 1 uL of culture was plated on SD-Leu plates. Red vs. green colonies per plate were counted and charted.

Growth Curves
Single colonies were picked into 5 mL SD-Leu media in culture tubes. Cultures were grown overnight to saturation at 30°C with 280 rpm shaking. Stationary phase cultures were diluted to an OD$_{600}$ of .300-.330 as measured with a Nanodrop 2000c, 5 mL dilute culture was aliquoted into screw-cap tubes. 5 mL SD-Leu plus appropriate amount of alcohols was added. Each sample was run in triplicate. Screw-cap tubes were grown at 30°C with 280 rpm shaking and measurements were taken every 2 hours with Genesys-20 spectrophotometer.

Table 3.1 Strains and Plasmids used in this study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plasmid</th>
<th>Promoter</th>
<th>Insert</th>
<th>Marker</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pSD266</td>
<td>pRev1</td>
<td>Tpo1</td>
<td>Leu2</td>
<td>This Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pSD279</td>
<td>pRev1</td>
<td>Emerald</td>
<td>Leu2</td>
<td>Lee et al. [9]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pSD306</td>
<td>pRev1</td>
<td>MT</td>
<td>Leu2</td>
<td>This Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pSD270</td>
<td>pTdh3</td>
<td>Emerald</td>
<td>Leu2</td>
<td>Lee et al. [9]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pSD268</td>
<td>pTdh3</td>
<td>mKate</td>
<td>Leu2</td>
<td>Lee et al. [9]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pSD280</td>
<td>pTdh3</td>
<td>Tpo1</td>
<td>Leu2</td>
<td>This Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pSD307</td>
<td>pTdh3</td>
<td>MT</td>
<td>Leu2</td>
<td>This Study</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strain</th>
<th>Parent</th>
<th>Genotype</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BY4741</td>
<td></td>
<td>MATa his3Δ1 leu2Δ0 met15Δ0 ura3Δ0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sSD002</td>
<td>BY4741</td>
<td>BY4741 GCD1-E85 CIT2-C338</td>
<td>Chapter 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sSD009</td>
<td>BY4741</td>
<td>BY4741 evolved</td>
<td>Chapter 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Chapter 4
Evolving Strains for Medium-chain Alcohol Tolerance

ABSTRACT
For microbially-produced biofuels to be cost-effective, high production titers need to be achieved. One cause of low titers is the biofuels themselves, which are toxic and decrease growth rates and cell viability. Improving production organism tolerance can help improve titers by allowing cells to continue growth and production in higher biofuel concentrations. Toward the goal of highly tolerant production hosts, we have evolved a laboratory strain of *S. cerevisiae* to be more tolerant toward the medium-chain alcohol *n*-hexanol. These evolved strains display log-phase growth rates more than double that of the wild-type strain in the presence of toxic levels of *n*-hexanol. The hexanol evolution yielded strains with log-phase growth rates of 0.27 /hr in YPD media with 0.1% *n*-hexanol, whereas for wild-type strain *K* = 0.12 /hr under the same conditions. A second round of evolution starting with these more tolerant strains further improved tolerance. In 0.18% hexanol, *K* = 0.1 /hr for round two strains, *K* = 0.06 /hr for round one strains, and the wild type does not have significant growth. The phenotype is stable in the absence of solvent pressure, and is dominant: when mated with a non-tolerant yeast, the diploids have tolerance levels matching those of the tolerant haploid strains. The tolerance extends to other medium-length alcohols such as *n*-pentanol and *n*-heptanol. We have sequenced the genomes and found that the responsible mutations are Gcd1<sup>D85E</sup> and Sui2<sup>D77Y</sup>. Re-creating these mutations in a wild-type strain confirmed that they confer tolerance to the *S. cerevisiae*. These results will be useful for engineering effective biofuel production hosts.

INTRODUCTION
Biofuels are a promising alternative to traditional fuel sources that are fraught with negative environmental impacts and rising costs. Medium-chain alcohols such as *n*-butanol and *n*-hexanol have higher energy densities and less corrosivity than ethanol, making them promising biofuel molecules [1]. However, these solvents are toxic and are thus produced at low levels [2]. Lamsen and Atsumi explain that toxicity of solvents prevents strains from reaching industrial production titers [3]. One way to combat low titers is to improve tolerance toward industrially relevant solvent concentrations, thus allowing the cell to survive higher solvent levels and thus produce more biofuels.

*S. cerevisiae* is an attractive biofuel production host because it is genetically tractable and resistant to phage infection, and industrial fermentations are well established. Since humans first started using the yeast *S. cerevisiae* for ethanol production, strains have naturally evolved for growth in fermentative conditions and high ethanol tolerance. Modern advances permitted lab-scale investigations to determine several specific mutations that improve tolerance to ethanol. Recently, Stanley et al showed that strains evolved for ethanol tolerance using spontaneous mutation outperformed strains from evolutions employing chemical mutation (though they did not report which mutations were responsible for tolerance improvements) [4]. These lab-
scale evolutions have continued to improve upon thousands of years of evolution, and at the same time as reveal valuable insights into genetic and regulatory mechanisms of ethanol tolerance.

Laboratory evolutions have also been designed to improve butanol tolerance. Gonzalez-Ramos and co-workers investigated the impact of libraries of overexpressed and knocked-out genes in order to assess butanol stress responses and pinpoint target proteins for tolerance optimization [5]. In that study, protein degradation pathways were found to be key in minimizing butanol toxicity. Several proteins involved in butanol tolerance have been uncovered through evolution experiments. For example, mitochondrial proteins are upregulated under isobutanol stress [6]. Gonzalez-Ramos et al. identified mutations in RPN4, a proteasome transcription factor, and RTG1, another transcription factor involved in intraorganelle communication [5]. A mutated version of glycerol-3-phosphatase (Gpp2) also confers higher isobutanol tolerance [6]. Although these evolutionary experiments led to enhanced understanding of the proteins involved in tolerance, the evolved strains had only marginally improved \( n \)-butanol tolerance levels.

We carried out evolutions of \( S. \) cerevisiae in \( n \)-butanol and \( n \)-hexanol. To our knowledge, strain evolution had not previously been used to improve tolerance toward alcohols with more than four carbons. Even though \( n \)-hexanol production in yeast has only been demonstrated, we elected to preemptively improve strain tolerances. Additionally, we expected that tolerance to longer chain lengths might require different mutations than those beneficial in butanol evolutions, thereby uncovering new tolerance mechanisms. The \( n \)-hexanol tolerance evolutions were successful, improving growth rates in alcohols from five to eight carbons. The tolerant phenotype is stable and dominant and is caused by mutations Gcd1\textsuperscript{D85E} and Sui2\textsuperscript{D77Y}.

Chemostats for Microaerobic Evolutions

![Chemostats for Microaerobic Evolutions](image)

Figure 4.1. Chemostats simplify anaerobic evolutions. Fresh media enters a port on the left and spent media and cells are removed via the right port, maintaining log phase culture.
RESULTS

Evolutions. We ran one set of evolutions in chemostats, using increasing concentrations of \( n \)-butanol and \( n \)-hexanol. The chemostats (Figure 4.1) did not have air inlets/outlets, so the culture was microaerobic, mimicking conditions that would be found in large-scale fermentation tanks. Chemostats were difficult to maintain in sterile condition, resulting in a bacteria, \textit{Staphylococcus warneri}, overtaking the cultures at various intervals. \textit{S. warneri} was the only significant contaminant: \textit{E. coli} and a long rod-shaped bacteria that was likely \textit{Lactobacillus} were also present, but these bacteria were unable to outcompete the yeast at the high alcohol concentrations. The \( n \)-butanol evolution failed to produce strains that had an improved growth rate in the presence of \( n \)-butanol. The \( n \)-hexanol evolution produced one strain, \textit{sSD006}, which had significantly improved growth rate in the presence of \( n \)-hexanol (Figure 4.2).

![Microaerobic Evolution Round I Improved Hexanol Tolerance, 0.12% \( n \)-Hexanol](image)

Figure 4.2. Microaerobically evolved strains have improved growth rates in 0.12% \( n \)-hexanol when compared to the wild type. Growth was monitored by measuring OD_{600} of cultures grown aerobically in YPD + 0.15\% \( n \)-hexanol v/v. Wild type is shown in a solid black line. Strains from round I evolution are shown in colored lines. Samples are run in triplicate and error bars represent standard deviations.
We ran another set of evolutions aerobically, via daily dilution in screw-cap tubes. Again, the butanol evolutions failed to produce strains that had an improved growth rate in the presence of $n$-butanol. The hexanol evolutions produced several strains with improved growth rates, of which sSD002, sSD003, and sSD004 were the most successful (Figure 4.3). In round II, we tried aerobic evolutions in YPD and SC media. The YPD media produced strains with improved growth rates, while the SC media evolutions did not. The best strains from round II were sSD019, derived from sSD003, and sSD021, derived from sSD006 (Figure 4.4).

Figure 4.3. Aerobically evolved strains show greatly improved growth rates in 0.15% $n$-hexanol when compared to the wild type. Growth was monitored by measuring OD$_{600}$ of cultures grown aerobically in YPD + 0.15% $n$-hexanol v/v. Wild type is shown in a solid black line. Strains from round I evolution are shown in colored lines. Samples are run in triplicate and error bars represent standard deviations.
Characterization. We characterized several evolved strains for tolerance to a variety of alcohols. Figure 4.4 shows growth rates of evolved strains in YPD + 0.15% \( n \)-hexanol. Growth was monitored by measuring \( \text{OD}_{600} \) of cultures grown aerobically in YPD + 0.15% \( n \)-hexanol \( v/v \). Wild type is shown in a solid black line. Strains from round I evolution are shown in dashed lines. Strains from round II evolution are shown in dotted lines. Samples are run in triplicate and error bars represent standard deviations.

**Figure 4.4. A second round of aerobic evolution further enhanced growth rates in 0.15% \( n \)-hexanol.** Growth was monitored by measuring \( \text{OD}_{600} \) of cultures grown aerobically in YPD + 0.15% \( n \)-hexanol \( v/v \). Wild type is shown in a solid black line. Strains from round I evolution are shown in dashed lines. Strains from round II evolution are shown in dotted lines. Samples are run in triplicate and error bars represent standard deviations.

The wild-type yeast (black line) is viable but not noticeably growing under these conditions. sSD006 (red dashed line), which came from the microaerobic evolution, has a slight growth rate improvement. Strains sSD002 and sSD003 (green and blue dashed lines) have significant growth rate improvements in \( n \)-hexanol. Round II evolutions further improved growth rates. There was a large jump in tolerance as strain sSD006 gained extra mutations in strain sSD021 (red dotted line). sSD003 evolved further to sSD019 (blue dotted line), though the improvement was not as dramatic as for sSD021.
Table 4.1. Evolved strains show improved tolerance toward medium-chain alcohols, particularly \(n\)-hexanol and \(n\)-heptanol. A) Qualitative assessment of evolved strain tolerances based on growth rate improvements in the presence of toxic levels of alcohols. Growth rates \((h^{-1})\): \(0 = 0.0 - 0.03\); \(+ = 0.04 - 0.10\); \;++ = 0.11 - 0.17\); \;+++ = 0.18 - 0.24\); \;++++ \(\geq 0.25\). Growth rates were based on three experimental days with \(n=3\) each day. Butanol tolerance is based on final \(OD_{600}\) after 48 hrs, rather than growth rate. BuOH: \(n\)-butanol, 1.2%. PtOH: \(n\)-pentanol, 0.5%. HxOH: \(n\)-hexanol, 0.15%. HpOH: \(n\)-heptanol, 0.05%. OcOH: 3-octanol, 0.05%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strain</th>
<th>Evolution Round</th>
<th>Mutations</th>
<th>BuOH</th>
<th>PtOH</th>
<th>HxOH</th>
<th>HpOH</th>
<th>OcOH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wild Type</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sSD003</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>GCD1 D85E</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sSD019</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>GCD1 D85E</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>++++</td>
<td>++++</td>
<td>+++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sSD006</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>GCD7 R56C</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sSD021</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>SUI2; GCD7 D77Y; R56C</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>++++</td>
<td>++++</td>
<td>+++</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.5. Evolved strains have the same growth phenotype in unstressed media. Growth was monitored by measuring \(OD_{600}\) of cultures grown aerobically in YPD. Wild type is shown in a solid black line. Evolved strains are shown in colored lines. Samples are run in triplicate and error bars represent standard deviations.
We characterized strains sSD003, sSD019, sSD006, and sSD021 for tolerance to other alcohols, as detailed in Table 4.1. The wild-type level of tolerance was considered to be 0, as these strains had a negligible growth rate. Growth rates of 0.0-0.03 were marked as 0 tolerance. Growth rates of 0.04-0.10 were listed as +, 0.11-0.17 were listed as ++, 0.18-0.24 were listed as ++++, and growth rates of 0.25 and over were listed as +++++. sSD006 had minimal tolerance improvements, and only for \( n \)-hexanol and \( n \)-heptanol. sSD003 had improved tolerance to \( n \)-hexanol, but tolerance levels dropped off for shorter or longer carbon chains. Strains sSD019 and sSD021 from the second round of evolution had the highest tolerance levels to all alcohols. Unfortunately, \( n \)-butanol tolerance was only seen for strains sSD003 and sSD019, and the tolerance improvement is minimal. In YPD without alcohols, the wild-type and evolved strains have indistinguishable growth (Figure 4.5).

![Graphs showing growth rates](image)

Figure 4.6. Evolved strains show greatly improved growth rates in 0.15% \( n \)-hexanol when compared to the wild type. Growth was monitored by measuring OD\(_{600}\) of cultures grown aerobically in YPD + A) 0.2 mM Octanoic acid, B) 0.10 mM Decanoic acid, C) 2.5 mM Spermine or D) 1.5 mM Spermidine. Wild type is shown in a solid black line. Evolved strains are shown in colored lines. Samples are run in triplicate and error bars represent standard deviations.
The evolved strains have tolerance that is specific for medium-chain alcohols. We also examined their tolerance toward 0.4 and 0.6 mM octanoic acids (Figure 4.6A) and 0.2 and 0.4 mM decanoic acids (Figure 4.6B), but did not see improved growth rates with the exogenous addition of these fatty acids. We next tested growth in the presence of the polyamines, spermine (Figure 4.6C) and spermidine (Figure 4.6D), but no tolerance improvement was seen at multiple concentrations of each polyamine.

Evolved strains are also hexanol tolerant in anaerobic conditions. We examined the strains with 0.15% n-hexanol, and observed that the aerobically evolved strains all grew much better than the wild-type strain even when grown under the anaerobic conditions of a sealed, oxygen-free test tube (Figure 4.7A). As expected, the microaerobically evolved strains retained tolerance in anaerobic conditions (Figure 4.7B), though they did not perform better than aerobically evolved strains sSD002, sSD003, or sSD004.

Figure 4.7. Evolved strains maintain improved growth rates in 0.15% n-hexanol under anaerobic conditions. Cultures in YPD + 0.15% n-hexanol were flushed with argon prior to growth. Anaerobic growth was monitored by measuring OD$_{600}$. Samples are run in triplicate and error bars represent standard deviations. A) Wild type is shown in a solid black line. Aerobically evolved strains are shown in colored lines. B) Wild type is shown in a solid black line. Aerobically evolved strains are shown in colored lines.
Growth in medium-chain alcohols causes yeasts to flocculate. We grew wild type yeast and strains sSD003 and sSD019 in YPD and YPD + 0.15% n-hexanol. We took images to compare flocculation phenotypes, and found that the strains evolved for tolerance appear to be flocculating at the same level as the wild-type strain, as seen in Figure 4.8D-E. When grown without hexanol (Figure 4.8A-C), the strains had the same non-flocculating morphology.

Figure 4.8. Growth in 0.15% n-hexanol causes yeasts to flocculate. The evolved strains had a similar morphology to the wild-type when grown in 0.15% n-hexanol. Images were taken using brightfield microscopy. A-C) YPD media D-F) YPD + 0.15% n-Hexanol v/v. A,D) Wild-type. B,E) sSD002. C,F) sSD017.
We determined that the tolerant phenotype is stable, and is likely a genetic mutation rather than a transient adaptation. We streaked evolved strains on YPD plates weekly for 8 weeks, in order to allow for growth without selective pressure. Growth in 0.15% $n$-hexanol was then monitored. In Figure 4.9A, strains sSD002, sSD003, and sSD004 grew relatively well in hexanol, while the wild type was not noticeably growing. Figure 4.9B shows growth of the round II evolved strains after 8 weeks without selective pressure. They are again growing more quickly than the wild-type, and have not lost their evolved tolerance. This suggest that genomic mutations are responsible for the tolerance.

**Figure 4.9. Evolved hexanol tolerance is maintained after 8 weeks without selective pressure.** Strains were grown on YPD plates for 8 weeks, with strains streaked to single colonies weekly. Growth of these colonies was monitored by measuring OD$_{600}$ of cultures grown aerobically in YPD + 0.15% $n$-hexanol. Cultures were flushed with argon prior to growth. Wild type is shown in a solid black line. Evolved strains are shown in colored lines. Samples are run in triplicate and error bars represent standard deviations. A) Aerobically evolved strains from round I compared to wild type. B) Aerobically evolved strains from round II, compared to wild type and strain sSD002 from round I.
Table 4.2. Tetrad Tolerance Assessment shows one gene is responsible for tolerance. Tolerance was scored based on final OD$_{600}$ after 24 hour growth in 0.15% \( n \)-hexanol in 96-well blocks.
Working under the assumption of a genetic basis for alcohol tolerance, we used tetrad analysis to determine that one mutation per strain was responsible for tolerance. The evolved strains were derived from BY4741, which has mating type MATα. We mated the tolerant strains with wild type BY4742, which has mating type MAc. The resulting diploids were sporulated, and full tetrads selected and sorted. The four daughter cells were grown in YPD + 0.15% n-hexanol and tolerance was assessed by growth after 24 hours. Table 4.2 tabulates the ratios of tolerant to non-tolerant daughter cells from each tetrad. Tetrads from strain sSD002 seem to have more tolerant daughter cells than from the other parent strains. This may be due to an imperfect scoring system or errors during tetrad selection. Overall, a 2:2 tolerant:non-tolerant ratio was predominant, indicative of one gene being responsible for alcohol tolerance. The spread of the data can be explained by the numerous auxotrophic markers in the BY4741 and BY4742 strains: shuffling of these will give variation in the unstressed growth rates. Such differences will be enhanced by depression of growth rates in hexanol. Despite these variations, there is a 2:2 tolerant:non-tolerant ratio trend.

Figure 4.10. Tolerant phenotype is dominant in mixed diploids. Growth of diploid yeast was monitored by measuring OD_{600} of cultures grown aerobically. Diploids generated from two wild-type strains are shown with a black solid line. Diploids generated from a wild type strain and sSD017, sSD018, and sSD019 are shown in dashed lines. Diploids generated from randomly mated haploids after sporulation of tolerant diploids are shown in dotted lines. A) Growth in YPD. Single samples run. B) YPD + 0.15% n-hexanol. Samples are run in duplicate and error bars represent standard deviation.
We tried to improve upon the evolved strains by generating diploids with multiple tolerance-conferring mutations. We pooled the tolerant daughter cells, which have random mating types, and mated them to create diploids with genes from two different tolerant strains. We selected several of these diploids and grew them alongside diploids from known parents. All diploids have similar growth in YPD (Figure 4.10A), while there is a range of growth rates among the diploids grown in 0.15% $n$-hexanol (Figure 4.10B). A few strains, particularly sSD004 and sSD146, had better growth than diploids derived from sSD017, sSD018, and sSD019. This suggests that a combination of evolved mutations can even further enhance tolerance levels. We did not further characterize or work with these tolerant diploids.
Genomic Sequencing We used genomic sequencing to determine which genomic mutations were responsible for medium-chain alcohol tolerance. The evolved strains and the mutations are shown in Table 4.3. Strains evolved for one 30-day round (sSD003 and sSD006) accumulated fewer mutations than strains that underwent two 30-day rounds (sSD019 and sSD021).

Table 4.3. Evolved Strain Mutations and Gene Descriptions.

- **GCD1** - γ subunit of eIF2B (GEF)
- **CIT2** - Citrate Synthase
- **PDR5** - ABC drug efflux pump
- **UBP13** - Ubiquitin protease
- **LSB6** - Type II phosphatidylinositol 4-kinase
- **NST1** - unknown, salt sensitivity
- **COX1** - Cytochrome C oxidase
- **GCD7** - β subunit of eIF2B (GEF)
- **SUI2** - α subunit of eIF2
- **SEY1** - role in ER fusion and morphology

Figure 4.11. The Gcd1 and Sui2 mutations can be expressed from plasmids. Mutated (solid lines) and un-mutated (dashed lines) versions of the GCD1, SUI2, and GCD7 genes were expressed from plasmids in the wild-type strain. These strains were grown in SD-Leu-Ura plus 0.12% n-hexanol and OD$_{600}$ was measured every 2 hours. Samples are run in triplicate and error bars represent standard deviation.
Each strain had relatively few mutations, enabling us to reconstruct each individual mutation and identify those that confer tolerance. We began by introducing the mutations that appeared in the translation initiation machinery proteins, Gcd1, Gcd7, and Sui2, because at least one of these proteins was mutated in each of the evolved tolerant strains. As the tolerance phenotype is dominant, we were able to express copies of the mutated genes from plasmids and assess growth in the presence of toxic concentrations of the alcohols (Figure 4.11). Gcd7\textsuperscript{R56C} does not confer significant tolerance, as growth rates of strains carrying the mutation are indistinguishable from wild-type strains (Figures 4.11, 4.12). The Sui2\textsuperscript{D77Y} mutation confers hexanol tolerance. It arose in a strain with the Gcd7 mutation, so we tested both mutations together, as well. The Gcd7 mutation did not improve upon the tolerance conferred by Sui2\textsuperscript{D77Y}. Gcd1\textsuperscript{D85E} is sufficient for hexanol tolerance. We also knocked out genomic copies of these genes, so that the plasmid copy was the only copy (Figure 4.12). We saw the same tolerance levels in strains with the Gcd1\textsuperscript{D85E} and Sui2\textsuperscript{D77Y} mutations. The Gcd7\textsuperscript{R56C} mutation seemed to reduce tolerance as compared to wild type Gcd7.

Figure 4.12. Translation initiation mutations Gcd1 D85E and Sui2 D77Y are responsible for alcohol tolerance. Mutated (solid lines) and un-mutated (dashed lines) versions of the GCD1, SUI2, and GCD7 genes were expressed in strains with the respective gene knocked out. These strains were grown in YPD plus 0.15% \textit{n}-hexanol and OD\textsubscript{600} was measured every 2 hours. Samples are run in triplicate and error bars represent standard deviation.
In addition to translation initiation factor mutations, strains sSD019 and sSD021 had mutations in Pdr5, a multidrug efflux pump. In sSD019, Pdr5 was truncated after residue 445. In sSD021, Pdr5 had a G925A mutation. It is unknown what effect this mutation has upon Pdr5 activity, though we expect that it is reducing or eliminating activity. Pdr5 has a high basal energy use, so ΔPdr5 mutations improve overall strain fitness and growth rates. We tested growth rates of a ΔPdr5 strain in 0.15% n-hexanol (Figure 4.13) but did not see a significant growth rate increase in the ΔPdr5 strain.

**Figure 4.13. ΔPdr5 does not improve tolerance toward n-hexanol.** Mutated (solid lines) and un-mutated (dashed lines) versions of the GCD1 and GCD7 genes were expressed in strains with the respective gene knocked out. A wild type strain (orange dashed line) and ΔPdr5 strain (solid orange line) were also grown. These strains were grown in YPD plus 0.15% n-hexanol and OD$_{600}$ was measured every 2 hours. Single samples run, no error reported.
DISCUSSION

We evolved yeast strains for improved medium-chain alcohol tolerance using several methods. The simplest and most efficient method was daily subculturing in YPD media in the presence of exogenously added alcohols. Performing the evolutions in rich YPD media gave rise to more tolerant strains than in defined SC media. We suspect that this was the case because strains generally grow faster in YPD media than SC media, thus allowing more generations in the same time period. The more limiting conditions of SC media reduced number of generations and accumulation of mutations during the evolution time. We hypothesize that increasing the evolution period for SC media may help, but given the promising results from the YPD evolutions, we did not pursue this direction. Additionally, the particular mutations that arose (e.g. Sui2 and Gcd1) may have required a nutrient-rich environment, to evade regulatory mechanisms that may suppress mutations. Sui2 and Gcd1 are tightly regulated translation initiation factors, and translation initiation is slowed or turned off during starvation condition. It is plausible that the alcohol tolerance conferring mutations are detrimental in nutrient-limiting conditions, and may have been selected against in media such as SC media. We have not yet characterized the Sui2 and Gcd1 mutations under amino-acid- or sugar-limited conditions.

The microaerobic chemostat evolutions were difficult to maintain, and bacterial contamination was a frequent problem. Even after the full 30 days, the most tolerant strains from the hexanol evolution were much less tolerant than the strains from the aerobic evolutions, even in anaerobic conditions (Figure 4.7B). It is surprising that the larger chemostat cultures did not also produce the same point mutations as did the aerobic evolutions. It is possible that microaerobic conditions were limiting, in a similar way as SC media, which hindered evolution or specifically suppressed the translation initiation mutations. Using the microaerobically evolved strains as parent strains for another round of aerobic evolution was successful, since the chemostat strains did not reach the tolerance levels of the aerobically evolved strains. The Gcd7^{R56C} mutation itself did not confer much tolerance, but after the second round of evolution, this strain developed the Sui2^{D77Y} mutation, which greatly improved tolerance. We are unsure whether the Gcd7^{D85E} mutation was required for the Sui2^{D77Y} mutation to arise under the conditions of our evolution, as the two mutations do not seem to be working in concert (Figures 4.11, 4.12).

Although none of the butanol evolutions produced more tolerant strains, we were able to evolve a strain with somewhat improved butanol tolerance. Strains sSD003 and sSD019, with the Gcd1^{D85E} mutation, have a small improvement in butanol tolerance, with a growth rate of about 0.03/hour in 1.2% n-butanol. This improvement is on par with other butanol tolerance evolutions [1,2]. It is puzzling that multiple groups have been unable to evolve yeast strains with improved butanol tolerance. Yeast has been highly evolved for ethanol tolerance, so it is possible that this alcohol tolerance extends to butanol as well. Yeasts can grow in much higher levels of butanol than E. coli: 2.0% for S. cerevisiae [8] vs. 0.8% for E. coli [9]. Despite lower tolerance to butanol, E. coli can produce significantly more n-butanol, at 5 g/L [10], while S. cerevisiae can only produce 0.2 g/L [11]. This suggests that despite relatively high growth rates in extracellular butanol, butanol is still highly disrupting metabolism. Another possible explanation for the difficulties evolving yeast for butanol is that butanol has particularly...
toxic properties, such that tolerance may require substantial structural or regulatory changes or combinations of changes. For example, butanol disrupts internal pH by increasing membrane permeability, which in turn inhibits ATPases and glucose uptake [12]. It has also been shown to inhibit Pdr5 in yeasts [13]. Perhaps there are as-yet unknown additional butanol toxicity mechanisms which prevent evolutions from being successful.

The strains evolved for hexanol tolerance are also tolerant toward a range of medium-chain alcohols. \( n \)-Hexanol and \( n \)-heptanol tolerance were the most improved, though \( n \)-pentanol and 3-octanol tolerance are also increased (Table 4.1). Tolerance was not improved for alcohols of four or fewer carbons. We did not test chains longer than eight carbons. It is known that straight-chain alcohols with ten or more carbons have reduced solubility, thus decreasing toxicity of the alcohol. These longer chain alcohols tend to “layer” on top of the culture, rather than enter the cells. The strains do not have tolerance to two other classes of molecules, polyamines and carboxylic acids (Figure 4.6). We expect that the tolerance is alcohol specific, rather than a general fitness improvement. When grown without any stress, evolved strains have growth that is indistinguishable from the wild type strain (Figure 4.5).

Before determining the causative mutations, we fully characterized the evolved hexanol tolerant strains. In anaerobic conditions, the tolerant phenotype is maintained (Figure 4.7). Wild-type yeasts flocculate in alcohols. The evolve strains also flocculated in 0.15% \( n \)-hexanol despite their improved growth rates, so the tolerance did not effect this phenotype (Figure 4.8). We determined that the tolerance is a stable, genetic mutation, since the phenotype was not lost after eight weeks without selective pressure (Figure 9). Since it was a genetic modification, we did not look at upregulation or down regulation of gene expression, or do any sort of proteomics analysis. These studies have been done before for butanol evolutions [1,2], though not for hexanol evolutions, to our knowledge. This would be an interesting future direction for research. We also established that the phenotype is dominant. Diploids with one tolerant parent have the same tolerance level as the tolerant parents (Figure 4.10B). Tolerance can be conferred by expressing causative mutations on plasmids in wild type cells (Figure 4.11). Finally, tetrad analyses showed that one gene was responsible for tolerance (Table 4.2).

Genomic sequencing was a key experiment in determining the cause of hexanol tolerance. Table 3 lists the mutations found in each evolved strain, as well as a short explanation of each gene. The most striking result was that each strain had a mutation in a translation initiation factor. We expressed these mutated genes from plasmids in strains with the respective strain knocked out (Figure 4.12) and saw that the Gcd1\(^{D85E}\) and Sui2\(^{D77Y}\) mutations were responsible for hexanol tolerance. The Gcd7\(^{R56C}\) mutation, which arose in strain sSD006, did not confer much tolerance. Since the Gcd1 and Sui2 mutations had such significant effects on tolerance, we focused on these mutations for further studies. It is also of note that round II evolved strains both had a Pdr5 mutation (Table 4.3). Strain sSD019 has a stop codon after residue 446, and in strain sSD021, there is a G925A mutation, which we expect is reducing or eliminating Pdr5 activity. Pdr5 is a highly expressed multi-drug efflux pump [14]. It is an ABC transporter and can use a significant amount of cellular energy [15]. Strains with Pdr5 knocked out are known to have better growth rates in the presence of isobutanol, likely because the strain is more fit [16]. We expect that these mutations were responsible for an overall
cell fitness increase, rather than an alcohol tolerance increase. A Pdr5 knockout did not show any improvement in growth rate in 0.15% \( n \)-hexanol (Figure 4.13).

**MATERIALS AND METHODS**

**Strains and Media**
We used wild-type *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* strains BY4741 (MATa his3Δ1 leu2Δ0 met15Δ0 ura3Δ0) and BY4742 (MATa his3Δ1 leu2Δ0 lys2Δ0 ura3Δ0). Yeast without plasmids were grown in YPD (1% yeast extract (Amresco), 2% peptone (BD Chemical), 2% \( \alpha \)-dextrose (Amresco)). Yeast with plasmids were grown in appropriate synthetic dropout media, e.g. SD-Leu (0.67% Yeast Nitrogen Base (BD Chemical), 2% \( \alpha \)-Dextrose (Amresco), 0.2% amino acid mix without leucine from US Biological).

**Microaerobic evolutions.**
We began the chemostat with 0.5 L YPD media and 5 mL of a saturated culture BY4741. The initial alcohol concentrations were 0.8% \( n \)-butanol and 0.1% \( n \)-hexanol. The flux rate was 0.25-0.5 mL/minute, due to the alcohols dramatically suppressing growth rate. Chemostats were maintained in a 30°C room with a medium-speed stir bar. The OD\(_{600}\) of the chemostats were maintained at 0.5 - 2.0. As the ODs increased, the alcohol concentrations were steadily increased to final concentrations of 1.2% \( n \)-butanol and 0.3% \( n \)-hexanol. Every 7 days, a glycerol stock of the culture was made. Samples from the chemostat were taken daily and checked for bacterial contamination using bright field microscopy. When contamination was found, the chemostats were re-started using the latest glycerol stock from that chemostat. At the end of the evolution, glycerol stocks were made and culture was streaked to single colonies on plates.

**Aerobic Evolutions.**
Aerobic evolutions were started with a 1:1000 dilution of a saturated overnight culture of strain BY4741. The initial cultures were 10 mL of YPD media with alcohols added. Cultures were grown in a 30°C water-bath shaker at 200 rpm. The \( n \)-butanol concentration was increased from 1.1% to a final 1.3% and daily dilutions were decreased from 1.0 mL into 10 mL fresh media to 0.5 mL into 10 mL fresh media. The \( n \)-hexanol concentration was maintained at 0.12% and daily dilutions were decreased from 1.0 mL into 10 mL fresh media to 0.7 mL into 10 mL fresh media. Every 7 days, a glycerol stock of the culture was made. At the end of the evolution, glycerol stocks were made and culture was streaked to single colonies on plates.

**Evolutions Round II.**
Strains sSD002, sSD003, and sSD004 from the aerobic evolution I and strains sSD006 and sSD010 from the microaerobic evolution were grown overnight to saturation. Overnights were subcultured into YPD media + 0.12% \( n \)-hexanol or SD media + 0.12% \( n \)-hexanol. 0.5 mL of cultures were diluted into 10 mL fresh media daily, and \( n \)-hexanol concentrations were increased from 0.12% to 0.21%. Samples were checked daily for bacterial contamination using bright field microscopy. For days 14-30, 100 ug/mL chloramphenicol was added to YPD cultures to prevent bacterial growth. Every 7 days, a glycerol stock of the culture was made. At the end of the evolution, glycerol stocks were made and culture was streaked to single colonies on plates.
**Microscopy**
Images were taken using an Andor Clara-Lite digital camera and a Nikon Ni-U upright microscope with a 100x, 1.45 n.a. plan apochromat objective.

**Growth Curves**
Single colonies were picked from the post-evolution plates into 5 mL YPD media in culture tubes. Cultures were grown overnight to saturation at 30°C with 280 rpm shaking. Stationary phase cultures were diluted to an OD\(_{600}\) of .30-.33 a.u. as measured with a Nanodrop 2000c, 5 mL dilute culture was aliquoted into screw-cap tubes. 5 mL YPD with 0 or 0.24% or 0.30% \(n\)-hexanol was added. Each sample was run in triplicate. Screw-cap tubes were grown at 30°C with 280 rpm shaking and measurements were taken every 2 hours with Genesys-20 spectrophotometer. Subsequent growth curves were done in the same manner, with concentrations of alcohols, fatty acids, or polyamines as reported. Anaerobic growth curves were done in culture tubes capped with rubber stoppers and flushed with Argon for 3 minutes prior to growth in the shaker.

Tolerant strains were streaked out on YPD plates without alcohols weekly for 8 weeks. Single colonies were picked and growth curves were done in 0.12% and 0.15% \(n\)-hexanol.

**Diploid Generation**
BY4741 and evolved derivatives and BY4742 were streaked onto fresh YPD plates. After 30 hours, BY4741 derivatives and BY4742 were patched onto a fresh YPD plate and kept at 30°C. After 5 hours, diploids were seen under microscope. Patches were streaked onto selective plates (SD -Lysine -Methionine).

**Sporulation**
Diploids were resuspended in 1% potassium acetate (Sigma). After 4 days, sporulated diploids were resuspended in 1 M sorbitol (Fisher) + 0.5 mg/ml Zymolyase (from Zymo Research) and cell walls digested for 10 minutes at 30°C. 0.8 mL H\(_2\)O was added and cells put on ice, then spores were streaked onto a plate. Tetrad were selected and dissected using dissecting microscope, then gridded onto YPD plates. After 2 days, tetrads were picked into 300 μL YPD in 96-well blocks, including positive and negative controls (sSD021 and BY4741). After 2 days, 2 μL of saturated cultures were diluted into 300 μL YPD or YPD + 0.15% \(n\)-hexanol. After 24 hours, OD\(_{600}\) was measured for 100 μL using a Molecular Devices SpectraMax M2 plate reader.

**Genomic Sequencing**
Genomic DNA preparations were done using the YeaStar Genomic DNA kit from Zymo Research Corporation. Sequencing was done on an Illumina platform HiSeq 2000 with Paired-End 100bp reads. Analysis was done using CLC Genomics Workbench 6.

**Genetic Methods**
His3 and KanMX cassettes amplified and homologous ends added via PCR. Cassettees were transformed into yeast using the LiOAc method [7]. Strains sSD040 and sSD054
were generated by replacing the Gcd7 gene with a His3 cassette in BY4741 containing a plasmids pSD469 (Gcd7<sup>R56C</sup>) or pSD474 (Gcd7) and confirming by PCR of the junctions. Strains sSD029 and sSD053 were generated by replacing the Gcd1 gene with a KanMX cassette in BY4741 containing plasmids pSD450 (Gcd1<sup>D85E</sup>) or pSD442 (Gcd1) and confirming by PCR of the junctions. Strains sSD055 and sSD056 were generated by replacing the Sui2 gene with a KanMX cassette in BY4741 containing a plasmids pSD444 (Sui2) or pSD452 (Sui2<sup>D77Y</sup>) and confirming by PCR of the junctions. Strain sSD060 was generated by replacing the Gcd7 gene with a His3 cassette in strain sSD055 containing a plasmids pSD474 or and confirming by PCR of the junctions. Strain sSD058 was generated by replacing the Gcd7 gene with a His3 cassette in strain sSD056 containing a plasmids pSD469 or and confirming by PCR of the junctions.

Table 4.4. Strains used in this study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strain</th>
<th>Parent</th>
<th>Genotype</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BY4741</td>
<td>MATa</td>
<td>his3Δ1 leu2Δ0 met15Δ0 ura3Δ0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BY4742</td>
<td>MATα</td>
<td>his3Δ1 leu2Δ0 lys2Δ0 ura3Δ0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sSD002</td>
<td>BY4741</td>
<td>BY4741 GCD1-E85 CIT2-C338 This Study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sSD003</td>
<td>BY4741</td>
<td>BY4741 GCD1-E85 CIT2-C338 This Study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sSD004</td>
<td>BY4741</td>
<td>BY4741 evolved This Study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sSD006</td>
<td>BY4741</td>
<td>BY4741 GCD7-C56 This Study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sSD009</td>
<td>BY4741</td>
<td>BY4741 evolved This Study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sSD010</td>
<td>BY4741</td>
<td>BY4741 evolved This Study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sSD017</td>
<td>BY4741</td>
<td>BY4741 evolved This Study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sSD018</td>
<td>BY4741</td>
<td>BY4741 evolved This Study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sSD019</td>
<td>BY4741</td>
<td>BY4741 GCD1-E85 CIT2-C338 PDR5-*446 UBPl3-V135 LS6B-C234 NST1-G662 This Study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sSD020</td>
<td>BY4741</td>
<td>BY4741 evolved This Study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sSD021</td>
<td>BY4741</td>
<td>BY4741 GCD7-C56 SUI2-Y77 PDR5-A925 SEY1-529E This Study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sSD029</td>
<td>BY4741</td>
<td>BY4741 Gcd1Δ::KanMX p[GCD1-85E LEU2 CEN6] This Study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sSD040</td>
<td>BY4741</td>
<td>BY4741 Gcd7Δ::His3 p[GCD7-56C URA3 CEN6] This Study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pSD053</td>
<td>BY4741</td>
<td>BY4741 Gcd1Δ::KanMX p[GCD1 LEU2 CEN6] This Study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pSD054</td>
<td>BY4741</td>
<td>BY4741 Gcd7Δ::His3 p[GCD7 URA3 CEN6] This Study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pSD055</td>
<td>BY4741</td>
<td>BY4741 Sui2Δ::KanMX p[SUI2 LEU2 CEN6] This Study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pSD056</td>
<td>BY4741</td>
<td>BY4741 Sui2Δ::KanMX p[SUI2-77Y LEU2 CEN6] This Study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pSD058</td>
<td>sSD056</td>
<td>BY4741 Sui2Δ::KanMX Gcd7Δ::His3 p[SUI2-77Y LEU2 CEN6] p[GCD7-56C URA3 CEN6] This Study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pSD060</td>
<td>sSD055</td>
<td>BY4741 Sui2Δ::KanMX Gcd7Δ::His3 p[SUI2 LEU2 CEN6] p[GCD7 URA3 CEN6] This Study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.5. Plasmids used in this study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plasmid</th>
<th>Promoter</th>
<th>Insert</th>
<th>Marker</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pSD442</td>
<td>pGcd1</td>
<td>Gcd1</td>
<td>Leu2</td>
<td>This Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pSD443</td>
<td>pGcd7</td>
<td>Gcd7</td>
<td>Leu2</td>
<td>This Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pSD444</td>
<td>pSui2</td>
<td>Sui2</td>
<td>Leu2</td>
<td>This Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pSD450</td>
<td>pGcd1</td>
<td>Gcd1D85E</td>
<td>Leu2</td>
<td>This Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pSD451</td>
<td>pGcd7</td>
<td>Gcd7R56C</td>
<td>Leu2</td>
<td>This Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pSD452</td>
<td>pSui2</td>
<td>Sui2D77Y</td>
<td>Leu2</td>
<td>This Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pSD469</td>
<td>pGcd7</td>
<td>Gcd7R56C</td>
<td>Ura3</td>
<td>This Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pSD474</td>
<td>pGcd7</td>
<td>Gcd7</td>
<td>Ura3</td>
<td>This Study</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Chapter 5
Removing inhibition by medium-chain alcohols

ABSTRACT
Yeast-based chemical production is an environmentally friendly alternative to petroleum-based production or processes that involve harsh chemicals. However, potential products such as isobutanol, \(n\)-butanol and \(n\)-hexanol for biochemical applications are toxic to production organisms, making production less efficient and less cost-effective due to reduced yields. Toxicity mechanisms are not well understood, and therefore there have been few successful rational approaches to alleviating toxicity and improving tolerance. We used an evolutionary approach to evolve the laboratory strain of \(S.\) \(cerevisiae\) BY4741 for increased tolerance for \(n\)-hexanol. We found that the addition of \(n\)-hexanol inhibits initiation of translation, and evolved mutations in the \(\alpha\) subunit of eIF2, Sui2, and the \(\gamma\) subunit of its guanine exchange factor (GEF) eIF2B, Gcd1, rescue this inhibition. Moreover, the translation initiation process is affected by other alcohols including \(n\)-pentanol, and \(n\)-heptanol, and the mutations in the eIF2 and eIF2B complexes greatly improve tolerance to these medium-chain alcohols.

INTRODUCTION
\(S.\) \(cerevisiae\) is used as a production organism for chemicals such as farnesol, \(n\)-butanol, and isobutanol [1,2,3]. Yeast-based production is desirable because yeasts are genetically tractable and easily maintained, and industrial-scale fermentation processes are well established. A major challenge to this method is that many alcohol compounds have both general and specific toxic effects in the cell. For instance, membrane fluidity and corresponding function are affected by butanol [4]. In addition, solvents increase denaturant sensitivity and decrease thermotolerance of proteins, with effects proportional to carbon chain length [5]. These solvents can also specifically inhibit protein function. For example, \(n\)-butanol inhibits the ATPase of \(Clostridium\) acetobutylicum [4] and \(n\)-butanol and \(n\)-hexanol inhibit the multidrug resistance pump Pdr5 [6]. Understanding these effects is the first step toward engineering solutions to improve tolerance.

One particularly promising set of studies reveals that the fusel alcohols, including \(n\)-butanol and isoamyl alcohol, can inhibit translation initiation. Fusel alcohols are by-products of amino acid metabolism in \(S.\) \(cerevisiae\). Ashe et al. showed that these alcohols inhibit eIF2B and thus translation initiation [7]. To explain this inhibition, Taylor et al. suggest that fusel alcohols are either directly binding eIF2B to inhibit translation, or the alcohols are altering as-yet unidentified post-translational modifications, such as phosphorylation [8]. Moreover, mutations in both eIF2 and its GEF eIF2B can modulate this inhibition [7,8]. Inhibition of translation decreases growth rate and would halt production of enzymes necessary for biofuel production and cell maintenance. It is critical that this inhibition be alleviated for biofuel production organisms.

The eIF2 complex is an important part of translation initiation as it brings the methionine-charged initiator tRNA to the 40S subunit of the ribosome [9,10]. This reaction is powered by GTP, and therefore the GEF eIF2B is required for GDP turnover.
eltF2 is composed of three subunits, α (Sui2), β (Sui3), and γ. The α subunit, Sui2, is regulated by phosphorylation at serine 51. This phosphorylation inhibits translation initiation. eltF2B is composed of two subcomplexes, one with a regulatory function, and one with catalytic activity. The regulatory subcomplex of eltF2B, composed of the α (Gcn3), β (Gcd7), and δ (Gcd2) subunits, binds more tightly to phosphorylated Sui2, blocking exchange activity and effectively sequestering the eltF2 [11]. The catalytic subunit, composed of the γ (Gcd1), and ε (Gcd6) subunits, has exchange activity and acts upon phosphorylated and un-phosphorylated Sui2 with equal activity (Hinnebusch 1991). Mutations in the α, β, and δ subunits ameliorate inhibition by phosphorylated Sui2 [12,13]. For example, S199P, I118T, and D178Y mutations in GCD7, the β subunit of eltF2B, eliminate translation inhibition by Sui2 phosphorylation, presumably by decreasing binding affinity for Sui2 [12].

Several methods have been employed to improve biofuel tolerance of *S. cerevisiae*. Gonzalez-Ramos and colleagues investigated the impact of libraries of overexpressed and knocked-out genes in order to assess butanol stress responses and pinpoint target proteins for tolerance optimization [14]. They discovered that protein degradation pathways are key in minimizing butanol toxicity. Ghiaci et al. found that mitochondrial proteins are upregulated under isobutanol stress [15]. Several proteins involved in butanol tolerance have been uncovered through evolution experiments. For example, Ramos et al. found that mutations to two transcription factors increased tolerance to butanol [14]. A mutated version of glycerol-3-phosphatase (Gpp2) also improves isobutanol tolerance [15].

We chose to modulate gene function via natural evolution and selection of tolerant strains. This work is fully described in Chapter 4. Briefly, after two 30-day rounds of evolution in *n*-hexanol, the yeasts were significantly more solvent tolerant. We sequenced the genomes of our tolerant strains and noticed several interesting mutations in proteins required for translation initiation, including a D77Y mutation in the eltF2α subunit, Sui2 and a D85E mutation in the γ subunit of eltF2B, Gcd1. With this work, we demonstrate that longer-chain alcohols such as *n*-hexanol also inhibit translation initiation. Previously, only fusel alcohols such as butanol have been shown to be inhibitory [7,8]. This study extends the range of known alcohol inhibitors for the eltF2 and eltF2B complexes, giving insight into the inhibition mechanism. Mutations in several eltF2B subunits are known to modulate fusel alcohol sensitivity [8], yet only tolerance-decreasing mutations have been reported for Gcd1 [7]. Mutations in Sui2 affecting solvent tolerance have not been reported.
**REVIEW OF TRANSLATION INITIATION**

Pavitt *et al.* propose that the γ (Gcd1) and ε (Gcd6) subunits of eIF2B form a subcomplex that can function independently of the α, β (Gcd7), and δ subunits [13]. This independent function lacks the regulation provided by the other subunits, so that nucleotide exchange is not inhibited by phosphorylation of the α (Sui2) subunit of eIF2. Thus, translation initiation inhibition by stress responses such as amino acid starvation and fusel alcohols does not occur. The eIF2B α-β-δ subcomplex preferentially binds to the phosphorylated eIF2 α subunit, preventing nucleotide exchange by the eIF2B γ-ε subcomplex, which binds both forms of eIF2-α equally (Figure 5.1). It is possible that the mutations found in our evolved strains are modulating the binding affinities of the two complexes, and thus removing some regulation. Targeting interactions between these complexes for directed evolution efforts could further eliminate inhibition by alcohols and thus reduce toxicity.

_Eukaryotic translation initiation is a tightly regulated process involving multiple heteromeric protein complexes._ As detailed in Table 1, the eIF2 complex of *S. cerevisiae* is composed of an α (Sui2), β (Sui3p), and γ subunit (Gcd11p). The eIF2α subunit, Sui2, brings the methionine-charged initiator tRNA (Met-tRNA_{Met}) to the 40S subunit of the ribosome and the eIF2γ subunit binds an activating GTP, forming a ternary complex (Figure 5.1) [9,10]. Sui2 can be phosphorylated at S51 by the δ subunit of eIF2B, the guanine exchange factor (GEF) of eIF2 (Table 5.1 and additional details below); this modification generally inhibits translation [8,16,17] (Figure 5.1). The δ subunit of eIF2B is activated by uncharged tRNAs that accumulate during starvation conditions [9,10], in turn phosphorylating Sui2 and inhibiting translation under these conditions. However, Gcn4p, the transcriptional activator for amino-acid-producing genes, has increased translation under these conditions [11,18,19], allowing the cell to regulate its amino acid availability.

_Translation initiation depends on the guanine nucleotide exchange activity of eIF2B._ After eIF2 delivers the tRNA_{Met}, it is left inactive and bound to GDP [11]. eIF2B is the GEF required to re-activate eIF2 after GTP hydrolysis [20] (Figure 5.1). This heteropentameric complex has an α (Gcn3), β (Gcd7), γ (Gcd1), δ (Gcd2), and ε (Gcd6) subunit (Table 5.1) [11,13,19]. Strains with deletions of the β, γ, δ, and ε subunits are non-viable [12]. The α, β, and δ subunits are regulatory and do not have exchange activity. This sub-complex binds more tightly to phosphorylated Sui2 (eIF2α), blocking exchange activity and effectively sequestering the eIF2 [11]. The catalytic subunit, composed of the γ and ε subunits, has exchange activity and acts upon phosphorylated and un-phosphorylated Sui2 with equal activity [11]. Certain mutations in the genes encoding the α, β, and δ subunits ameliorate inhibition by phosphorylated Sui2. For example, Gcd7^{S199P}, Gcd7^{I118T}, and Gcd7^{D178Y} mutations in the β subunit of eIF2B, eliminate translation inhibition by Sui2 phosphorylation, presumably by decreasing binding affinity for Sui2 [12]. Additionally, the eIF2Ba subunit, Gcn3p, can be knocked out entirely from the genome without loss of viability and gcn3Δ strains are not inhibited by phosphorylation of Sui2 as the wild-type strains are, suggesting a role in Sui2 sequestration [13]. Overexpression of the eIF2B-β, γ, δ, and ε subunits has the same effect, suppressing translation inhibition by Sui2 phosphorylation [12].

_Fusel alcohols inhibit translation initiation._ Fusel alcohols are byproducts of amino
Figure 5.1. eIF2 is regulated by phosphorylation. eIF2 (brown circles) subunit α has a phosphorylation site at S51. When eIF2α is phosphorylated (pink triangle), eIF2B (Green boxes) preferentially binds to the phosphorylated eIF2α. When sequestered, eIF2B cannot exchange GDP for GTP, so eIF2 is inactive.

eIF2-GTP can form Pre-Initiation Complex.

GDP exchange activates eIF2

S51-P prevents GEF activity
catabolism that can accumulate under nitrogen starvation conditions. These alcohols, including butanol and isoamyl alcohol, inhibit translation initiation. Taylor et al. showed that increasing concentrations of \( n \)-butanol leads to increasing inhibition of translation initiation [8]. Overexpression of eIF2B subunits reverses this inhibition, suggesting that the alcohols are inhibiting eIF2B [7]. Several mutations in both eIF2 and eIF2B modulate fusel alcohol inhibition [7,8]. Fusel alcohol inhibition is independent of Sui2 phosphorylation, as an Sui2^{S51A} mutation did not affect inhibition [8]. Butanol inhibits ternary complex levels but without regulation by Sui2 phosphorylation [8]. Isoflurane, an anesthetic, is also known to inhibit translation initiation independently of Sui2 phosphorylation [21]. Taylor et al. suggest that fusel alcohols are either directly binding eIF2 to inhibit translation, or the alcohols are altering as-yet unidentified post-translational modifications, such as phosphorylation [8]. Additionally, a P180S mutation in the Gcd1 subunit of eIF2B was shown to increase \( n \)-butanol sensitivity [7]. Dev et al. show that pairs of Sui2 and Gcd7 mutations can be lethal, or increase or decrease inhibition by Sui2 phosphorylation [22].

### RESULTS

**Mutations in translation initiation factors confer tolerance phenotype.** Previously, we evolved yeast strains with medium-chain alcohol tolerance, as detailed in Chapter 4. Several mutations were found in each of the evolved strains (Table 5.2). Of these mutations, the most striking were the Gcd1^{D85E}, Gcd7^{R56C}, and Sui2^{D77Y} mutations. Sui2 is a subunit of the eIF2 complex, an essential translation initiation complex. Gcd1 and Gcd7 are subunits of eIF2B, which is the guanine exchange factor for eIF2 (refer to Table 5.1). The evolved strains that carry mutations to these genes grow significantly better than the wild-type strains in the presence of 0.15% \( n \)-hexanol. We re-created these mutations in wild-type strains by introducing plasmids with the mutated and unmutated gene variants and then knocking out the genomic copies of the genes with a KANMX cassette. As these genes are essential, simple knockouts could not be generated. The strains carrying the genes encoding Sui2 and Gcd1 mutations had faster growth rates than strains without these mutations in the presence of 0.15% \( n \)-hexanol, demonstrating that these mutations indeed give rise to the phenotype observed in the evolved strains (Figure 5.3). Interestingly, the tolerant phenotype is dominant, allowing wild-type strains carrying plasmids encoding Sui2^{D77Y} and Gcd1^{D85E} to outperform strains with control plasmids in the same growth assay (Figure 5.4).
Figure 5.2. Evolved strains show greatly improved growth rates in 0.15% \( n \)-hexanol when compared to the wild type. Growth was monitored by measuring OD\textsubscript{600} of cultures grown aerobically in YPD + 0.15% \( n \)-hexanol v/v. Wild type is shown in a solid black line. Strains from round I evolution are shown in dashed lines. Strains from round II evolution are shown in dotted lines. Samples are run in triplicate and error bars represent standard deviations.
Figure 5.3. Translation initiation mutations Gcd1 D85E and Sui2 D77Y are responsible for alcohol tolerance. Mutated and un-mutated versions of the GCD1, SUI2, and GCD7 genes were expressed in strains with the respective gene knocked out. These strains were grown in YPD plus 0.15% \( n \)-hexanol and \( OD_{600} \) was measured every 2 hours. Samples are run in triplicate and error bars represent standard deviations.
Figure 5.4. The \textit{Gcd1} and \textit{Sui2} mutations are dominant. Mutated (solid lines) and un-mutated (dashed lines) versions of the \textit{GCD1}, \textit{SUI2}, and \textit{GCD7} genes were expressed from plasmids in the wild-type strain. These strains were grown in SD-Leu-Ura plus 0.12\% \textit{n}-hexanol and OD\textsubscript{600} was measured every 2 hours. Samples are run in triplicate and error bars represent standard deviations.
S. cerevisiae strains evolved increased medium-chain alcohol and fusel alcohol tolerance. The evolved strains exhibit tolerance to C4 to C8 straight-chain alcohols as measured by growth rate in the presence of each solvent. In 0.12% \( n \)-hexanol, evolved strains have a growth rate of 0.27/hour while the wild-type strain has a growth rate of only 0.12/hour. In higher concentrations of \( n \)-hexanol, the evolved strains continue to replicate, while the wild-type strain does not noticeably divide. We further characterized these strains with respect to fusel alcohol tolerance. The relative tolerance improvements are summarized in Table 5.3. Of the fusel alcohols, the strains were most tolerant toward amyl alcohol and isoamyl alcohol, which are both five-carbon alcohols. \( n \)-Butanol and isobutanol tolerance was minimal in these assays. Isobutanol tolerance is likely due to Pdr5 mutations, because it is only seen in strains sSD019 and sSD021, which contained the Pdr5 mutations. In the absence of solvents, the evolved strains and WT strain had equivalent growth in YPD media.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strain</th>
<th>PrOH</th>
<th>BuOH</th>
<th>iBuOH</th>
<th>AOH</th>
<th>iAOH</th>
<th>PtOH</th>
<th>HxOH</th>
<th>HpOH</th>
<th>OcOH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wild Type</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sSD003 Gcd1 D85E</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>+++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sSD019 Gcd1 D85E</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>++++</td>
<td>++++</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sSD006 Gcd7 R56C</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sSD021 Gcd7 R56C</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.3. Evolved strains show improved tolerance toward medium-chain alcohols, particularly \( n \)-hexanol and \( n \)-heptanol. A) Qualitative assessment of evolved strain tolerances based on growth rate improvements in the presence of toxic levels of alcohols. Growth rates (h\(^{-1}\)); 0 = 0.0 - 0.03; + = 0.04 - 0.10; ++ = 0.11 - 0.17; +++ = 0.18 - 0.24; ++++ ≥ 0.25. Butanol tolerance is based on final OD\(_{600}\) after 48 hrs, rather than growth rate. PrOH: propanol, 3.0%. BuOH: \( n \)-butanol, 1.2%. iBuOH: isobutanol, 1.0%. AOH: amyl alcohol, 0.5%. iAOH: isoamyl alcohol, 0.5%. PtOH: \( n \)-pentanol, 0.5%. HxOH: \( n \)-hexanol, 0.15%. HpOH, 0.05%: \( n \)-heptanol, 0.05%. OcOH: 3-octanol, 0.05%.
We confirmed that alcohol tolerance is due to the Sui2, Gcd1, and Gcd7 mutations. To do so, we again employed strains harboring a plasmid-borne version of the respective genes and deleted for the genomic version. We grew these strains in YPD supplemented with the various alcohols listed in Table 5.4 and found that the Gcd1 and Sui2 mutations conferred tolerance toward the alcohols with five to eight carbons. Strain sSD006 did not have high tolerance toward any alcohols (Table 5.3), and likewise the mutation in Gcd7 identified in that strain did not confer significantly improved tolerance (Figure 5.5). The Gcd1 and Sui2 mutations confer similar tolerance improvements for all alcohols tested.

Figure 5.5. Re-created mutation strains show improved tolerance toward medium-chain alcohols, particularly n-pentanol and n-hexanol. Strains were grown in YPD + alcohols and OD_{600} measured at 4 and 10 hours. Growth rates were calculated using ln(OD_{600} 10hr/OD_{600} 4 hr)/6 hr. Growth rates were normalized to growth rates of strains expressing wild-type genes. All samples were done in triplicate and error bars represent standard deviations. Isobutanol: 1.0%, Isoamyl Alcohol: 0.5%, n-Pentanol: 0.5%, n-Hexanol: 0.15%, n-Heptanol: 0.05%, 3-Octanol: 0.05%.
Figure 5.6. The Gcd1 and Sui2 mutations partially rescue the inhibition of translation caused by hexanol and isoamyl alcohol. A) Wild-type and evolved strains were grown in YPD, YPD + 0.15% n-hexanol, or YPD + 0.5% isoamyl alcohol, then polysomes were analyzed. Polysome to monosome ratios were calculated and three independent measurements averaged and reported with standard deviations. B) The polysome analysis was repeated on strains generated with single mutations (see Table 3). C) Representative traces of WT, sSD029 (Gcd1 D85E) and sSD056 (Sui2 D77Y).
Mutations in Sui2 and Gcd1 decrease inhibition of translation initiation inhibition by alcohols. We investigated the impact of mutations in Gcd1 and Sui2 on translation initiation using polysome analysis. The wild-type strain is notably inhibited by n-hexanol and isoamyl alcohols, as seen in Figures 5.6A and C. Halfmers are seen after hexanol exposure (Figure 5.6C), which is indicative of extreme inhibition [28]. The presence of the Gcd1<sup>D85E</sup> and Sui2<sup>D77Y</sup> mutations (strains sSD029 and sSD056 respectively) relieve this inhibition, as seen in Figures 5.6B. Strains harboring the Sui2 mutation appear to be more effective at relieving translation initiation inhibition. At 0.2% n-hexanol, the polysome to monosome ratio for evolved strain sSD003, containing the Gcd1 mutation, is reduced by a factor of 2, yet the evolved strain sSD021, which contains the Sui2 mutation, is not significantly affected (Figure 5.6A). As expected based on the growth assay results, the Gcd7 mutation (strain sSD040) did not lead to significantly increased polysome to monosome ratios (Figure 5.6B).
Figure 5.7. Mutations at Gcd1 position 85 and Sui2 position 77 confer a range of tolerance levels. Plasmids containing mutated Sui2 and Gcd1 were transformed into WT strains. Strains were diluted to an OD$_{600}$ of 0.003 in SD-Ura + alcohols and growth rate was calculated using OD$_{600}$ measured at 4 and 12 hours. The grey bar is the WT, the orange bar is the evolved mutation. Samples were run in triplicate three times and error bars represent standard deviations. A, E) Measurements in n-butanol represent final OD$_{600}$ after 48 hours of growth in 96-well blocks, rather than growth rate. A-D) Gcd1 D85X mutation strains; WT is D85; evolved is D85E. A) 1.3% n-butanol. B) 0.5% n-pentanol. C) 0.13% n-hexanol. D) 0.05% n-heptanol. E-H) Sui2 D77X mutation strains; WT is D77; evolved is D77Y. E) 1.3% n-butanol. F) 0.5% n-pentanol. G) 0.13% n-hexanol. H) 0.05% n-heptanol.
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Mutations at position 85 of Gcd1 and position 77 of Sui2 give a range of tolerance levels. When plasmid copies of the mutated Sui2 and Gcd1 proteins are expressed from plasmids in wild-type cells such that two copies of the gene are present, the tolerance phenotype is dominant (See Chapter 4). We used this dominant phenotype to our advantage in order to assess the flexibility of the Gcd1 D85 and Sui2 D77 positions with respect to alcohol tolerance. We generated strains with every amino acid at these positions and assessed tolerance levels in C4-C7 straight chain alcohols. Interestingly, we found that there is a range of tolerance levels (Figure 5.7). The relative tolerance levels among the strains expressing proteins with these substitutions were somewhat consistent with respect to the various alcohols. For example, K, R, and V at position 77 in Sui2 usually give rise to tolerance and E, H, and M do not. However, there is not an obvious chemical or structural reason as to why some of the substitutions confer more tolerance than others. Interestingly, several mutations in Gcd1 confer decreased tolerance levels below that of the wild-type strain (Figures 5.7A-D), which we would not have expected in a strain that also carries the wild-type gene. These mutations probably have deleterious effects and we would not anticipate survival of strains carrying only these mutations. The strains with Gcd1$^{D85E}$ mutations (sSD003 and sSD019) showed an increased tolerance to n-butanol, while strain sSD021, which has the Sui2$^{D77Y}$ mutation, did not have any n-butanol tolerance (Figures 5.3 and 5.4).

Saturation mutagenesis at position 85 in Gcd1 resulted in a small range of butanol tolerances (Figure 5.7A), while mutating Sui2 position 77 did not give rise to improved n-butanol tolerance (Figure 5.7E).

Sui2 position 77 (Figure 5.8) is highly conserved. The homologous position in human eIF2α is an aspartate as well (Table 4). Archaea, however, have a range of residues at position 77, including a tyrosine in Aeropyrum camini (Table 5.4). The most common residues at this position were aspartate (D) and asparagine (N). Gcd1 position 85 is fairly well conserved among other yeasts, with either an aspartate (D) or a glutamate (E) appearing in most homologs (Table 5.5). The Candida genus had unexpected diversity at this position; notably a histidine (H) and leucine (L) are known natural variants in this genus.

Figure 5.7. Sui2 D77Y mutation is found in the eIF2B and kinase binding domain. S. cerevisiae Sui2p structure adapted from Dhaliwal et al. [24], modeled using Pymol [25]. Magenta residues are the eIF2B and kinase binding residues. D77 is shown in black.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organism</th>
<th>Accession</th>
<th>Sequence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S. cerevisiae</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>RSIQKLIRVGKDVARLRRVTKEKGDILSRRVSVSSEDIIK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. pombe</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>RSVQHIKVRGNEVVVLVDRDEKGDILSRRVSPEDVVK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. niger ATCC1015</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>RSIKLIRIGNECVVIRVDDEKGDILSRRVSPPEAIIK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Sapiens</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>RSIKLIRIGNECVVIRVDDEKGDILSRRVSPPEAIIK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. furiosus</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>KNIRDYKREGQKVAKVRDPKGDILSRRVQTRQQRKA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KM3_73_B11</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>RKVNYKQREGKVVKLVEKRDEKGDILSRRVQTRQQRKA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. fumarii</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>RRIKVQREGKQRKRVQRTDEKKR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thaumarchaeota</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>RNKIFQREGKQRKRVQRTDEKKR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. niger ATCC1015</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>MVGKATSGSYFSKPTISMLKSGLYLSRVRSPEDVVK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. infernus</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>RNIRDHVQREGKVRVAKVRNKEKGDILSRRVSDQQRE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT1000_48_A08</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>RKVRRVKRSEGKQRVAKVRNPDEKGDILSRRVSDQQRE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euryarchaeote</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>KNIRAFYVREGKVRVAKVRQPDEKGDILSRRVSDQQRE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. maripaludis</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>RNIRDHVKREGKVRVAKVRNPDEKGDILSRRVSDQQRE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GW2011_AR3</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>RNIRDHVQREGKVRVAKVRNPDEKGDILSRRVSDQQRE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. camini</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>RNIVAFLKPRQKVVVRVIRYRNRGQVDVSLKRVMDSEKKR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

S. cerevisiae: *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*, elF2 alpha subunit
S. Pombe: *Schizosaccharomyces pombe* 972h-, elF2 alpha subunit
H. Sapiens: *Homo Sapiens*, elF22 subunit 1
A. niger ATCC1015: *Aspergillus niger* ATCC 1015, putative elF2 alpha subunit
P. furiosus: *Pyrococcus furiosus* DSM 3638, elF-2
KM3_73_B11: Uncultured marine thaumarchaeote KM3_73_B11, RNA-binding S1 domain-containing protein
P. fumarii: *Pyrolobus fumarii*, elF-2 subunit alpha
T. archaean: *Thaumarchaeota archaean* SCGC AAA007-O23, RNA-binding protein
A. niger: *Aspergillus niger* CBS 513.88, elF2 subunit alpha
M. infernus: *Methanocoldococcus infernus* ME, elF2, alpha subunit
SAT1000_48_A08: Uncultured marine thaumarchaeote SAT1000_48_A08, RNA-binding S1 domain-containing protein
Euryarchaeote: Uncultured marine group II euryarchaeote, elF-2 subunit alpha
M. maripaludis: *Methanococcus maripaludis* C6, elF-2 subunit alpha
GW2011_AR3: archaeon GW2011_AR3, elF-2 subunit 1
A. camini: *Aeropyrum camini* SY1 = JCM 12091, elF-2 subunit alpha
Table 5.5. Gcd1 Alignments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Alignment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S. cerevisiae</td>
<td>PKALLPIGNRPHIEYVLDWCDQADFKEISVVAPVDEIELIE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. pombe</td>
<td>PKALLPIGNKPHLHYPLYWLEAAGFTSAILCMEAEAEHIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y. lipolytica</td>
<td>PKPLPVGNKPLINLYLNEERVGFEEVIVTRTVDQQKALC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. sapien</td>
<td>PKLPVANKPMHYVLDWCDKAFPRVTVVVGTDAEDQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. stipitis</td>
<td>PKALLPIANKMYVLDWCDKAFPRVTVVVGTDAEDQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. elongisporus</td>
<td>PKALIPVANKSILTYVLDWCDKAFPRVTVVVGTDAEDQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. orthopsilosis</td>
<td>PKALLPIANKPMHYVLDWCDKAFPRVTVVVGTDAEDQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. niger</td>
<td>PKCLIPIALPMVYPLDWCRAIIEVLMVTPSALAPLK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. albicans</td>
<td>PKPLLPIANKPMVYVLDWCRAIIEVLMVTPSALAPLK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. stipitis</td>
<td>PKALLPIANKPMVYVLDWCRAIIEVLMVTPSALAPLK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. guilliermondii</td>
<td>PKALLPVANRPVYVLWCDQAFPLVTLVCNGEDKLEIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. marneffei</td>
<td>PKALIPIANRPVYVLDWCDYRMGITNITLVTTPASQAPLE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

S. cerevisiae: Saccharomyces cerevisiae, eIF2B subunit gamma
S. pombe: Schizosaccharomyces pombe 972h-, eIF2B gamma subunit (predicted)
Y. lipolytica: Yarrowia lipolytica, eIF-2B gamma N
H. sapiens: Homo sapiens, eIF-2B subunit gamma isoform 2
A. niger: Aspergillus niger CBS 513.88, eIF2B-gamma
S. stipitis: Scheffersomyces stipitis CBS 6054, eIF2B subunit
M.farinosa: Millerozyma farinosa CBS 7064, Piso0_002371
L. elongisporus: Loderomyces elongisporus NRRLYB-4239 conserved predicted protein
C. orthopsilosis: Candida orthopsilosis Co 90-125, Gcd1 translation initiation factor
C. albicans: Candida albicans P57072, eIF-2B subunit gamma
S. brasiliensis: Sporothrix brasiliensis 5110, eIF-2B subunit gamma
M. guilliermondii: Meyerozyma guilliermondii, hypothetical protein PGUG_03826
T. marneffei: Talaromyces marneffei ATCC 18224, putative eIF2B-gamma

DISCUSSION
Translation initiation is an intricate and highly choreographed process involving multiple protein complexes. The many layers of regulation for this process are not yet known, as evidenced by the dearth of information on fusel alcohol regulation. We have evolved strains of S. cerevisiae with increased tolerance toward medium-chain alcohols owing to mutations in the translation initiation factors Gcd1 and Sui2. These two mutations confer nearly identical tolerance levels. Given the highly similar phenotypes, we expect that these two mutations are alleviating or counteracting the same alcohol toxicity mechanism. The mutations did not affect tolerance toward other non-alcohol compounds such as carboxylic acids or polyamines (Chapter 4). Therefore, it seems likely that the toxicity mechanism is alcohol specific. Since both eIF2 and eIF2B mutations improve translation initiation rates and overall strain tolerance, we hypothesize that the alcohols are interfering with interaction between these two complexes. Sui2 has been crystallized [24], and residues that interact with eIF2B and kinases are known [22,29,30]. Sui2 residue D77 falls in the eIF2B-eIF2 binding interface, as depicted in Figure 5.8. Gcd1 does not have a crystal structure, so it is difficult to interpret how the Gcd1D85E mutation may be affecting eIF2-eIF2B interactions. Further investigation into the Gcd1 and Sui2 mutants will yield valuable information.
about the mechanism of translation initiation inhibition by alcohols.

It is interesting to note that both strains sequenced from a second round of evolution (sSD019 and sSD021) acquired mutations in the drug efflux pump Pdr5 (Table 5.2). In Chapter 4 we showed that a $\Delta PDR5$ strain did not have improved growth in hexanol, though it is known that $\Delta PDR5$ strains have higher growth rates in butanol [31]. As the only pertinent genomic difference between sSD003 and sSD019 is the $pdr5$ truncation which is undoubtedly eliminating Pdr5 function, it is likely that the improvement in growth in isobutanol, amyl alcohol, and isoamyl alcohol is caused by the loss of Pdr5 function. The G925A mutation in strain sSD021 probably has a similar improvement upon tolerance. We ran a polysome analysis on a $\Delta PDR5$ strain and found that it did not affect translation initiation. The Pdr5 truncation and Pdr5$^{G925A}$ mutation are likely improving tolerance by enhancing overall cell fitness, as Pdr5 utilizes a large amount of energy. In growth-limiting conditions, even slight advantages such as a $\Delta PDR5$ can help a strain overtake a culture. We did not pursue these mutations further.

Polysome profiling is a standard assay used to assess defects in translation initiation. Polysomes are clusters of ribosomes translating an mRNA [32,33]. Inhibition of translation initiation reduces the number of polysomes inside the cell, while single ribosomes, or monosomes, are comparatively increased. A decrease in the polysome to monosome ratio (P/M) is evidence of defects in translation initiation. Ribosomes that are not translating – “vacant” ribosomes – can be distinguished from single ribosomes by their salt sensitivity [32]. Additionally, defects in elongation can be differentiated with this method. Elongation defects without translation initiation defects will result in a larger P/M ratio, as more ribosomes accumulate on each mRNA [34].

We used polysome profiling to look at how alcohols and the Gcd1 and Sui2 mutants are specifically affecting translation initiation. It is clear that hexanol inhibits translation initiation (Figure 5.6A), and that the Gcd1$^{D85E}$ and Sui2$^{D77Y}$ mutations can rescue the phenotype (Figure 5.6B), though the exact mechanism is as-yet unknown. The Gcd1 and Sui2 mutations confer slightly different polysome profiles, which indicates that they may function through different mechanisms. Strain sSD021, with the Sui2$^{D77Y}$ mutation, continues to exhibit high levels of translation initiation even in 0.2% $n$-hexanol (Figure 5.6A). In the same concentration, strain sSD003, which has the Gcd1$^{D85E}$ mutation, has dramatically reduced translation initiation, and the polysome profiles show halfmers (data not shown). We were unable to identify halfmers in the polysome analysis of strains with the Sui2 mutation. Another hint at multiple mechanisms is the fact that only strains with the Gcd1$^{D85E}$ mutation have $n$-butanol tolerance (Table 5.3).

We wanted to look more deeply at what made these specific mutations give medium-chain alcohol tolerance. Saturation mutagenesis at Gcd1 position 85 and Sui2 position 77 result in a small library with varying tolerance levels (Figure 5.7). Unfortunately, there did not seem to be any pattern for which mutations improved tolerance. I, V, and N at position 85 of Gcd1 confer the most improvement, while M, S, and W give rise to the worst tolerances (Figure 5.7A-D). For Sui2 residue 77, V, I, and K were the most capable mutations, while E, H, and M did not improve tolerances (though butanol tolerance was quite different) (Figure 5.7E-H). It is surprising that so many amino acids were able to improve tolerance levels. Since these positions are very well conserved across species (Table 5.4 and 5.5), we did not expect such a variety of residues to be accommodated. Figure 5.7G shows that nearly all other residues can
improve tolerance over the native aspartate. We anticipate that there is some strong evolutionary pressure toward maintaining these positions. As all of our experiments are done on short timescales and in favorable conditions, the yeasts are not experiencing extreme stress or starvation conditions that would necessitate inhibition of translation initiation for survival. Experiments in amino-acid limited media or over long time-scales would be useful for investigating the mechanisms of both alcohol tolerance and translation initiation regulation.

We anticipate that the Sui2 and Gcd1 mutations will be valuable tools for studying the effects of various alcohols on translation initiation and for probing the mechanism of fusel alcohol inhibition. The mutations, and any further insights into translation initiation inhibition, will be useful for generating medium-chain alcohol production strains with high tolerance and high titers.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Strains and Media
We used wild-type *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* strain BY4741 (MATa his3Δ1 leu2Δ0 met15Δ0 ura3Δ0). Yeast without plasmids were grown in YPD (1% yeast extract, 2% peptone, 2% α-dextrose). Yeast with plasmids were grown in appropriate synthetic dropout media, eg SD-Leu (0.67% Yeast Nitrogen Base (Amresco), 2% α-Dextrose (BD Chemical), 0.2% amino acid mix without leucine from US Biological).

Growth Curves
Single colonies were picked from the post-evolution plates into 5 mL YPD media in culture tubes. Cultures were grown overnight to saturation at 30°C with 280 rpm shaking. Stationary phase cultures were diluted to an OD$_{600}$ of .30-.33 a.u. as measured with a Nanodrop 2000c, 5 mL dilute culture was aliquoted into screw-cap tubes. 5 mL YPD with 0 or 0.24% or 0.30% n-hexanol was added. Each sample was run in triplicate. Screw-cap tubes were grown at 30°C with 280 rpm shaking and measurements were taken every 2 hours with Genesys-20 spectrophotometer.

Strain and Plasmid Generation
Plasmids were generated using standard molecular biology cloning techniques and homologous recombination. Transformations were performed using the LiOAc protocol [23]. Knock-outs were generated by replacing the genes of interest with KanMX4 or His3 markers via homologous recombination into strains containing plasmid copies of the selected genes.

Polysome Profiling
Overnight cultures were diluted into 250 mL YPD and grown until an OD$_{600}$ of ~1. Cultures were exposed to solvents for 30 minutes, then 25 mg cycloheximide (Sigma) in DMSO (Sigma) was added to arrest translation. Cells were washed twice and resuspended in buffer {20 mM Tris (Fisher) pH 7.4, 50 mM KCl (Spectrum), 10 mM MgCl2 (EMD), 1 mM DTT (Fisher), 100 μg/mL cycloheximide(Sigma)}). 800 μg of RNA was loaded onto a 10-50% sucrose (Fisher) gradient and centrifuged 3 hours at 35,000 rpm. The gradient was fractionated and absorbance at 254 nm measured. Polysome and monosome peak areas were calculated using Microsoft Excel.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plasmid</th>
<th>Promoter</th>
<th>Insert</th>
<th>Marker</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pSD269</td>
<td>pTdh3</td>
<td>Venus</td>
<td>Ura3</td>
<td>[26]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pSD279</td>
<td>pRev1</td>
<td>Emerald</td>
<td>Leu2</td>
<td>[26]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pSD442</td>
<td>pGcd1</td>
<td>Gcd1</td>
<td>Ura3</td>
<td>This Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pSD443</td>
<td>pGcd7</td>
<td>Gcd7</td>
<td>Ura3</td>
<td>This Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pSD444</td>
<td>pSui2</td>
<td>Sui2</td>
<td>Ura3</td>
<td>This Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pSD450</td>
<td>pGcd1</td>
<td>Gcd1 D85E</td>
<td>Ura3</td>
<td>This Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pSD451</td>
<td>pGcd7</td>
<td>Gcd7 R56C</td>
<td>Ura3</td>
<td>This Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pSD452</td>
<td>pSui2</td>
<td>Sui2 D77Y</td>
<td>Ura3</td>
<td>This Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pSD469</td>
<td>pGcd7</td>
<td>Gcd7 R56C</td>
<td>Leu2</td>
<td>This Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pSD474</td>
<td>pGcd7</td>
<td>Gcd7</td>
<td>Leu2</td>
<td>This Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pSD447</td>
<td>pGcd1</td>
<td>KanMX</td>
<td>Ura</td>
<td>This Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pSD448</td>
<td>pGcd7</td>
<td>KanMX</td>
<td>Ura</td>
<td>This Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pSD449</td>
<td>pSui2</td>
<td>KanMX</td>
<td>Ura</td>
<td>This Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pSD463</td>
<td>pHis3</td>
<td>His3</td>
<td>His3</td>
<td>[26]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pSD538</td>
<td>pSui2</td>
<td>Sui2 D77A</td>
<td>Ura3</td>
<td>This Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pSD539</td>
<td>pSui2</td>
<td>Sui2 D77C</td>
<td>Ura3</td>
<td>This Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pSD540</td>
<td>pSui2</td>
<td>Sui2 D77E</td>
<td>Ura3</td>
<td>This Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pSD541</td>
<td>pSui2</td>
<td>Sui2 D77F</td>
<td>Ura3</td>
<td>This Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pSD542</td>
<td>pSui2</td>
<td>Sui2 D77G</td>
<td>Ura3</td>
<td>This Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pSD543</td>
<td>pSui2</td>
<td>Sui2 D77H</td>
<td>Ura3</td>
<td>This Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pSD544</td>
<td>pSui2</td>
<td>Sui2 D77I</td>
<td>Ura3</td>
<td>This Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pSD545</td>
<td>pSui2</td>
<td>Sui2 D77K</td>
<td>Ura3</td>
<td>This Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pSD546</td>
<td>pSui2</td>
<td>Sui2 D77L</td>
<td>Ura3</td>
<td>This Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pSD547</td>
<td>pSui2</td>
<td>Sui2 D77M</td>
<td>Ura3</td>
<td>This Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pSD548</td>
<td>pSui2</td>
<td>Sui2 D77N</td>
<td>Ura3</td>
<td>This Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pSD549</td>
<td>pSui2</td>
<td>Sui2 D77P</td>
<td>Ura3</td>
<td>This Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pSD550</td>
<td>pSui2</td>
<td>Sui2 D77Q</td>
<td>Ura3</td>
<td>This Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pSD551</td>
<td>pSui2</td>
<td>Sui2 D77R</td>
<td>Ura3</td>
<td>This Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pSD552</td>
<td>pSui2</td>
<td>Sui2 D77S</td>
<td>Ura3</td>
<td>This Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pSD553</td>
<td>pSui2</td>
<td>Sui2 D77T</td>
<td>Ura3</td>
<td>This Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pSD554</td>
<td>pSui2</td>
<td>Sui2 D77V</td>
<td>Ura3</td>
<td>This Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pSD555</td>
<td>pSui2</td>
<td>Sui2 D77W</td>
<td>Ura3</td>
<td>This Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pSD557</td>
<td>pGcd</td>
<td>Gcd1 D85A</td>
<td>Ura3</td>
<td>This Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pSD558</td>
<td>pGcd</td>
<td>Gcd1 D85C</td>
<td>Ura3</td>
<td>This Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pSD559</td>
<td>pGcd</td>
<td>Gcd1 D85F</td>
<td>Ura3</td>
<td>This Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pSD560</td>
<td>pGcd</td>
<td>Gcd1 D85G</td>
<td>Ura3</td>
<td>This Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pSD561</td>
<td>pGcd</td>
<td>Gcd1 D85H</td>
<td>Ura3</td>
<td>This Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pSD562</td>
<td>pGcd</td>
<td>Gcd1 D85I</td>
<td>Ura3</td>
<td>This Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pSD563</td>
<td>pGcd</td>
<td>Gcd1 D85K</td>
<td>Ura3</td>
<td>This Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pSD564</td>
<td>pGcd</td>
<td>Gcd1 D85L</td>
<td>Ura3</td>
<td>This Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pSD565</td>
<td>pGcd</td>
<td>Gcd1 D85M</td>
<td>Ura3</td>
<td>This Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pSD566</td>
<td>pGcd</td>
<td>Gcd1 D85N</td>
<td>Ura3</td>
<td>This Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pSD567</td>
<td>pGcd</td>
<td>Gcd1 D85P</td>
<td>Ura3</td>
<td>This Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pSD568</td>
<td>pGcd</td>
<td>Gcd1 D85Q</td>
<td>Ura3</td>
<td>This Study</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.7 Strains used in this study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strain</th>
<th>Parent</th>
<th>Genotype</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BY4741</td>
<td></td>
<td>MATa his3Δ1 leu2Δ0 met15Δ0 ura3Δ0</td>
<td>This Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BY4742</td>
<td></td>
<td>MATa his3Δ1 leu2Δ0 lys2Δ0 ura3Δ0</td>
<td>This Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1516</td>
<td>BY4741</td>
<td>MATa his3Δ1 leu2Δ0 met15Δ0 ura3Δ0 TPO1Δ::KANMX</td>
<td>[27]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sSD002</td>
<td>BY4741</td>
<td>BY4741 GCD1-E85 CIT2-C338</td>
<td>This Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sSD003</td>
<td>BY4741</td>
<td>BY4741 GCD1-E85 CIT2-C338</td>
<td>This Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sSD004</td>
<td>BY4741</td>
<td>BY4741 evolved</td>
<td>This Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sSD006</td>
<td>BY4741</td>
<td>BY4741 GCD7-C56</td>
<td>This Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sSD009</td>
<td>BY4741</td>
<td>BY4741 evolved</td>
<td>This Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sSD010</td>
<td>BY4741</td>
<td>BY4741 evolved</td>
<td>This Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sSD017</td>
<td>BY4741</td>
<td>BY4741 evolved</td>
<td>This Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sSD018</td>
<td>BY4741</td>
<td>BY4741 evolved</td>
<td>This Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sSD019</td>
<td>BY4741</td>
<td>BY4741 gcd1-E85 cit2-C338 pdr5-446 ubp13-V135 lsb6-C234 nst1-G662</td>
<td>This Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sSD020</td>
<td>BY4741</td>
<td>BY4741 evolved</td>
<td>This Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sSD021</td>
<td>BY4741</td>
<td>BY4741 gcd7-C56 sui2-Y77 pdr5-A925 sey1-529E</td>
<td>This Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sSD029</td>
<td>BY4741</td>
<td>BY4741 Gcd1Δ::KANMX p[gcd1-85E LEU2 CEN6]</td>
<td>This Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sSD040</td>
<td>BY4741</td>
<td>BY4741 GCD7Δ::HIS3 p[gcd7-56C URA3 CEN6]</td>
<td>This Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pSD053</td>
<td>BY4741</td>
<td>BY4741 GCD1Δ::KANMX p[GCD1 LEU2 CEN6]</td>
<td>This Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pSD054</td>
<td>BY4741</td>
<td>BY4741 GCD7Δ::HIS3 p[GCD7 URA3 CEN6]</td>
<td>This Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pSD055</td>
<td>BY4741</td>
<td>BY4741 SUI2Δ::KANMX p[SUI2 LEU2 CEN6]</td>
<td>This Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pSD056</td>
<td>BY4741</td>
<td>BY4741 SUI2Δ::KANMX p[sui2-77Y LEU2 CEN6]</td>
<td>This Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pSD058</td>
<td>sSD056</td>
<td>BY4741 SUI2Δ::KANMX GCD7Δ::HIS3 p[sui2-77Y LEU2 CEN6] p[gcd7-56C URA3 CEN6]</td>
<td>This Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pSD060</td>
<td>sSD055</td>
<td>BY4741 SUI2Δ::KANMX GCD7Δ::HIS3 p[SUI2 LEU2 CEN6] p[GCD7 URA3 CEN6]</td>
<td>This Study</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 5.8 Plasmid and strain construction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plasmid</th>
<th>Insert</th>
<th>F/R Primers (Template)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pSD442</td>
<td>Sdc25/Sdc26 (Genomic)</td>
<td>pSD269 (SpeI/BamHI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pSD443</td>
<td>Sdc27/Sdc28 (Genomic)</td>
<td>pSD269 (SpeI/BamHI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pSD444</td>
<td>Sdc29/Sdc30 (Genomic)</td>
<td>pSD269 (SpeI/BamHI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pSD450</td>
<td>Sdc25/Sdc26 (sSD003)</td>
<td>pSD269 (SpeI/BamHI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pSD451</td>
<td>Sdc27/Sdc28 (sSD006)</td>
<td>pSD269 (SpeI/BamHI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pSD452</td>
<td>Sdc29/Sdc30 (sSD021)</td>
<td>pSD269 (SpeI/BamHI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pSD469</td>
<td>Sdc27/Sdc28 (pSD443)</td>
<td>pSD279 (SpeI/BamHI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pSD474</td>
<td>Sdc27/Sdc28 (pSD451)</td>
<td>pSD279 (SpeI/BamHI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pSD447</td>
<td>Sdc31/Sdc32 (1516)</td>
<td>pSD442 (ClaI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pSD448</td>
<td>Sdc33/Sdc34 (1516)</td>
<td>pSD443 (NruI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pSD449</td>
<td>Sdc35/Sdc36 (1516)</td>
<td>pSD444 (BglII)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pSD468</td>
<td>Sdc71/Sdc72 (pSD463)</td>
<td>pSD443 (NruI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pSD538-555</td>
<td>Sdc10/Sdc12/Sdc11 (pSD444)</td>
<td>pSD449 (ClaI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pSD557-574</td>
<td>Sdc673/Sdc15/Sdc06/Sdc74 (pSD442)</td>
<td>pSD447 (ClaI)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Knockout Cassettes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knockout Cassettes</th>
<th>Primers</th>
<th>Template</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>∆Gcd1Δ::KanMX</td>
<td>Sdc25/Sdc26</td>
<td>pSD447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>∆Gcd7Δ::KanMX</td>
<td>Sdc27/Sdc28</td>
<td>pSD448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΔSui2Δ::KanMX</td>
<td>Sdc29/Sdc30</td>
<td>pSD449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>∆Gcd7Δ::His3</td>
<td>Sdc27/Sdc28</td>
<td>pSD468</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Primers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primers</th>
<th>F/R</th>
<th>Sequence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sdc25</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>gggcgaattggagctcactcgcgaattcagtctactagtgatcacggtcatctcttatg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sdc26</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>atcataaatcataaagaaatgcctctcagtgtagatccgaaaacatgatgaaatgtgta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sdc27</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>gggcgaattggagctcactcgcgaattcagtctactagtgatcacggtcatctcttatg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sdc28</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>atcataaatcataaagaaatgcctctcagtgtagatccgaaaacatgatgaaatgtgta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sdc29</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>gggcgaattggagctcactcgcgaattcagtctactagtgatcacggtcatctcttatg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sdc30</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>atcataaatcataaagaaatgcctctcagtgtagatccgaaaacatgatgaaatgtgta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sdc31</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>aaagttcccaccgttgatagctcccccccctattgtcgtagtccgtacgctgcaggtc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sdc32</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>gtctcttatttaaagagactgatggagatatacataatatttatatttatattatatag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sdc33</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>gtaaacacaacacgtagctctgagttgatcaccatcactaggaatatcatctccttc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sdc34</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>agattttttcatgtaatgtcataaaagacacactatgagaaattcttatctcttatg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sdc35</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>gtctctattgagagagtgtagatcataaagaaatgcctctcagtgtagatccgaaaagccttc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sdc36</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>ttatattttatattcttcagtgtaatgtcataaaagacacactatgagaaattcttatcct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sdc37</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>ggtcctgttctcagctctctcttataataacaaataacatagctacgctgcaggtc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sdc38</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>gaggtatatatttatatttatatttatatttatattatatag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sdc39</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>ggacctctgttttttcttcagctctctcttataataacaaataacatagctacgctgcaggtc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sdc40</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>ggtcctgttctcagctctctcttataataacaaataacatagctacgctgcaggtc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sdc41</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>gcacagccacagtcctgactgtcctgttctcttcctgactattctgactgtcctgactgtcctgact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sdc42</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>ggtcctgttctcagctctctcttataataacaaataacatagctacgctgcaggtc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sdc43</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>gcacagccacagtcctgactgtcctgacttttctcctactgactgtcctgactgtcctgact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sdc44</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>ggtcctgttctcagctctctcttataataacaaataacatagctacgctgcaggtc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sdc45</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>gcacagccacagtcctgactgtcctgacttttctcctactgactgtcctgactgtcctgact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sdc46</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>ggtcctgttctcagctctctcttataataacaaataacatagctacgctgcaggtc</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Chapter 6
Improving yields by optimizing AcCoA flux

ABSTRACT

Many commercial products, including biofuels and specialty compounds, are produced cytosolically in Saccharomyces cerevisiae from acetyl-CoA (AcCoA). Increasing available AcCoA can improve titers of these bioproducts. One mechanism to increase cytosolic AcCoA is to use a transporter to direct AcCoA from organelles such as the mitochondria into the cytoplasm. There is no direct AcCoA transport between these regions. However, AcCoA transporters exist. The human AT-1 transporter acts directly on AcCoA to move AcCoA from the cytosol to the endoplasmic reticulum (ER) lumen [1]. Additionally, there is a homolog found in S. cerevisiae, YBR220C. We are re-engineering these transporters to control AcCoA flux between the mitochondria and cytoplasm.

INTRODUCTION

Acetyl Coenzyme A (AcCoA) is important for production of many compounds, including industrially useful molecules such as pharmaceuticals and biofuels. One such compound is amorphodiene, a precursor to the drug artemisinin [2]. High value products such as α-santalene [3] and flavonoids such as naringenin [4] are also produced from AcCoA. AcCoA is the building block for cellular lipids, and lipid-like products such as linolenic acid [5], sterols [6], and omega-3-fatty acids [6]. AcCoA can be built up to butyryl-CoA and then converted to n-butanol via alcohol dehydrogenase [7,8]. A potential limitation in the production of such compounds is the level of cytosolic AcCoA.

Many groups have used metabolic engineering approaches to improve cytoplasmic acetyl CoA levels. The strategy of deleting competing AcCoA-utilizing enzymes and pathways, including malate and citrate synthases, has been used to improve n-butanol production [7]. Another example involves what was coined the “pyruvate dehydrogenase bypass,” in which Shibata and colleagues expressed a Salmonella AcCoA synthetase in S. cerevisiae and overexpressed acetaldehyde dehydrogenase to increase cellular acetyl-CoA levels [2]. This technique resulted in two-fold higher titers of amorphadiene [2]. A combination of these approaches was used to increase α-santalene production by four-fold [3]. It is also possible to engineer pyruvate dehydrogenase overproduction to increase cytoplasmic AcCoA; this approach conferred a 12-fold increase in n-butanol production [9].

AcCoA is found in significant concentrations within the cytosol, peroxisomes, and mitochondria, but there is no direct transport of AcCoA between these locations in yeast [10]. Additionally, AcCoA pools are not constant, and vary depending on cell state and carbon source [10]. Increasing overall AcCoA certainly helps to improve cytoplasmic concentrations, but there is still room for improvement. Controlling flux of AcCoA among the cellular pools can help stabilize AcCoA levels and direct AcCoA to the cytoplasm where it is needed for bioproduction. In an interesting study, Matsuda et al. simulated a merging of cytoplasmic and mitochondrial spaces, which allowed for transport of cofactors such as NADP+ and acetyl-CoA between the two spaces. The merged
cytoplasm-mitochondria model improved theoretical yields of $n$-butanol production [11]. Implementing this “sharing” of acetyl-CoA among the mitochondria and cytoplasm in conjunction with the metabolic strategies for increasing AcCoA will improve strains for AcCoA-based bioproduction.

AcCoA cannot passively diffuse through membranes at appreciable rates, so an alternate transport mechanism is required to move it between intracellular compartments. There are several indirect methods that control AcCoA levels in intracellular compartments (Figure 6.1) [3]. In yeast, the glyoxylate cycle depletes peroxisomal and cytoplasmic AcCoA levels. AcCoA is enzymatically converted into malate and succinate, which are transported to the mitochondrial lumen, in which they enter the TCA cycle [12-13]. In the peroxisome, AcCoA is converted to citrate, which readily leaves the compartment [14]. Another mechanism is the carnitine shuttle, which eukaryotic cells use to deliver AcCoA from the cytoplasm to the mitochondrial matrix [15]. In this process, an enzyme transfers the acetyl group from AcCoA to carnitine, which is then transported into the mitochondria via the Crc1 transporter [12,14].

Figure 6.1. Acetyl CoA metabolism is important for production of many bioproducts. The purple circle indicates the peroxisome and the blue circle indicates the mitochondria. Cytosolic AcCoA is shown in red. The AcCoA pools are linked indirectly via metabolism. We intend to directly link the mitochondrial and cytoplasmic AcCoA pools via the AT-1 transporter.
the mitochondria, the carnitine is de-acetylated by the enzyme Cat1 and AcCoA is regenerated. Yeast cannot synthesize carnitine, and media supplementation would be cost-prohibitive, which limits implementation of the carnitine shuttle for high-level production. Interestingly, the peroxisome lacks the carnitine transporter Crc1, despite the presence of the Cat1 enzyme [14], so there may be other undiscovered carnitine and AcCoA transport mechanisms. As targets for metabolic engineering, both the glyoxylate shunt and carnitine shuttle have some disadvantages, as they are multi-step processes with low energy efficiency.

A more efficient way to control AcCoA flux is to directly transport AcCoA between compartments. An AcCoA transporter has been identified in humans [16]. Jonas et al. identified and characterized the AT-1 transporter as an endoplasmic reticulum (ER)-localized transporter that brings AcCoA from the cytoplasm into the ER lumen [1]. Acetyl-CoA is needed in the ER for protein acetylation. There is a homolog in *S. cerevisiae*, YBR220C, though to date no studies have been published on this transporter. AT-1 is a Major Facilitator Superfamily transporter, so it does not use ATP [1]. These proteins are excellent candidates for engineering increased cytosolic AcCoA concentrations.

With this work, we set out to direct AcCoA flux toward the cytosol using membrane-based transporters. Our first goal was to secrete AcCoA from the mitochondria into the cytosol. We identified and tested several targeting sequences predicted to localize proteins to the mitochondrial membrane. We are now assessing how cytoplasmic AcCoA concentrations are affected by engineered transporters in the mitochondria.

**Figure 6.2.** AT-1 is an Acetyl-CoA Transporter from *H. sapiens*. AT-1 is modeled on GlpT using Phyre [25].
Figure 6.3. The protein transporter AT-1 successfully expresses within the yeast cell. FLAG-tagged AT-1 and YBR220C were expressed under high (pTdh3) and low (pRev1) strength constitutive promoters. Whole cell extracts were run on 15% SDS polyacrylamide gels and transferred to PVDF membranes. Mouse anti-FLAG primary and HRP-conjugated anti-Mouse secondary antibodies were used.

Figure 6.4. AT-1 localizes to the ER while overexpressed YBR220C aggregates. Fluorescent (GFP) and bright field (BF) images of A-C) Strains expressing AT-1 with a C-terminal GFP fusion, D-F) Strains expressing YBR220C with a C-terminal GFP fusion. Scale bar represents 1 µm.
RESULTS

*The H. sapiens* transporter AT-1 expresses in *S. cerevisiae*. We cloned the gene encoding the AT-1 transporter with a C-terminal FLAG tag into plasmids under the control of the low-strength pRev1 promoter or the high-strength pTdh3 promoter. Expression was confirmed using a western blot (Figure 6.3). The AT-1-FLAG construct is 64.0 kDa. In the insoluble pellets from strains containing either the low- or high-expression plasmids, we observe bands near the correct size, with some apparent degradation products as well. There is also a larger-sized band, which we attribute to aggregation of degradation products because it is not large enough to be a dimerization of the full protein. Additionally, microscopic analysis of AT-1-GFP fusions show that the transporter is localizing to intracellular membranes, likely the endoplasmic reticulum (Figure 6.4A-C).

**Figure 6.5.** Targeting Sequences with high efficiencies are derived from mitochondrial proteins. N-terminal targeting sequences were taken from three mitochondrial proteins: Mitochondrial Oxidase Assembly protein 1 (Oxa1), ATPase F-1 β-subunit (F-1), and Cytochrome Oxidase IV (OxaIV). Targeting efficiencies were calculated with TargetP [20].

*Designed tags direct proteins to the mitochondrial inner membrane.* Mitochondrial-targeting tags were designed from the N-terminal region of mitochondrial inner membrane proteins. The sequences were taken from the mitochondrial proteins Oxa1, β-subunit of the F1-ATPase (F1), and cytochrome oxidase IV (OxaIV) (Table 6.2). We used the online program TargetP [20] to predict ability of these designed tags to target proteins to the mitochondria (Figure 6.5). When fused to GFP, the Oxa and OxaIV tags appear to localize to the mitochondria, as evidenced by co-localization of tagged GFP and the mitochondrial stain in Figures 6.6A and 6.6C. The F1 tag has a lower targeting efficiency, which much of the GFP remaining in the cytoplasm (Figure 6.6B).
Figure 6.6. Mitochondrial localization of GFP using designed tags. Fluorescent and bright field (BF) images were taken with a confocal microscope. Cells were stained with MitoTracker mitochondrial dye. Images are of strains expressing GFP tagged with targeting sequences A) OxaI, B) F1, C) OxaIV. Scale bar represents 1 µm.

Figure 6.7. Oxal-tagged AT-1 localizes to the mitochondria, but the F1-tag does not move AT-1 from the ER. Cells expressing Oxa1-RFP and A) Oxa1-AT-1-FLAG or B) F1-AT-1-FLAG were fixed and FLAG tags were labeled with mouse anti-FLAG and goat anti-mouse FITC conjugated antibodies. Scale bar represents 1 µm.
The AT-1 transporter can be targeted to the mitochondria. We similarly generated fusions of the OxaI and F1 tags to the AT-1 transporter along with a C-terminal GFP, but were unable to detect any fluorescence. Thus, we next generated fusions of the OxaI and F1 tags to the AT-1 transporter along with a C-terminal FLAG tag. We then used immunofluorescence to assess localization. The MitoTracker dye does not work with fixed cells, so we employed an Oxa1-tagged RFP as a mitochondrial control. The Oxa1-tagged AT-1 co-localizes with an Oxa1-tagged RFP, so it is likely that the transporter is in the mitochondria (Figure 6.7B). Conversely, the F1-tagged AT-1 appears to be minimally co-localized with the Oxa1-tagged RFP (Figure 6.7A). The variation in fluorescence patterns is likely because the images were collected on a standard fluorescence microscope.

*Mitochondrially targeted AT-1 does not affect growth rates.* Growth rates for strains expressing mitochondrial-targeted AT-1 were monitored for 10 hours (Figure 6.8). Control strains expressing GFP, mitochondrially targeted GFP, and untargeted AT-1 were also monitored for growth. There does not appear to be any growth defect for strains expressing AT-1 or mitochondrially-targeted AT-1 or GFP.

Figure 6.8. AT-1 does not cause a growth defect in *S. cerevisiae*. Strains expressing AT-1 (solid red line), F1-tagged AT-1 (dotted red line) and Oxa1-tagged AT-1 (dashed red line) were grown in SD-Leu and OD600 measured periodically. Strains expressing GFP (solid green line), F1-tagged GFP (dotted green line) and Oxa1-tagged GFP (dashed green line) were grown as controls. Samples were run in triplicate and error bars represent standard deviations.
AT-1 reduces cytosolic levels of Acetyl-CoA. Intracellular AcCoA was extracted and LC-MS used to quantify AcCoA levels. Strains expressing a GFP control or the AT-1 transporter have approximately the same amounts of intracellular AcCoA (Figure 6.10A). Localizing the transporter to the mitochondria with the OxaI and F1 tags decreases total AcCoA levels. Cytoplasmic fractions were isolated to examine AcCoA levels in each relevant organelle. Cytoplasmic AcCoA levels decrease when the AT-1 transporter is expressed as compared to cells expressing only GFP (Figure 6.10B). Results from strains expressing F1-tagged AT-1 were variable, while OxaI-tagged AT-1 may confer decreased cytoplasmic AcCoA levels.

The yeast homologue, YBR220C requires different expression conditions than AT-1. Expression of a YBR220C-GFP fusion from the high-strength promoter pTdh3 leads to aggregation (Figure 6.4D-F). Additionally, OxaI-tagged YBR220C confers a decreased growth rate compared to control strains as well as OxaIV-tagged YBR220C (Figure 6.9). Interestingly, overexpression of YBR220C without modifications does not decrease growth rates, so we anticipate that optimization of the expression conditions for each fusion will result in minimally affected growth rates as observed with AT-1.

Figure 6.9. Overexpressed YBR220C can disrupt the the mitochondria when tagged with the OxaI tag. Strains expressing YBR220C (solid blue line), OxaI-tagged YBR220C (short dashed blue line) and OxaIV-tagged YBR220C (long dashed blue line) were grown in SD-Leu and OD\textsubscript{600} measured periodically. Strains expressing GFP (solid green line), OxaI-tagged GFP (short dashed green line) and OxaIV-tagged GFP (long dashed green line) were grown as controls. Samples were run in triplicate and error bars represent standard deviations.
**DISCUSSION**

In order to direct a transporter to the mitochondria, we first needed to design some mitochondrial targeting tags. Several published studies on the characterization of mitochondrial targeting peptides [20-22] simplified tag design for this work. We chose the N-terminal sequences from known mitochondrial proteins cytochrome oxidase activity I (Oxal) [21], cytochrome oxidase IV (OxalV) [22], and ATPase F1 β-subunit (F1) [22] to target proteins to the mitochondrial membrane. Using the TargetP program [20], we optimized the three tags for high targeting efficiency but short sequence, to reduce the chance of including a domain that would fold separately or disrupt folding for the targeted proteins. As longer tags gave a higher targeting efficiency, the designed tags have a range of sizes, from 28 to 80 residues, with a concomitant range of targeting efficiency (Figure 6.5). We fused these tags to GFP to confirm mitochondrial targeting via microscopy. The Oxal and OxalV tags direct the majority of GFP into the mitochondria, as seen in Figure 6.6A and 6.6C. The tagged GFP co-localizes significantly with the MitoTracker dye. However, the F1 tag has a low efficiency, and minimal co-localization of F1-GFP and the MitoTracker dye is seen (Figure 6.6B). The majority of the F1-GFP appears to be cytoplasmic. The F1 tag may serve as a relevant negative control for future studies.

The heterologous AT-1 transporter is functional and properly localized in *S. cerevisiae*. In human cells, the AT-1 transporter localizes to the endoplasmic reticulum [1]. When expressed in yeast, it appears to also localize to the ER, as assessed by microscopy of AT-1-GFP fusions (Figure 6.4A-C). Analysis of cytoplasmic AcCoA concentrations shows a decrease in strains expressing AT-1 (Figure 6.9). This is likely due to the AT-1 transporting AcCoA from the cytoplasm into the ER. Additionally, the AT-1 transporter does not confer any growth rate defect when expressed in yeast (Figure 6.8). Together, these data show that AT-1 is a promising target for engineering.

---

**Figure 6.10.** ER-targeted AT-1 decreases cytoplasmic Acetyl-CoA concentrations. Acetyl-CoA was extracted from 200 OD of stationary phase cells grown in SD-Leu. Concentrations were measured using GC-MS. Error bars represent standard deviations, n=3. A) Intracellular AcCoA was extracted from sonicated cells. B) Cytoplasmic AcCoA was extracted from osmotically lysed spheroplasts.
AcCoA concentrations within various organelles of *S. cerevisiae*.

The mitochondrial targeting tag OxaI is able to direct AT-1 to the mitochondria (Figure 6.7B). The F1 tag is not particularly effective, though some AT-1 is likely in the mitochondria (Figure 6.7A); the majority of the AT-1 is localized to the ER. Neither of these tagged transporters cause a growth defect (Figure 6.8). Unfortunately, our preliminary data suggests the mitochondrially targeted AT-1 does not improve cytoplasmic AcCoA levels (Figure 6.10B). The error for these experiments is high, which may be obscuring any improvements. We are currently refining the extraction method and expect to reduce the errors with further experimentation. We will also try several tag variations, including tags with an added transmembrane domain, in order to test whether orientation of the AT-1 transporter is reversed with the current tags. If the transporter is not oriented correctly, it will not efflux AcCoA from the mitochondria.

The homologous YBR220C has not been as amenable to study as the AT-1 transporter. Expression of a YBR220C-FLAG fusion under control of the low-strength pRev1 promoter is not detectable by western blot (Figure 6.3). Moreover, overexpression of a YBR220C-GFP fusion under the control of the high-strength pTdh3 promoter causes what structures that appear to be aggregates to form (Figure 6.4B). When directed into the mitochondria with the OxaI tag, these YBR220C aggregates cause a significant growth defect (Figure 6.9). Surprisingly, the OxaIV-targeted YBR220C did not cause a growth defect. We suspect that altering the promoter will improve growth rates upon overexpression of YBR220C. In Chapter 2, we showed that promoter strengths are important for proper function of the transporter Tpo1. Again, in Chapter 5, we found that promoter strength was critical for the essential translation initiation proteins. The high-strength pTdh3 promoter, which was developed for high expression levels of heterologous cytosolic enzymes [23], may not be appropriate for expression of native yeast proteins and particularly membrane proteins. Thus we will optimize YBR220C expression using its native promoter as well as other transporter promoters such as pTpo1 and pPdr5 (See Chapter 2). Optimizing the promoter will allow us to move forward with engineering YBR220C for AcCoA efflux from the mitochondria.

**MATERIALS AND METHODS**

*Strains and Media*

We used wild-type *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* strain BY4741 (MATa his3Δ1 leu2Δ0 met15Δ0 ura3Δ0). Yeast without plasmids were grown in YPD (1% yeast extract, 2% peptone, 2% α-dextrose). Yeast with plasmids were grown in appropriate synthetic dropout media, eg SD-Leu (0.67% Yeast Nitrogen Base (Amresco), 2% α-Dextrose (BD Chemical), 0.2% amino acid mix without leucine from US Biological).

*Plasmid Generation*

Plasmids were generated using standard molecular biology cloning techniques and homologous recombination. Transformations were performed using the LiOAc protocol [17]. The AT-1 gene was cloned from MGC Human AT-1 sequence-verified cDNA from Thermo Scientific.

*Westerns*
Whole cell lysates were prepared by resuspending 2 mL of stationary phase cells in 200 uL Homogenization Buffer (50 mM Tris, pH 7.5, 1 mM EDTA, 1 mM BME, 10% glycerol, 17.4 ug/ml PMSF). Cells were lysed by vortexing 2 minutes with glass beads. Lysed cells were pelleted by spinning at 10,000 xg for 2 minutes. Supernatants were separated and pellets resuspended in 200 uL Homogenization buffer. 4X SDS running buffer (200 mM Tris, 4% ß-mercaptoethanol, 8% SDS, 0.04% bromophenol blue, 40% glycerol pH 6.8) was added and samples were boiled 95°C for 5 minutes. 10 uL of sample were run through a 15% SDS-PAGE gel. Proteins were transferred to PVDF membrane using a semi-dry blotting protocol. Membranes were blocked in 5% milk in TBST (50 mM Tris, 150 mM NaCl, 0.05% Tween-20, pH 7.5) for 30 minutes at room temperature. Membrane was incubated in a 1:7,000 dilution of mouse anti-FLAG antibody in TBST + 1% milk (Sigma) overnight, washed 3X 5 minutes with 10 mL TBST, then incubated 2 hours at room temperature in a 1:1000 dilution of HRP-conjugated goat anti-mouse antibody in TBST. Membranes were imaged using the SuperSignal West Pico Chemiluminescent substrate (Pierce) and Chemidoc Imager.

Confocal Microscopy
Confocal images were taken using a Leica SD600 confocal microscope with a Yokogawa CSU-X1 spinning disk head and a 100X, 1.4 n.a. oil immersion objective. Images were captured using Metamorph software from Molecular devices and 488 and 561 nm lasers. Mitochondria were stained using MitoTracker Red MXRos dye from Molecular Probes. Images were processed using ImageJ.

Immunofluorescence
Images were taken using an Andor Clara-Lite digital camera and a Nikon Ni-U upright microscope with a 100x, 1.45 n.a. plan apochromat oil immersion objective. Images were taken at room temperature. Fluorescence images were collected using a C-FL Endow GFP HYQ band pass filter and the Y-2E/C bandpass filter. Images were captured using the Nikon NIS Elements software. Images were processed using ImageJ.

Growth Curves
Single colonies were picked from the post-evolution plates into 5 mL SD-Leu media in culture tubes. Cultures were grown overnight to saturation at 30°C with 280 rpm shaking. Stationary phase cultures were diluted to an OD$_{600}$ of 0.30-0.33 a.u. as measured with a Nanodrop 2000c, 10 mL dilute culture was aliquoted into screw-cap tubes. Each sample was run in triplicate. Screw-cap tubes were grown at 30°C with 280 rpm shaking and measurements were taken every hour with Genesys-20 spectrophotometer.

Acetyl CoA Measurement
Single colonies were inoculated into 12 mL SD-Leu media and grown at 30°C, 280 rpm shaking for 24 hours. 200 OD$_{600}$ was pelleted and washed with 2 mL sterile H.O. For whole-cell AcCoA measurements, pellets were resuspended in 1 mL 2 Methanol (Fisher): 2Acetonitrile (Fisher):1H$_2$O + 0.1% formic acid. Samples were sonicated for a total of 7 minutes with a cycle of 20” on, 40” off at 50% power. Samples were
centrifuged for 20 minutes at 5,000 rpm, 4°C. Supernatants were removed and vacuum centrifuged for 1 hour at 45°C to remove solvents. Method was adapted from [18].

For cytoplasmic AcCoA measurements, pellets were resuspended in 800 uL Buffer A (1.2 M sorbitol (Fisher), 50 mM K2PO4 (Fisher), 1 mM EDTA (Fisher), 1 mM KCl(Spectrum), 10 mM DTT (OmniPur), pH 7.5). 1 mg Zymolyase (Zymo Research) was added and solution was incubated for 1 hour at 30°C. Samples were centrifuged 4,000 xg for 5 minutes at RT. Spheroplasts were resuspended in 1 mL Buffer B (1.2 M Sorbitol, 5 mM MES (Fisher), 1 mM EDTA, 1 mM KCl, pH 5.5). Spheroplasts were again centrifuged and resuspended in 200 uL Buffer C (5 mM MES, 1 mM EDTA, 1 mM KCl, pH 5.5). Lysed cells were spun at 20,000 xg for 20 minutes at 4°C. Spheroplast method was adapted from [19]. Supernatant was removed and 2V Methanol and 2V Acetonitrile was added. Precipitates were removed via centrifugation at 5,000 rpm for 20 minutes at 4°C. Supernatant was removed and vacuum centrifuged for 1 hour at 45°C to remove solvents.

Analysis of AcCoA was conducted with a reverse-phase C18 column using a Shimadzu LC-MS system. Mobile phase was 20 mM ammonium acetate in water (Solvent A), and 20 mM ammonium acetate in methanol (Solvent B), separated with the following gradient: 10% to 22.5% B for 15 min, 22.5% to 100% B for 5 min, 100% to 10% B for 0.1 min, held at 10% B for 24.9 min. A flow rate of 0.14 mL/min was used throughout. A 1 mg/mL AcCoA standard (Sigma) in 50% methanol: 50% water was diluted for the standard curve. Analysis method was adapted from [18].

### Table 6.1. Strains and Plasmids used in this study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strain</th>
<th>Parent</th>
<th>Genotype</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BY4741</td>
<td></td>
<td>MATa his3Δ1 leu2Δ0 met15Δ0 ura3Δ0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plasmid</th>
<th>Promoter</th>
<th>Insert</th>
<th>Marker</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pSD476</td>
<td>pRev1</td>
<td>YBR220C</td>
<td>Leu2</td>
<td>This Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pSD477</td>
<td>pTdh3</td>
<td>YBR220C-link-Emerald</td>
<td>Leu2</td>
<td>This Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pSD478</td>
<td>pTdh3</td>
<td>YBR220C</td>
<td>Leu2</td>
<td>This Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pSD508</td>
<td>pRev1</td>
<td>AT-1</td>
<td>Leu2</td>
<td>This Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pSD509</td>
<td>pTdh3</td>
<td>AT-1</td>
<td>Leu2</td>
<td>This Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pSD510</td>
<td>pRev1</td>
<td>AT-1-link-Emerald</td>
<td>Leu2</td>
<td>This Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pSD511</td>
<td>pTdh3</td>
<td>AT1-link-Emerald</td>
<td>Leu2</td>
<td>This Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pSD527</td>
<td>pRev1</td>
<td>AT1-4XFLAG</td>
<td>Leu2</td>
<td>This Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pSD528</td>
<td>pTdh3</td>
<td>AT1-4XFLAG</td>
<td>Leu2</td>
<td>This Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pSD529</td>
<td>pRev1</td>
<td>YBR220C-4XFLAG</td>
<td>Leu2</td>
<td>This Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pSD616</td>
<td>pRev1</td>
<td>Emerald-link-YBR220C</td>
<td>Leu2</td>
<td>This Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pSD617</td>
<td>pTdh3</td>
<td>Emerald-link-YBR220C</td>
<td>Leu2</td>
<td>This Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pSD619</td>
<td>pTdh3</td>
<td>F1tag-Emerald-link-AT-1</td>
<td>Leu2</td>
<td>This Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pSD620</td>
<td>pTdh3</td>
<td>Oxa1tag-Emerald</td>
<td>Leu2</td>
<td>This Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pSD621</td>
<td>pTdh3</td>
<td>F1tag-Emerald</td>
<td>Leu2</td>
<td>This Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pSD627</td>
<td>pTdh3</td>
<td>Oxa1Vtag-Emerald</td>
<td>Leu2</td>
<td>This Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pSD635</td>
<td>pTdh3</td>
<td>Oxa1tag-AT-1</td>
<td>Leu2</td>
<td>This Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pSD636</td>
<td>pTdh3</td>
<td>F1tag-AT-1</td>
<td>Leu2</td>
<td>This Study</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6.2. Mitochondrial Targeting Tags

OxaI: 60 amino acids
MFKLTSRLVTSRFAASSRLATARTIVLPRPHPSWIFQAKRFNSTGPNANDVSEIQTQLP

F1: 28 amino acids
MVLPRLYTATSRAAFKAAKQSAPLLSTS

OxaIV: 80 amino acids
MLSLRQSIRFFKPATRTLCSSRYLLQQKPVVKTAQNLAEVNGPETLIGPGAEGTVPTDLDQETGLARLELLGKLEGIDV
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Conclusions

The potential for manipulating cellular small-molecule transport

As more transporters are discovered for small molecules such as alkanes [1], it becomes clear how crucial transporters are to biotechnology. Transporters are essential for both native cell processes such as ethanol production and engineered processes such as butanol production. Transporters drive production by importing sugars for energy [2], pathway substrates [3], and even water [4] into the cell. Excreting products to the extracellular space removes toxic products from the cell and simplifies downstream extraction processes.

A common problem with using transporters is that expression level is a critical parameter. In Chapter 2, we showed that the native Tpo1 promoter gives the optimal expression level, even in the presence of toxic levels of MCFAs. Low-strength promoters expressed insufficient Tpo1 levels to efflux the MCFAs while high-strength promoters expressed so much Tpo1 that the transporter itself became toxic. Proper expression of the native acetyl-CoA transporter YBR220C in *S. cerevisiae* was also dependent on the promoter, as showed in Chapter 6. Other transporters, such as AcrB in *E. coli* [5], have the same optimization issue. Since negative results are not often reported, it is likely that many other groups struggle with optimizing expression levels of transporters.

In moving forward with transport-related projects in *S. cerevisiae*, developing a library of transporter-specific promoters would be beneficial. Since the membrane area is significantly smaller than the cytoplasm and already crowded with other membrane proteins, expression levels need to be lower than that of cytoplasmic enzymes. Overexpressed transporters can oversaturate the membrane, disrupting membrane fluidity and function. Additionally, many transporters are constitutively active, using large amounts of ATP or depleting the proton gradient. This basal activity increases energy demand on the cell and may reduce growth rate. Having a suite of constitutive promoters tailored to the parameters of transporter proteins would simplify implementation of heterologous transporters, as well as streamline optimization of native transporters for novel applications.

Protein engineering perspectives

The *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* transporter of polyamines (Tpo1) is known for its activity on polyamines such as spermine and spermidine, and our work with this transporter indicates it would make a particularly advantageous engineering target. We characterized Tpo1 for its activity on medium-chain fatty acids (MCFAs), which are promising potential biofuels. Surprisingly, we found that distinct sets of binding residues are utilized for MCFAs as compared to polyamines. These dual sets of substrate-binding residues in Tpo1 are interesting from a protein design perspective.

Currently, random non-active site mutations generated by directed evolution are often more effective than rational design [6]. However, these random mutations are limited to small steps in the energy landscape [7]. On the other hand, well-designed mutations can confer exactly the desired phenotype [8-9]. As modeling and computer
design technology improve [10], we can better target mutations for effective protein engineering. Developing a rigorous understanding of how proteins interact with small molecules and other proteins at the amino acid level could help inform computer models and enable the design of novel and desired features.

As a rational design challenge, it would be intriguing to attempt to engineer Tpo1 to bind new substrates while maintaining activity on a subset of native substrates. For example, it might be useful to engineer specificity for alcohol substrates using the fatty acid-binding residues, while maintaining native polyamine activity. Such efforts, if successful, would be a step toward more complex, multi-functional protein designs and would provide elegant solutions for effluxing biofuels and toxic feedstock impurities from production cells.
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