



Engineering Prokaryote Synthetic Biology Biosensors

Xinyi Wan, Trevor Y. H. Ho, and Baojun Wang

Contents

Introduction	2
Synthetic Biology as an Enabling Platform for Rapid Construction and Optimization of Prokaryotic Biosensors	3
A Streamlined Approach to Developing Novel Prokaryotic Biosensors	3
Efficient Sensor Optimization by Standardized and Modularized Genetic Parts	6
Biosensor Improvement by Directed Evolution	6
Development of New Sensing Modules	7
Tools and Strategies from Synthetic Biology for Optimizing Biosensor Performance	8
Properties of a Biosensor	8
Strategies for Enhancing Selectivity	9
Strategies for Lowering the Limit of Detection (LOD)	12
Strategies for Increasing Output Dynamic Range	14
Strategies for Reducing Leakiness	17
Functional Expansion of Biosensors by Synthetic Biology	19
Memory Devices	19
Computation Modules to Integrate Signals	23
Modules to Reshape Response Function	24
Reporter Modules for Interfacing with Different Detection Platforms	25
Biosafety Enhancing Modules	25
Conclusions and Future Directions	26
References	27

Abstract

Prokaryotic whole-cell biosensors are effective yet inexpensive, renewable, and environmentally friendly substitutes for many contemporary sensors and diagnostic devices. Unfortunately, many previously constructed prokaryotic

X. Wan · T. Y. H. Ho · B. Wang (✉)

School of Biological Sciences, University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, UK

Centre for Synthetic and Systems Biology, University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, UK

e-mail: baojun.wang@ed.ac.uk

biosensors are plagued by poor performance, which prohibits their use in real-life applications. Biosafety concerns, promiscuous analyte detection, limited detection range, low output dynamic range, and high background expression are common issues. Engineering principles and strategies from the emerging field of synthetic biology offer unprecedented solutions. They accelerate new biosensor development and improve biosensor behavior. Addition of novel devices and modules from synthetic biology further augments functions beyond sensing and renders them safer. Thanks to this, prokaryotic whole-cell biosensors have enjoyed a renaissance in recent years, and they hold promise to address the increasing demand for marketable biosensors.

Keywords

Whole-cell biosensor · Synthetic biology · Prokaryotes · Response curve · Limit of detection · Selectivity · Dynamic range · Leakiness

Introduction

Whole-cell biosensors are domesticated or engineered cells that detect and report a target or condition of interest (Daurert et al. 2000; van der Meer and Belkin 2010; Wang and Buck 2012; Gui et al. 2017). They are viable alternatives to electronic or chemical sensors and have drawn increasing attention over the last three decades. Whole-cell biosensors are biodegradable and can be mass produced using inexpensive nutrients. So they are renewable, environmentally friendly, and cost-effective (van der Meer and Belkin 2010; Kim et al. 2018). Both prokaryotic and eukaryotic biosensors have been developed. This chapter limits its scope to only prokaryotic sensors, but the principles covered should also apply to their eukaryotic counterparts.

Prokaryotic biosensors have been researched for various purposes, for instances, environment assessment (Stocker et al. 2003; Wang et al. 2013; Huang et al. 2015b; Hwang et al. 2016; Kim et al. 2016; Cayron et al. 2017), clinical diagnosis (Duan and March 2010; Saeidi et al. 2011; Archer et al. 2012; Gupta et al. 2013; Hwang et al. 2014; Kotula et al. 2014; Courbet et al. 2015; Danino et al. 2015; Cayron et al. 2017; Daeffler et al. 2017; Riglar et al. 2017; Ho et al. 2018; Watstein and Styczynski 2018), and controlled bioprocessing (Zhang and Keasling 2011; Zhang et al. 2012). Some less common applications include mineral surveying and landmine clearing (Cerminati et al. 2011; Belkin et al. 2017).

Despite their advantages and demonstrated successes, many prokaryotic whole-cell biosensors fail to survive in or even reach the competitive biosensor market. A recurring concern is biosafety – whole-cell biosensors are often subjected to higher levels of legal and ethical scrutiny because there is a risk of releasing genetically engineered microorganisms into the wild (Dana et al. 2012). Yet with biosafety aside, many prokaryotic biosensors are still leaky with low output dynamic ranges and suffer from unsatisfactory detection limit and selectivity (Stocker et al. 2003; Amaro et al. 2011; De Mora et al. 2011; Siegfried et al. 2012; Wang et al. 2013;

Huang et al. 2015a; Kim et al. 2016; Merulla and van der Meer 2016). Nevertheless, recent advancements in synthetic biology have provided numerous solutions.

Synthetic biology is the rational design of biological systems. It achieves so by applying established principles from engineering to biology and so is highly interdisciplinary (Endy 2005; Purnick and Weiss 2009; Cheng and Lu 2012; Wang and Buck 2012; Way et al. 2014; Bradley et al. 2016a, b; Bashor and Collins 2018; Xiang et al. 2018). These principles include: (1) Abstraction: complexity is managed through a hierarchy and less relevant information is hidden for clarity. (2) Standardization: genetic elements are standardized into reusable parts with measurable parameters that can be ranked on a common scale. (3) Modularization: genetic parts and devices are independent and interchangeable modules with defined functions, and (4) Rational and quantitative design: behavior of biological systems can be described and predicted by mathematical models. These principles and concepts enabled synthetic biologists to develop new strategies and devices, which substantially enhanced the performance of existing prokaryotic biosensors. In addition, they paved the way for developing novel biosensors with augmented capabilities. This chapter thus focuses on how synthetic biology facilitates biosensor development, creates tools for improving biosensors, and expands their capacities beyond sensing.

Synthetic Biology as an Enabling Platform for Rapid Construction and Optimization of Prokaryotic Biosensors

A Streamlined Approach to Developing Novel Prokaryotic Biosensors

Before the advent of genetic engineering, the development of a biosensor relied much on serendipity. Many biosensors were by-products from studying the stress responses or metabolic pathways of microbes. For instances, Microtox, one of the earliest biosensors, is a bioluminescent bacterium that glows weaker when its metabolism is disturbed by toxic chemicals (Bulich and Isenberg 1981), and a whole-cell naphthalene biosensor was developed by random transposition of a luciferase reporter into a naphthalene degradation pathway isolated from a soil bacterial species (King et al. 1990). In these examples, the biosensor development processes depended on the fortuitous discovery of a species or a strain with desirable responses towards the targets, and they were hardly generalizable or readily reproducible.

In contrast, synthetic biology offered a formalized approach for biosensor development. A biosensor can be abstracted as a processor with a sensing module, a processing module, and an actuating module (Fig. 1a) (van der Meer and Belkin 2010; Wang and Buck 2012; Bradley and Wang 2015; Bernard and Wang 2017; Kim et al. 2018). Any naturally occurring response pathway in a prokaryote can also be dissected and classified in a similar fashion. Therefore, development of a biosensor is reduced to a task of identifying or creating an input module that can respond to the target and rewiring it to an observable output.




Fig. 1 (continued)

This framework is illustrated by the classical example of the whole-cell biosensor for detecting arsenic in drinking water. *Escherichia coli* naturally protect themselves from high concentrations of arsenic through its endogenous arsenic resistant pathway (Fig. 1b) (Cervantes et al. 1994; Nealson et al. 2002; Silver and Phung 2005; Andres and Bertin 2016). When bounded by arsenite (III), the ArsR transcription factor would de-repress its cognate promoter P_{arsR} which then triggers expression of molecular pumps that remove arsenite from the cell (Shi et al. 1996; Silver and Phung 2005; Chen and Rosen 2014; Saha et al. 2017). The ArsR- P_{arsR} transcriptional regulation can thus be understood as a sensing module and the genes coding for the arsenic efflux pumps as an actuating module. The natural sensing module can then be isolated and wired to a downstream reporter *gfp*, and this reengineered *E. coli* would give a higher level of green fluorescence under an increased level of arsenic, serving the purpose of a biosensor (Fig. 1d).

This framework is universal and can be adopted to quickly build new prokaryotic biosensors, because many other sensing modules have also been characterized. The majority of these sensing modules worked through either an allosterically controlled transcriptional regulator or a bacterial two-component system. The most well-studied examples for the former category include modules for detecting metal ions like mercury (Fig. 1c and e) and nutrients such as arabinose and lactose (Misra et al. 1985; Barkay et al. 2003; van der Meer and Belkin 2010; Mahr and Frunzke 2016). Others include modules for reporting quorum sensing molecules that could indicate infections caused by pathogens or inflammation biomarkers (Saeidi et al. 2011; Archer et al. 2012; Gupta et al. 2013; Hwang et al. 2014). There are also examples for hypoxia responsiveness (Anderson et al. 2006; Yu et al. 2012), aromatic contamination, and DNT/TNT from landmines (Selifonova and Eaton 1996; Belkin et al. 2017). For two-component systems, notable modules include sensors for detecting green, red, and blue light, respectively (Olson et al. 2014; Fernandez-Rodriguez et al. 2017), as well as sensors for zinc and lead (Fig. 3a) (Wang et al. 2013) and the aforementioned sensors for inflammation (Daeffler et al. 2017; Riglar et al. 2017). For both categories of sensing modules, the output from the module is almost always a transcriptional output. Therefore, they can be conveniently connected to an output module in a “plug-and-play” fashion to drive reporter gene expression.



Fig. 1 Architecture and engineering of synthetic biosensors. (a) Architecture of a modular synthetic biosensor. R, receptor. P, promoter. *gfp*, gene encoding a green fluorescent protein. *rfp*, gene encoding a red fluorescent protein. *luxAB*, genes encoding a bacterial luciferase for luminescent output. *lacZ*, gene coding β -galactosidase for colorimetric output. *arg*, acoustic reporter genes which express gas vehicles that are detectable by ultrasound. *luxI* and *lasI*, genes encoding synthases for quorum sensing molecules. (b) *ars* operon from *E. coli*'s chromosome and its role in arsenic regulation (Silver and Phung 2005; Chen and Rosen 2014). GlpF, an aquaglyceroporin. PST, phosphate-specific transport system. PIT, phosphate inorganic transport system. (c) *mer* operon from *Shigella flexneri* R100 plasmid and its role in mercury regulation (Misra et al. 1985; Barkay et al. 2003). CH_3HgX , organic form of mercury. HgX , inorganic form of mercury. (d) An engineered *E. coli* biosensor with arsenic sensing and reporting function. (e) An engineered *E. coli* biosensor with mercury sensing and reporting function

Efficient Sensor Optimization by Standardized and Modularized Genetic Parts

In biotechnology, whole-cell mutagenesis remains the canonical technique to improve the characteristics of a strain. While it is still widely used in whole-cell biosensor optimization, they have further benefited from the modularization of genetic elements. The dissection of gene circuitries into stand-alone parts, e.g., promoters and ribosome-binding sites (RBS), encourages the scope of the otherwise global random mutagenesis, as well as their manifested effects, to be confined to a local region. This is exemplified by the work of Li et al. (2015). In pursuit of a better sensing module for arsenite, they simultaneously mutated the *ArsR* coding sequence and the P_{arsR} promoter by error-prone polymerase chain reaction and identified mutations that reduced leakiness and boosted the output dynamic range (Li et al. 2015).

Part standardization also led to the appearances of part libraries. Since the length of a sequence undergoing mutagenesis is shortened, the combinatorial sequence space to be explored is drastically shrunk. Therefore, sequence variations can be thoroughly exhausted, and this resulted in a large variety of elements with performance that spans the entire activity spectrum. For example, the Anderson promoter library was generated from saturation mutagenesis of a constitutive promoter, and there is a community RBS collection on iGEM that confers different strengths for translation initiation (<http://parts.igem.org>).

They are particularly helpful if only a single part needs to be optimized – a part that was too strong and led to undesirable behavior in a biosensor could be swapped out by a weaker version effortlessly. This will be illustrated by an example of replacing an RBS to reduce biosensor leakiness in section “[Managing Leakiness on a Translational Level](#).” In addition, these libraries enable full exploration of a design space for expression strengths. It has been suggested that a promoter library and an RBS library could be combinatorically combined to optimize the expression strength for any gene of interest (Kosuri et al. 2013).

Biosensor Improvement by Directed Evolution

Synthetic biology has also provided new techniques for optimizing or altering biosensor behavior through directed evolution, which include phage-assisted continuous evolution (PACE) (Esvelt et al. 2011) and compartmentalized partnered replication (CPR) (Abil et al. 2017). In an example, a biosensor actuated through a split T7 RNAP polymerase had an improved signal-to-noise ratio after one split half was subjected to evolution by PACE (Pu et al. 2017). In another example, the transcriptional repressor for tryptophan has been evolved by CPR to respond specifically to halogenated tryptophan analogues (Ellefson et al. 2018).

Development of New Sensing Modules

In biosensor development, there is a perennial and insatiable need for new sensing modules for new chemicals, biomarkers, or other targets. Due to strong chemical specificities in regulators and receptors, existing sensing modules intended for one target can rarely fully satisfy the sensing requirement of a different target, even though the two targets may be highly similar in structure. Thus, a search for a specific sensor module is almost always necessary.

In nature, prokaryotes contribute the most in biodiversity. They thrive in all niches, including those inhabitable to other organisms, and respond to countless stimuli. If an environment has long been enriched with a compound, it is very likely to find in the vicinity a prokaryotic dweller evolved to detect and metabolize it (Nealson et al. 1991; Cervantes et al. 1994; Nealson et al. 2002). Consequently, a conventional practice to uncover a new biological sensing module is to sample and study bacteria in a target-enriched environment. The aforementioned naphthalene biosensor is one of such examples – the naphthalene metabolic pathway originated from a strain of *Pseudomonas fluorescens* living in the soil of a manufactured gas plant. This is still routinely practiced but it poses a limit in biosensor development. Nowadays, there are new strategies to accelerate sensing module discoveries.

Part Mining

Part mining is the bioinformatics-guided search for biological parts from sequenced genomes and is a branch of genome mining. Genetic parts or proteins often have orthologues in closely related species which carry out similar tasks and have homology in sequences. Therefore, if a part of interest has a defined sequence feature, orthologs that potentially belong to the same family can be identified by performing sequence alignments across multiple genomes. Shortlisted candidates can then be synthesized and characterized, and parts that showed desirable responses can be grouped to form a new library. Many sequenced genomes, as well as metagenomes from unculturable prokaryotes, have been deposited into bioinformatics databases, which become a lucrative resource for part mining (Johns et al. 2018). For example, using sequences for a cadmium-responsive transcription factor from *Staphylococcus aureus*, researchers discovered a new sensing module for cadmium from the genome of *Bacillus oceanisediminis*, a bacterium that resides in sediment undersea (Kim et al. 2016).

In addition, some databases contain annotated proteins or parts, so mining can also be done via a search of keywords in described or predicted biological functions. One demonstrated example is the creation of a library of sensing modules for aromatic compounds, obtained through part mining from the UniProt database (Xue et al. 2014).

Antibody-Derived Domains as Universal Sensing Modules

Many sensing modules have been derived from natural pathways, but their development into biosensor components often requires a thorough understanding of the underlying biochemistry, which is a time-consuming process. Moreover, some

targets might not have a natural sensing module responsible for their detection. Some recent researches sought to circumvent these problems by turning to antibody-derived protein domains.

Antibody-derived domains are protein fragments of antibodies created proteolytically or genetically. The leading examples are the single domain antibodies (sdAb) (Holliger and Hudson 2005). They retain the variable region responsible for strong and specific antigen recognition and binding, but their considerably smaller sizes allow stable and soluble expression from bacteria. Most importantly, a novel sdAb for any given epitope can be quickly and inexpensively created by screening a synthetic and combinatorial antibody domain library against the epitope. Identified sdAb can then be fused with other protein domains that could elicit sensing responses upon target binding. A proof-of-concept example was demonstrated by fusion of a caffeine-binding sdAb to a DNA-binding domain (Chang et al. 2018). sdAb co-localized on a caffeine molecule would then allow dimerization of the DNA-binding domain and restore its function as a transcriptional repressor.

Tools and Strategies from Synthetic Biology for Optimizing Biosensor Performance

Many early biosensors have subpar performance compared to their electronic or chemical counterparts, rendering them uncompetitive in field applications. In recent years, tools and strategies developed from synthetic biology created new avenues to improve the characteristics of whole-cell prokaryotic biosensors. There are mathematical models that provide quantitative frameworks for sensor improvement (Ang et al. 2013; Mannan et al. 2017; Xiang et al. 2018), but this section focuses on tools and strategies that have been experimentally proven.

Properties of a Biosensor

From the perspective of engineering, it is paramount to define measurable properties so that improvements can be gauged quantitatively. Different metrics are available for defining a whole-cell sensor's performance (Daniel et al. 2013; Mannan et al. 2017). The one adopted in this chapter focuses on four important aspects most pertinent to applications: selectivity, limit of detection (LOD), output dynamic range, and leakiness (Fig. 2). Selectivity is a qualitative property that concerns how well the biosensor distinguishes the target of interest among others that are chemically similar (Fig. 2a).

The other three properties define characteristics of the response curve of a biosensor, which mathematically describes how a sensor's output varies with its input (Fig. 2b). Most biosensors have a sigmoidal response curve that monotonically increases with the target concentration. The LOD is the minimal concentration of the




Fig. 2 Metric for defining the performance of a biosensor. (a) Schematic illustrating a biosensor's selectivity. (b) A biosensor's response curve with the sensor's leakiness, limit of detection (LOD), and output dynamic range annotated

target that elicits an observable response. The output dynamic range refers to the ratio between the maximally achievable output and the basal output of the biosensor. Leakiness is the basal level of the biosensor when no target is present and has been known to jeopardize sensor applications: if colorimetric outputs are used, the response may be easily saturated even in the absence of targets and would restrict titrimetric analysis (Wackwitz et al. 2008).

Strategies for Enhancing Selectivity

Some sensing modules are naturally promiscuous and can be triggered by targets with similar chemical properties. This is often the case for heavy metal sensing (Amaro et al. 2011; Wang et al. 2013). For example, CadC from *S. aureus* can sense Cd, Pb, and Zn; CmtR from *Mycobacterium tuberculosis* can sense Cd and Pb; and ArsR from *E. coli* can sense As, Sb, and Bi (Saha et al. 2017).

These sensing modules are thus nonspecific and could give false positives when deployed in the field. Given that those transcription factors are allosterically regulated, an intuitive and routine approach is to randomly mutate their binding pockets, and then screen for mutants with increased selectivity towards the ion of interest. A number of successful cases have been reported: a mutated CueR remained sensitive to Cu^{2+} but no longer responded to Ag^+ and became more sensitive to Au^+ (Stoyanov and Browns 2003). In another example, MerR was mutated to detect Cd^{2+} rather than its original ligand Hg^{2+} (Hakkila et al. 2011). RcnR is normally regulated by both Ni and Co but could be mutated to only recognize the former (Cayron et al. 2017). However, as with general mutagenesis, this approach is time-consuming and does not guarantee success in identifying a receptor with desirable traits.

A general solution is to employ a genetic logic AND gate with two different receptors that can detect the same ligand (Bernard and Wang 2017). For example, two transcription factors can detect Zn^{2+} , but both are nonspecific: ZraR detects Zn^{2+}

and Pb^{2+} , and ZntR detects Zn^{2+} and Cd^{2+} (Wang et al. 2013). Implementation of an AND logic using ZraR and ZntR as the inputs will yield a biosensor that responds to Zn^{2+} but not Pb^{2+} or Cd^{2+} , thus increasing its specificity (Fig. 3a).

This AND gate example was derived from the HrpRS activator complex and its cognate promoter P_{hrpL} (Fig. 3b). P_{hrpL} is a σ^{54} -dependent promoter that is activated only when both HrpR and HrpS are present (Jovanovic et al. 2011; Wang et al. 2011a; Liu et al. 2018). Many other logic gates orthogonal to the HrpRS system are also available from the synthetic biology community: a T7 RNA polymerase-amber




Fig. 3 Biosensors specificity enabled by synthetic biology. (a) A zinc-specific biosensor using an AND gate (Wang et al. 2013). (a-i) A zinc/lead biosensor and its response curves for Zn^{2+} and Pb^{2+} . (a-ii) A zinc/cadmium biosensor and its response curves for Zn^{2+} and Cd^{2+} . (a-iii) A zinc-specific biosensor was generated by integrating both sensing modules from **i** and **ii** into an AND gate. *gfp*, gene encoding a green fluorescent protein. (b) The HrpR/HrpS hetero-regulation motif in the *hrp* (hypersensitive response and pathogenicity) system of *Pseudomonas syringae* pv. tomato DC3000 (Wang et al. 2011a; Wang and Buck 2014). The *hrp* system promotes pathogenicity of the bacteria in their plant host. The σ^{54} -dependent *hrpL* promoter can be activated by the heterohexamers of the transcriptional activators HrpR and HrpS




Fig. 4 Strategies for improving biosensors' LOD. (a, b) A transcriptional repressor (TR) and a transcriptional activator (TA)-based biosensor. P_C , constitutive promoter. P_{TR} , TR's cognate promoter. P_{TA} , TA's cognate promoter. Black dots, targets of interest. *gfp*, gene encoding a green

suppressor system that integrates two input signals (Anderson et al. 2007), activator-chaperone systems (Moon et al. 2012), split T7 RNA polymerase-based systems (Shis and Bennett 2013; Schaerli et al. 2014), and recombinase-based Boolean gates (Bonnet et al. 2013; Courbet et al. 2015). These orthogonal logic gates provide the means to enhance biosensor specificity in more complicated cases.

Strategies for Lowering the Limit of Detection (LOD)

Similar to solutions for biosensor selectivity, random mutagenesis on promoters or transcription factors used to be a popular way to generate mutated sensing modules capable of detecting lower ligand concentrations. However, the issue of LOD is intrinsically tied to the relative concentrations between the receptor and the ligand, so a more rational approach is to tune their respective densities in the cell.

LOD Improvement by Tuning Receptor Densities

Depending on their modes of action, the LOD of a sensing module could be lowered by increasing or decreasing concentrations of receptors (Merulla et al. 2013; Wang et al. 2015; Wan et al. 2019). If the receptor is a transcriptional repressor that could be derepressed by an inducer (Fig. 4a), reducing its concentration could lead to both a lower LOD and a higher dynamic range. In the canonical allosteric transcriptional regulation paradigm, the binding between the inducer and the repressor, and between the repressor and the promoter are in equilibrium. A minimum concentration of inducer is always required to sufficiently inactivate the repressor and to allow the promoter to drive an observable expression of the reporter gene. Reducing the repressor concentration would therefore lower the specified demand on the inducer concentration, which effectively translates into a decreased LOD for the sensing module. This strategy has been demonstrated on the previously described arsenic biosensor, in which its LOD was improved by replacing the strong constitutive promoter that drives the repressor ArsR by a weaker variant (Fig. 4c).

To improve the LOD in the opposite scenario, where the receptor is a transcriptional activator inducible by the inducer (Fig. 4b), the receptor density needs to be raised (Wang et al. 2015). In the case of the LuxR- P_{lux} sensor that detects the ligand AHL, more LuxR present in the cells implies a higher probability to form the LuxR-AHL complexes (Fig. 4d). Therefore, the P_{lux} promoter can be activated with a lower concentration of AHL.



Fig. 4 (continued) fluorescent protein. (c, d) Improving a biosensor's LOD by tuning receptor densities (Wang et al. 2015). (c) shows a TR-based arsenic biosensor, and (d) shows a TA-based AHL biosensor. P_{Strong} , strong constitutive promoter. P_{Weak} , weak constitutive promoter. (e) Improving a biosensor's LOD by increasing its targets' intracellular density (Hynninen et al. 2010; Cayron et al. 2017). IS, importing system. ES, exporting system. R, receptor. P_R , R's cognate promoter




Fig. 5 Strategies for improving biosensors' output dynamic range. (a) Different σ^{70} binding sites of an inducible promoter yield different basal levels and output dynamics as a result of relative equilibrium constants of σ^{70} binding to the -10 and -35 regions, $\ln(K_{eq}) = -(\Delta G_{-10} + \Delta G_{-35})$ (Chen et al. 2018). Non-consensus bases are underlined. ΔG_{-10} and ΔG_{-35} correspond to the relative changes in the binding energy due to changes in the -10 and -35 sites. R, receptor. P_R, R's cognate promoter which contains an operator for R (RO). yfp, gene encoding a yellow fluorescent protein. (b) Biosensors without transcriptional amplifiers (TAMP) (b-i), with two transcriptional repressor (TR)-based amplifiers (b-ii), or with a transcriptional activator (TA)-based amplifier (b-iii), and their response curves (Hooshangi et al. 2005; Wang et al. 2014; Kim et al. 2016). iv, an amplifier with positive feedback (Nistala et al. 2010). P_{TR}, TR's cognate promoter. P_{TA}, TA's cognate promoter. gfp, gene encoding a green fluorescent protein. (c) A gain-tunable TAMP based on a HrpRSV system (Wang et al. 2014). This device scales the weak transcriptional input signal (I) linearly in response to a second "gain tuning" transcriptional input (β^T)

It is noteworthy that receptor densities could also be dynamically controlled to give conditional LOD. A cadmium biosensor was integrated with a toggle switch, where the CadR repressor concentration was modulated by both the cadmium concentration and a LOD tuning ligand (Wu et al. 2009). Under a moderate level of the LOD tuning ligand, an increase in cadmium concentration would in turn reduce expression of the CadR repressor. This positive feedback mechanism lowered the LOD of the biosensor, and interestingly, the feedback could be quenched by increasing the concentration of the LOD tuning ligand.

LOD Improvement by Tuning Intracellular Ligand Densities

For ligands that interact with sensing modules intracellularly and do not diffuse freely across the membrane, increasing their cytoplasmic concentrations increases their availabilities and hence their probabilities to excite the sensing module. In fact, this strategy can be frequently found in nature. In *E. coli* for example, the transportations of arabinose and rhamnose across the cell membrane are governed by positive feedback loops (Altenbuchner and Mattes 2005; Fritz et al. 2014). Induction of the metabolism pathways drives the expression of the transmembrane transporter proteins, which subsequently facilitates the imports of the sugars.

In biosensor design, if the transmembrane transporters for a ligand could be identified, the same outcome could be reproduced by overexpressing importers and knocking out exporters (Fig. 4e). For instance, disruption of the efflux transporters for Zn/Cd/Pb in *P. putida* strain KT2440 decreased the detection limits by up to 45-fold (Hynninen et al. 2010). In another example, an engineered *E. coli* biosensor achieved a lower LOD for Ni through the introduction of several foreign Ni-uptake systems and the deletion of Ni efflux pumps (Cayron et al. 2017).

Strategies for Increasing Output Dynamic Range

A number of native promoters responsive to heavy metals are relatively weak and so their derived biosensors suffer from limited output dynamic ranges (Stocker et al. 2003; De Mora et al. 2011; Siegfried et al. 2012; Wang et al. 2013; Huang et al. 2015a; Kim et al. 2016; Merulla and van der Meer 2016). Again, one option is to perform random mutagenesis on the promoter to maximize the transcriptional output.

Recently, however, a more reliable approach has been developed for engineering hybrid σ^{70} -based promoters. Chen et al. demonstrated that the dynamic ranges of these promoters could be quantitatively predicted by the choices of their -35 and -10 regions, which dictate the binding affinities between the promoters and the σ factors required for transcription initiation (Fig. 5a) (Cox et al. 2007; Brewster et al. 2012; Guzina and Djordjevic 2017; Chen et al. 2018). By inserting binding sites of inducible transcription factors around the -35 and -10 sequences, inducible promoters with improved dynamic ranges could be obtained. This example nonetheless is specific to σ^{70} promoters and remains inapplicable to promoters with uninsulated promoter core sequences.

A more universal solution from synthetic biology is to magnify the initially limited output through transcriptional amplifiers (TAmPs). A TAMP is analogous to a buffer gate in electronics – it amplifies a transcriptional input signal before outputting it (Fig. 5b). In general, a TAMP takes the form of a transcriptional cascade that comprises a transcription factor (TF) and its cognate promoter P_{TF} . TF is the output of the sensing module and the P_{TF} drives expression of the next cascade or the final observable output. To qualify as a TAMP, P_{TF} must have a higher maximal activity than the promoter upstream of TF, so that a minute transcriptional input could be converted into a much larger downstream output. Therefore, mathematically, a TAMP can be understood as a function that receives a transcriptional input from a relatively narrow domain and maps it to a much larger range.

Early examples of TAmPs were built using transcriptional repressors. Two examples of repressor-based cascades have been built, and one was shown to amplify weak promoter activities that would otherwise be unobservable (Fig. 5b-ii) (Karig and Weiss 2005; Hooshangi et al. 2005). However, the use of repressor-based amplifiers might not be suitable for sensing modules with positive relationships between inputs and outputs, because they would invert the response functions, unless they are cascaded in even numbers.

New TAmPs based on transcriptional activators have been developed. This is exemplified by a TAMP built from the HrpRS system described above (Fig. 5b-iii and c) (Wang et al. 2014; Wan et al. 2019). It readily accepts a wide range of transcriptional inputs and linearly amplifies them in an analog fashion. This property proved useful when the amplifier was used to significantly improve an arsenic sensor's output dynamic range. The TAMP is also versatile – the amplification gain can be tuned by regulating the level of HrpS, which could be achieved either translationally, via changing the RBS, or post-translationally, by expressing the HrpS inhibitor HrpV. Another notable example of TAMP was based on the T7 RNA polymerase and its cognate promoter P_{T7} (Kim et al. 2016), which has been shown to improve both the LOD and the output dynamic range of a cadmium/lead biosensor.

Provided that the sensing module is tightly regulated, amplification capacities for a TAMP could be further augmented through the incorporation of a positive feedback loop. In a proof-of-concept circuit, the output of a TAMP drives expression of an activator used in the TAMP (Nistala et al. 2010), so signal amplification not only applies on the input but also on the output (Fig. 5b-iv). Compared to the stand-alone TAMP architecture, this coupled TAMP significantly improved the observable output as well as the detection limit of a biosensor. Caution should be exercised when applying this coupled architecture to a potentially leaky sensing module, because a high basal output level could be significantly amplified and would lead to a reduced output dynamic range.

Output amplification can also be realized using recombinase-based memory modules, provided that the maximal attainable transcription activity of the final output can surpass that of the sensing promoter. This will be described further in section “[Recombinase-Based Memory Devices.](#)”




Fig. 6 Strategies of tuning biosensors' leakiness and output dynamics. (a) A transcriptional repressor (TR)-based inducible promoter, with an operator site (TRO) at the distal, core, or proximal region of the promoter. Repression efficiencies were shown to depend on the TRO's location, which follows core \geq proximal \geq distal (Cox et al. 2007). P_{TR} , TR's cognate promoter. *yfp*, gene encoding

Strategies for Reducing Leakiness

Biological processes are evolved to be inherently leaky and noisy, because it leaves room for variations and allows bet-hedging in face of sudden and drastic changes in the environment (Randall et al. 2011). One would therefore rarely find a natural sensing module that displays little to no leaky behavior. So it is important, and more appropriate, to view leakiness not as a curable property but as an unavoidable issue to be managed. Leakiness of a biosensor typically originates from the promoter within the sensing module (Wackwitz et al. 2008; Arpino et al. 2013; Adams et al. 2014; Merulla and van der Meer 2016), but it could be addressed by strategies that act on levels of transcription, translation, and post-translational modifications.

Managing Leakiness on a Transcriptional Level

Receptor and Promoter Engineering

Since the sensing promoter is almost always the source of leakiness, it is logical to start by engineering the promoter and its cognate transcription factor. Once again, random mutagenesis and random promoter truncation are two popular approaches – libraries of mutant sensing regulator-promoter pairs are screened to obtain less leaky and yet still functional variants (Li et al. 2015; Daeffler et al. 2017). Identified candidates usually have mutations that alter the promoters' transcription initiation rates or the affinities between the transcriptional regulators and the promoters. The previously described cases of mutagenesis done on the ArsR- P_{arsR} sensing module and the quantitative approach to engineer hybrid σ^{70} promoters are examples of such approaches (Fig. 5a) (Li et al. 2015; Chen et al. 2018).

A similar but more predictable method is to vary the number and position of operators (Fig. 6a and b) (Merulla and van der Meer 2016; Zong et al. 2017; Chen et al. 2018; Wan et al. 2019). Operators are sequences within a promoter that serve as binding sites for transcriptional regulators, and there are some general rules regarding how they affect promoter leakiness. Operators for repressors may be placed in the distal region (upstream of -35), the core region (between -10 and -35), or the proximal region (downstream of -10) (Fig. 6a). If only a single operator for repressor exists in the promoter, maximal repression efficiency, and hence minimal



Fig. 6 (continued) a yellow fluorescent protein. **(b)** Transcriptional roadblocking effect. *gfp*, gene encoding a green fluorescent protein. **(c)** Antisense transcription as a tool to tune gene expression. Left panel: antisense promoter (P_{anti}) can reduce P_R 's leakiness by blocking entry of the ribosome to the reporter's mRNA (**c-i**), triggering mRNA degradation (**c-ii**), or blocking the reading of the RNA polymerase (RNAP) along the gene (**c-iii**). Right panel: The sensor's leakiness and output dynamics correlated with the strength of P_{anti} (Brophy and Voigt 2016). R, receptor. P_R , receptor's cognate promoter. **(d)** Modifications of ribosome binding sites (RBS) for a transcriptional activator (TA), a TR, or the reporter change the leakiness and output dynamics of a biosensor (Wang et al. 2011a; Nielsen et al. 2016; Rubens et al. 2016). P_{TA} , TA's cognate promoter. **(e)** Schematics of a post-translational regulation on an IPTG biosensor (Fernandez-Rodriguez and Voigt 2016). *L* represents a protein degradation tag LVA

leakiness, would be obtained when the operator is placed in the core region (Cox et al. 2007). Repression efficiency is further enhanced if the operator overlaps with part of the -10 or -35 regions (Chen et al. 2018).

Adding an extra operator downstream of a promoter can also reduce leakiness. Should the first operator fail to recruit the repressor, the repressor bound to the extra operator can still inhibit readthrough of the RNA polymerase (Fig. 6b). This effect is known as “roadblocking,” and its efficiency can be tuned by varying the distance between the extra operator and the core region (Hao et al. 2014; Merulla and van der Meer 2016). Though it should be noted that the roadblocking efficiency depends on the maximum strength of the sensing promoter, the repressor concentration and the affinity between the repressor and the operator, and so the effects on different operator-repressor pairs would likely be variable.

Unlike their repressor counterparts, operators for activators can only be functional when placed in the distal region (Cox et al. 2007).

Antisense Transcription

Antisense transcription refers to the strategy of inserting a second promoter downstream of the sensing promoter but in an opposite direction (Pelechano and Steinmetz 2013). The second promoter will drive transcription of an RNA that is partially or fully complementary to the RNA produced from the sensing promoter. Antisense transcription interrupts RNA polymerase reading from the first promoter (Fig. 6c-iii) (Brophy and Voigt 2016), thus reducing its basal expression level and leakiness. If the antisense promoter is located at the 3' end of the target gene, the antisense RNA will be long enough to form a double-stranded RNA with the target mRNA and then triggers its degradation (Fig. 6c-ii) (Lasa et al. 2011). The efficiency of this strategy can be tuned by regulating the strength of the antisense promoter (Fig. 6c) (Brophy and Voigt 2016), but the maximum output expression from the first promoter may also significantly decrease if the antisense promoter is too strong.

Antisense transcription may also exert translational interference: an anti-sense promoter that is positioned immediately downstream of the target promoter may lead to transcription of a short antisense RNA that inhibits translation initiation of the target gene (Fig. 6c-i) (Kawano et al. 2007).

Managing Leakiness on a Translational Level

The expression rate of any gene of interest can be superficially regarded as a product of its transcription rate and translation rate. Reducing the translation efficiency is therefore an indirect way to counteract transcription rates that are either too high or too low. This is most helpful in scenarios where transcription elements are fixed and cannot be readily replaced. For example, in a transcriptional cascade, the upstream and downstream promoters are defined. Yet the effective intracellular concentrations of the transcriptional regulators can be modulated by changing their translation rates. This would alter their input-output characteristics and in turn impact the final observable leakiness of the biosensor (Wang et al. 2011a; Nielsen et al. 2016). In a specific example, an active recombinase under the control of a leaky inducible promoter might switch on the downstream signal even in absence of a target. By

attenuating its translation initiation rate and hence its concentration, this undesirable effect could be mitigated (Rubens et al. 2016).

The most common way to tune translation is to modify the translation initiation rate, which is to a great extent governed by the sequence of the ribosome-binding site (RBS) that dictates its affinity towards the ribosome (Fig. 6d). RBS strengths can be described by a biophysical model and are generally predictable from the RNA sequences alone (Salis et al. 2009). A few RBS libraries with characterized translation initiation efficiencies are also available (<http://parts.igem.org>). However, translation rates of a protein have been shown to depend on myriad factors other than the RBS itself (Salis et al. 2009; Egbert and Klavins 2012; Kosuri et al. 2013; Mutalik et al. 2013; Wu et al. 2018). The recent work by Cambray et al. provided the most comprehensive understanding on how sequences other than the RBS affect translation efficiencies – RNA secondary structures in the vicinity of the start codon play a dominating role, while other factors, like codon usage, contribute to a much smaller extent (Cambray et al. 2018).

Managing Leakiness on a Post-translational Level

In some published biosensors, protein degradation tags were attached to the regulator or reporter proteins to promote their clearance from the cell and reduce their effective concentrations (Andersen et al. 1998; Arpino et al. 2013; Cameron and Collins 2014; Bradley et al. 2016b). However, this method comes with a trade-off with a reduction in maximum output level (Fig. 6e, gray line).

A solution that rescued the output level but maintained the lower level of leakiness has been recently developed (Fig. 6e) (Fernandez-Rodriguez and Voigt 2016; Wan et al. 2019). It achieved so by inserting a protease cleavage site between the reporter protein and the degradation tag, and the cognate protease is under the control of the sensing module. At lower target concentrations, a small amount of reporter was produced due to leaky expression, but they were quickly degraded due to the presence of the degradation tag. At high target concentrations, both the protease and the reporter would be strongly expressed, so the protease could cleave off the degradation tag from the latter, and the observable output could remain at a high level (Fig. 6e, orange dotted line). This protease-based regulation strategy is flexible and can be effortlessly applied to any leaky biosensors.

Functional Expansion of Biosensors by Synthetic Biology

Memory Devices

A biosensor with only sensing and actuating modules suffices to report the immediate bioavailability of a target. Yet when endowed with memory modules that allow record and retrieval of transient detection events, whole-cell biosensors become excellent platforms for continuous documentation of surroundings, because they are living organisms that can proliferate and colonize an environment with minimal maintenance from humans (Kotula et al. 2014). This could be useful in tracking a




Fig. 7 Diagrams of genetic circuits for memorizing environmental signals. (a) A toggle-switch-based memory device. Initially, the toggle switch is at an OFF state, where the TR2 is expressed and TR1 expression is repressed. Upon target detection, the sensing circuit expresses TR1, which flips the device into an ON state. TR1 and LacZ will be continuously expressed even after the target is removed (Kotula et al. 2014; Riglar et al. 2017). R, receptor. P_R , R's cognate promoter. TR, transcriptional repressor. P_{TR} , TR's cognate promoter. *lacZ*, gene encoding β -galactosidase for colorimetric output. (b) A recombinase-based memory device. Upon sensing a particular target, the biosensor produces the Cre recombinase, which first flips the orientation of the

delayed response in a difficult-to-reach environment, like those in clinical diagnostic settings (Courbet et al. 2015).

Memory devices can be broadly classified according to their reversibility and whether the memory is encoded in the DNA (i.e., genetic versus epigenetic). Synthetic biologists have created an overwhelming number of memory devices and they have been reviewed elsewhere (Inniss and Silver 2013; Roquet and Lu 2014; Bradley and Wang 2015). Given the scope of this chapter, only examples that have been successfully installed and demonstrated in biosensors will be covered.

Toggle Switches

The synthetic toggle switch can be considered as the earliest epigenetic and reversible memory device from synthetic biology (Kotula et al. 2014; Zhang et al. 2014; Certain et al. 2017; Riglar et al. 2017). It achieved bistability through two repressors that mutually inhibit each other (Fig. 7a) (Gardner et al. 2000). A transient induction that upregulates the expression of either one of the repressors (TR1) downregulates the expression of the other (TR2) and allows the latter to dominate, which results in a flip from one state to another. The state of the system will then be stably maintained until the now dominant repressor (TR1) is repressed again. Since only two states are allowed, the toggle-switch converts any graded input response into a digital output, and the readout for a target will no longer be titrated, but this might improve robustness in a sensor and aid decision-making processes (Roquet and Lu 2014).

The lambda phage *cI*/Cro genetic switch is a natural toggle switch which has high repression efficiency and modularity, but other strong repressors that display cooperative binding properties can also be used. Toggle switches have been widely used in whole-cell biosensors. For example, *E. coli* biosensors have been engineered to sense and record an antibiotic exposure or an inflammation in murine guts (Kotula et al. 2014; Riglar et al. 2017). Another toggle switch was part of a Pavlovian-like conditioning circuit in *E. coli*, where it could memorize a conditioned stimulus (Zhang et al. 2014).

Recombinase-Based Memory Devices

Site-specific recombinases are enzymes that perform genetic recombination on DNA flanked by specific recognition sites (aka recombination cassettes), resulting in either DNA excisions or inversions (Olorunniji et al. 2016). Biologically, recombinases



Fig. 7 (continued) *gfp* flanked by *loxP* sites, and then excises one of the two *loxP* sites through the *lox511* sites (Schnütgen et al. 2003). *P_C*, constitutive promoter. *gfp*, gene encoding a green fluorescent protein. (c) An integrase-based memory device switches the sensor's output from *gfp* expression to *rfp* expression. The integrase and excisionase together restore the *gfp* expression (Bonnet et al. 2012). *rfp*, gene encoding a red fluorescent protein. (d) A CRISPR-based “biological tape recorder” system. The signals are recorded into the genomic CRISPR array (Sheth et al. 2017). When there is no signal, only the reference DNA will be recorded; when there are signals, the trigger DNA will be rapidly replicated and preferentially recorded into the CRISPR array. (e) The CAMERA recording system (Tang and Liu 2018) has two possible mechanisms: *i*, it uses Cas9 nucleases to record signals by shifting the ratio of two recording plasmids; *ii*, it uses Cas9-derived base editors to change DNA sequences upon sensing a signal

belong to either the tyrosine or serine recombinase classes and can be further classified by their directionality and their permitted mode of actions (Wang et al. 2011b). For recombinases that can perform both excision and inversion, the mode of recombination depends on the relative orientations of the recombination sites: excision happens between aligned recombination sites and for inversion, anti-aligned sites (Fig. 7b). Both allow implementations of memory provided that the DNA within the recombination cassette is a functional biological part.

A simple memory device using DNA excision can be built by inserting a recombination sites-flanked terminator between a constitutive promoter and a translational unit, which interrupts gene expression until its removal (Bonnet et al. 2013). In the case of inversion, the genetic part within the cassette would be purposefully inserted in a nonfunctional orientation, only to be restored when the recombinase is active. In both cases, the DNA is transformed from one sustained state into another, thereby conferring memory. Since the flanked DNA can only exist in either one of the two states, all recombinase-based memory devices are analog to digital converters. Their genetic nature also implies that the memory is heritable and would last even if the host cell is dead (Siuti et al. 2013).

Many early synthetic memory devices were based on inversions using bidirectional recombinases like the Cre/lox and FLP/FRT systems. They tended to stochastically re-catalyze an inverted DNA back into the original orientation and create a mixed population of cells in either ON or OFF states, which posed an issue to robustness in memory (Schnütgen et al. 2003; Brophy and Voigt 2014). Workarounds to this issue include using mutated recombination sites that drive inversion equilibrium towards the product (Albert et al. 1995; Oberdoerffer 2003) or configurations that would lead to the disappearance of some recombination sites in the end state (Fig. 7b) (Schnütgen et al. 2003). The same mixed population issue also applies to unidirectional recombinases when their expression is at intermediate levels, but the problem could be alleviated through the use of feedback loops (Moon et al. 2011; Brophy and Voigt 2014; Folliard et al. 2017).

Memory devices engineered from recombinase-recombination cassettes with unidirectionality provide irreversible memories – a temporal exposure to the target will flip the system into an irrevocable state (Siuti et al. 2013). To date, a large number of orthogonal unidirectional recombinases have been identified, and they allow different inputs to be remembered within the same cell (Yang et al. 2014). They were demonstrated to record conditions in gastrointestinal tracts, as well as pathogens in human serum and urine samples (Archer et al. 2012; Courbet et al. 2015; Mimee et al. 2015). The sequence of detection events can also be recorded in a state machine, which assigns a unique state to every possible sequence order by coordinating multiple unidirectional recombinases (Roquet et al. 2016).

Biosensors built with irreversible memories would be single-use commodities. In contrast, reusable and rewritable memory devices can be constructed from recombinase-excisionase pairs with conditional bidirectionality (Fig. 7c) (Bonnet et al. 2012; Bonnet et al. 2013). The mechanism is illustrated using the integrase Bxb1 gp35 and its cognate excisionase Bxb1 gp47. The integrase alone will drive inversion towards one direction, but the direction is reversed in the presence of the excisionase.

CRISPR/Cas-Based Memory Devices

CRISPR (Clustered Regularly Interspaced Short Palindromic Repeats) and CRISPR-associated (Cas) systems are bacterial immunity systems against phage infections. Their molecular mechanisms have been intensely studied and frequently reviewed elsewhere and so will not be covered in this section (Shalem et al. 2015; Jiang and Doudna 2017). CRISPR/Cas systems have innate memory functions to remember previously invaded viruses. They capture exogenous DNA from plasmids or phages and integrate them into the genomic CRISPR arrays as spacer sequences. This adaptation process has been repurposed to yield a synthetic memory device, known as the “biological tape recorder” (Fig. 7d) (Sheth et al. 2017). A new spacer is incorporated into the array upon induction by a specific target, and multiple events over time can be recorded.

The popularity of the CRISPR/Cas system, nonetheless, remains in its versatility in performing precise DNA cutting and editing. These properties have been also harnessed in a memory device named CAMERA (CRISPR-mediated analog multi-event recording apparatus) (Fig. 7e) (Tang and Liu 2018). The system memorizes signals by one of the two ways: (1) An incoming signal modulates the activity of a DNA cleavage enzyme, which selectively cuts one of the two recording plasmids and thus alters the ratio between the two. (2) The signal instructs Cas9-derived base editors to modify designated DNA sequences. In both examples, the recorded information can be retrieved by sequencing the barcoded DNA sequences or by coupling the resulting change to an observable output.

Other Notable Memory Devices

The three types of memory devices described above were so far the most popular ones. Nonetheless, there are two other noteworthy examples that were also demonstrated in biosensors: (1) In a device named SCRIBE (Synthetic Cellular Recorders Integrating Biological Events), detection events lead to productions of hybrid RNA-ssDNA molecules that will undergo genetic recombination with the bacterial genome, modifying sequences on the latter (Farzadfard and Lu 2014). The strength of sensing correlates with the frequency of recombination and is therefore reflected on a population level, specifically, the proportion of cells that carries the modification. (2) An epigenetic and reversible memory device was constructed by DNA methylase and DNA-binding proteins (DBP) that are sensitive to DNA methylation. Target detection therefore triggers DNA methylation and precludes binding of the DBP, and memory reset is carried out via degradation of the methylase (Maier et al. 2017).

Computation Modules to Integrate Signals

Most biosensors were built to detect a single input, but by receiving and processing multiple inputs, they can be used to sense a complex condition or a global environment (Fig. 8) (Wang et al. 2013). Synthetic biology has offered numerous examples




Fig. 8 Detecting an environmental condition using multi-input AND gate and cell-cell communication. A three-input AND logic gate based on two HrpRS-based AND gates are separated into two different cell strains of a consortium (Wang et al. 2013). *luxI*, synthase of a quorum sensing molecule 3OC₆HSL. *rfp*, gene encoding a red fluorescent protein

on biocomputation and interested readers are advised to consult references cited here (Wang et al. 2011a; Moon et al. 2012; Wang and Buck 2014; Ma et al. 2016; Nielsen et al. 2016; Roquet et al. 2016; Rubens et al. 2016; Xiang et al. 2018).

Signal integration is of great interest in clinical diagnosis and biotherapy, where multiple signals define a specific disease state and determine if drugs should be administered. To date, no genetic circuits have been developed in prokaryotic biosensors to target multiple clinical biomarkers, but similar ideas have been proposed and tested. For example, a hypothetical *E. coli* that would invade tumor cells would only work when two conditions are satisfied: (1) it reaches a quorum due to colonization and (2) detects a hypoxic environment that is typically found in tumors (Anderson et al. 2006). The two conditions would thus require integration through an AND gate.

Modules to Reshape Response Function

Other forms of signal processing can remodel the conventional sigmoidal response curve to facilitate biosensor readout. By connecting a sensing module to an incoherent feedforward loop, a biosensor can behave as a bandpass filter and only responds to a limited range of analyte concentrations (Peking iGEM 2013; Rubens et al. 2016). In another example, a coherent feedforward loop successfully transformed the response curve into a semilog sensing curve (Zhang et al. 2013). These changes in response functions could be helpful when the output sensing modules are wired to specific actuators that are not very responsive to sigmoidal inputs.

Reporter Modules for Interfacing with Different Detection Platforms

Many biosensors were first developed using fluorescent reporters as the actuator, which facilitate their characterization in laboratory settings. Yet employing these biosensors in the field would be inconvenient since it must be accompanied with a fluorescent reader. The synthetic biology community has developed a diverse collection of reporters or actuators. They are standardized and so can easily substitute the fluorescent reporters. This allows the output signals to be observed through other means. For example, some reporter modules can convert detection events into electrical currents measurable by electrodes (Webster et al. 2014).

Typically, colorimetric reporters are often used to allow direct observations of sensor output by naked eyes. They include chromoproteins, some fluorescent proteins, and enzymes that produce pigments or catalyze chromogenic substrates (Biran et al. 2003; Stocker et al. 2003; Fujimoto et al. 2006; Wackwitz et al. 2008; Joshi et al. 2009; De Mora et al. 2011; Joe et al. 2012; Shin 2012; Kotula et al. 2014; Pardee et al. 2014; Courbet et al. 2015; Danino et al. 2015; Huang et al. 2015a; Pardee et al. 2016a; Didovyk et al. 2017; Watstein and Styczynski 2018). This could drive down the operating costs of a biosensor because it obviates additional readout machines.

Yet, there are also a few other interesting reporters that enable biosensors to operate *in vivo*: acoustic reporter genes were used to encode intracellular gas vesicles in *E. coli* (Bourdeau et al. 2018). These vesicles can scatter ultrasound waves that noninvasively penetrate living tissues and therefore lead to imaging contrast. Another example employs a luciferase reporter: *E. coli* entrapped in an ingestible micro-bio-electronic device (IMBED) can detect analytes that diffuse into their residing chemostat chamber. The cells then respond by emitting light which can be converted into digital signals through photodetectors. The signal can then be further relayed to computers via Wi-Fi (Mimee et al. 2018).

Biosafety Enhancing Modules

As explained in the introduction, biosafety remains the bottleneck for field applications of prokaryotic whole-cell biosensors, and a large volume of work in synthetic biology was dedicated to this issue. Some representative work has been selected to illustrate various strategies in managing the biocontamination risks.

“GeneGuard” was a stable and modular system for biosafety control in *E. coli* (Wright et al. 2015). Three safety modules were inserted into the genome: (1) A rich-media compatible auxotrophy selection marker ensures that the host cell would not survive if it leaves an industrial closed system. (2) Host-dependent origins of replication, as well as (3) toxin-antitoxin pairs prevent propagation of episomes that could have accidentally transferred to other organisms.

The host cells can also be programmed to commit suicide after a certain retention time in the environment. This could be achieved by putting genes encoding toxic products under the control of a synthetic timer (Ellis et al. 2009) or counting circuits (Friedland et al. 2009; Callura et al. 2010).

Another method is to erect a “linguistic barrier” between the host cell and other prokaryotes in nature (Pinheiro et al. 2012; Wright et al. 2013). The genes that are expressed in the host cells are refactored, so they cannot be transcribed or translated in other prokaryotes in the wild.

Conclusions and Future Directions

Prokaryotic whole-cell biosensors are suitable for a broad range of applications and are promising alternatives to other types of sensors. With the support of synthetic biology, the development and optimization of novel whole-cell biosensors has been vastly accelerated. Engineering principles facilitate biosensors to be constructed from a bottom-up approach and provide means to engineer new sensing modules on top of the myriad available options. Through the lens of rational design, researchers could pinpoint biological properties that limit selectivity, LOD, dynamic range, and leakiness and apply strategies that precisely tackle each issue and improve the overall sensing behavior of a biosensor. Finally, various parts and devices from the synthetic biology community augment functions of biosensors in memory and signal processing capacities, and make them easier and safer to be used in field applications. More tools and design principles that give rise to robust and reliable sensors will likely be discovered in the future, and they will further encourage whole-cell biosensors to be applied in real life scenarios.

Synthetic biology alone, however, cannot solve all the problems present in whole-cell biosensors. At the current stage, despite the fact that many prokaryotic biosensors had impeccable performance in the laboratory, only a few could be commercialized. There are three underlying reasons. First, the actual working environments for the biosensors are far more complicated than their laboratory counterparts, so requirements on LOD, selectivity, and robustness are more demanding. The major solution is to subject the biosensor to multiple rounds of rigorous tests using real environmental or clinical samples and progressively optimize their response behavior through genetic manipulation. Approaches described in this chapter should aid this process, but sample preprocessing steps like target purification or concentration might be helpful complementary methods to decrease biosensor LOD (Wen et al. 2017).

There is also a dearth of durable, inexpensive, and user-friendly platforms for whole-cell biosensor storage and multiplexed sample testing. Some options are available, but they do not keep the cells alive over long periods of time. Hydrogels, which include alginate beads, agarose, and silica gels, can entrap prokaryotic cells and keep them hydrated and functional for around a month (Chang and Prakash 2001; Nassif et al. 2002; Papi et al. 2005; Sharma et al. 2010; Buffi et al. 2011; Power et al. 2011; Shin 2012; Courbet et al. 2015; Belkin et al. 2017; Wan et al. 2019). Better entrapping materials and storage conditions are needed for prolonging the shelf life of biosensors. An alternative is to find a different chassis that is indifferent to harsh environments. In this sense, the Gram-positive bacteria *B. subtilis* are recently gaining ground. They can give physically and chemically

resistant endospores that can be stored dry in a wide range of temperatures for years but can still return to a vegetative state when nourished with water and nutrients (Joshi et al. 2009; Volpetti et al. 2017). Cheap microfluidic devices have also been developed as platforms for biosensor applications, yet they remain inconvenient for multiplexed sample processing and on-site diagnosis (Buffi et al. 2011; Kim et al. 2016; Volpetti et al. 2017; Wan et al. 2019).

Lastly, as long as they are still alive, whole-cell prokaryotic biosensors will carry the stigma of being potentially biohazardous when they exit laboratories. Biosafety concerns like ecosystem disruption and antibiotic resistant gene transfer will need to be addressed (Dana et al. 2012). Adequate intrinsic containment systems (biosafety circuits reviewed in section “**Biosafety Enhancing Modules**”) and physical containment systems like bioreactive nanofibers (Tong et al. 2014) and the aforementioned hydrogel/microfluidic device encapsulation will need to be in place for whole-cell biosensors to be safely deployed in the field.

In recent years, cell-free systems have been proposed as a solution to circumvent the biosafety issues associated with whole-cell biosensing. A cell-free system consists of cell extracts or purified transcription/translation machineries mixed with energy supplements and amino acids (Perez et al. 2016). It is cheap and easy to produce (Kwon and Jewett 2015; Didovyk et al. 2017). A number of biosensors using cell-free extracts have already been shown to be capable of detecting heavy metals, pathogens, antibiotics, and viral RNA (Pellinen et al. 2004; Pardee et al. 2014, 2016a; Didovyk et al. 2017; Duyen et al. 2017; Wen et al. 2017; Ma et al. 2018). Furthermore, they could be freeze-dried on cellulose paper, which increases their stability and portability (Pardee et al. 2014 2016b). Theoretically, any whole-cell biosensors can be converted into this paper-based cell-free system and become point-of-care diagnostic devices. Still, there will always be unbridgeable differences between an *in vivo* intracellular environment and a cell extract, which may cause unpredictable behavior during biosensor circuit migration. Therefore, until the moment that all circuits can be transferred systematically and flawlessly across the two platforms, whole-cell prokaryotic biosensors will remain a major player in the field of biosensors.

Acknowledgments This work was supported by funds from UK BBSRC [BB/N007212/1], Leverhulme Trust [RPG-2015-445], Wellcome Trust [202078/Z/16/Z], EPSRC/BBSRC Global Challenges Research Fund Awards and Wellcome Trust Institutional Strategic Support Fund Award to BW, China Scholarship Council and the Scottish Universities Life Sciences Alliance to XW, and Darwin Trust PhD Scholarships to TYHH.

References

- Abil Z, Ellefson JW, Gollihar JD, Watkins E, Ellington AD (2017) Compartmentalized partnered replication for the directed evolution of genetic parts and circuits. *Nat Protoc* 12:2493–2512. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nprot.2017.119>

- Adams BL, Carter KK, Guo M, Wu HC, Tsao CY, Sintim HO, Valdes JJ, Bentley WE (2014) Evolved quorum sensing regulator, LsrR, for altered switching functions. *ACS Synth Biol* 3:210–219. <https://doi.org/10.1021/sb400068z>
- Albert H, Dale EC, Lee E, Ow DW (1995) Site-specific integration of DNA into wild-type and mutant lox sites placed in the plant genome. *Plant J* 7:649–659. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-313X.1995.7040649.x>
- Altenbuchner J, Mattes R (2005) *Escherichia coli*. In: Production of recombinant proteins: novel microbial and eukaryotic expression systems. Wiley-VCH-Verl, Weinheim, pp 7–49
- Amaro F, Turkewitz AP, Martín-González A, Gutiérrez JC (2011) Whole-cell biosensors for detection of heavy metal ions in environmental samples based on metallothionein promoters from *Tetrahymena thermophila*. *Microb Biotechnol* 4:513–522. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1751-7915.2011.00252.x>
- Andersen JB, Sternberg C, Poulsen LK, Bjørn SP, Givskov M, Molin S (1998) New unstable variants of green fluorescent protein for studies of transient gene expression in bacteria. *Appl Environ Microbiol* 64:2240–2246
- Anderson JC, Clarke EJ, Arkin AP, Voigt CA (2006) Environmentally controlled invasion of cancer cells by engineered bacteria. *J Mol Biol* 355:619–627. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmb.2005.10.076>
- Anderson JC, Voigt CA, Arkin AP (2007) Environmental signal integration by a modular and gate. *Mol Syst Biol* 3:133. <https://doi.org/10.1038/msb4100173>
- Andres J, Bertin PN (2016) The microbial genomics of arsenic. *FEMS Microbiol Rev* 40:299–322. <https://doi.org/10.1093/femsre/fuv050>
- Ang J, Harris E, Hussey BJ, Kil R, McMillen DR (2013) Tuning response curves for synthetic biology. *ACS Synth Biol* 2:547–567. <https://doi.org/10.1021/sb4000564>
- Archer EJ, Robinson AB, Süel GM (2012) Engineered *E. coli* that detect and respond to gut inflammation through nitric oxide sensing. *ACS Synth Biol* 1:451–457. <https://doi.org/10.1021/sb3000595>
- Arpino JAJ, Hancock EJ, Anderson J, Barahona M, Stan GBV, Papachristodoulou A, Polizzi K (2013) Tuning the dials of synthetic biology. *Microbiol (United Kingdom)* 159:1236–1253. <https://doi.org/10.1099/mic.0.067975-0>
- Barkay T, Miller SM, Summers AO (2003) Bacterial mercury resistance from atoms to ecosystems. *FEMS Microbiol Rev* 27:355–384. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0168-6445\(03\)00046-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0168-6445(03)00046-9)
- Bashor CJ, Collins JJ (2018) Understanding biological regulation through synthetic biology. *Annu Rev Biophys* 47:399–423. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-biophys-070816-033903>
- Belkin S, Yagur-Kroll S, Kabessa Y, Korouma V, Septon T, Anati Y, Zohar-Perez C, Rabinovitz Z, Nussinovitch A, Agranat AJ (2017) Remote detection of buried landmines using a bacterial sensor. *Nat Biotechnol* 35:308–310. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nbt.3791>
- Bernard E, Wang B (2017) Synthetic cell-based sensors with programmed selectivity and sensitivity. In: Methods in molecular biology, pp 349–363
- Biran I, Rissin DM, Ron EZ, Walt DR (2003) Optical imaging fiber-based live bacterial cell array biosensor. *Anal Biochem* 315:106–113. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0003-2697\(02\)00700-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0003-2697(02)00700-5)
- Bonnet J, Subsoontorn P, Endy D (2012) Rewritable digital data storage in live cells via engineered control of recombination directionality. *Proc Natl Acad Sci* 109:8884–8889. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1202344109>
- Bonnet J, Yin P, Ortiz ME, Subsoontorn P, Endy D (2013) Amplifying genetic logic gates. *Science* 340:599–603. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1232758>
- Bourdeau RW, Lee-Gosselin A, Lakshmanan A, Farhadi A, Kumar SR, Nety SP, Shapiro MG (2018) Acoustic reporter genes for noninvasive imaging of microorganisms in mammalian hosts. *Nature* 553:86–90. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature25021>
- Bradley RW, Wang B (2015) Designer cell signal processing circuits for biotechnology. *New Biotechnol* 32:635–643. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nbt.2014.12.009>

- Bradley RW, Buck M, Wang B (2016a) Recognizing and engineering digital-like logic gates and switches in gene regulatory networks. *Curr Opin Microbiol* 33:74–82. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mib.2016.07.004>
- Bradley RW, Buck M, Wang B (2016b) Tools and principles for microbial gene circuit engineering. *J Mol Biol* 428:862–888. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmb.2015.10.004>
- Brewster RC, Jones DL, Phillips R (2012) Tuning promoter strength through RNA polymerase binding site design in *Escherichia coli*. *PLoS Comput Biol* 8:e1002811. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pcbi.1002811>
- Brophy JAN, Voigt CA (2014) Principles of genetic circuit design. *Nat Methods* 11:508–520. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nmeth.2926>
- Brophy JAN, Voigt CA (2016) Antisense transcription as a tool to tune gene expression. *Mol Syst Biol* 12:854–854. <https://doi.org/10.15252/msb.20156540>
- Buffi N, Merulla D, Beutier J, Barbaud F, Beggah S, Van Lintel H, Renaud P, Roelof van der Meer J (2011) Development of a microfluidics biosensor for agarose-bead immobilized *Escherichia coli* bioreporter cells for arsenite detection in aqueous samples. *Lab Chip* 11:2369–2377. <https://doi.org/10.1039/c1lc20274j>
- Bulich AA, Isenberg DL (1981) Use of the luminescent bacterial system for the rapid assessment of aquatic toxicity. *ISA Trans* 20:29–33
- Callura JM, Dwyer DJ, Isaacs FJ, Cantor CR, Collins JJ (2010) Physiology using synthetic riboregulators. *Proc Natl Acad Sci* 107:15898–15903. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1009747107>
- Cambray G, Guimaraes JC, Arkin AP (2018) Evaluation of 244,000 synthetic sequences reveals design principles to optimize translation in *Escherichia coli*. *Nat Biotechnol* 36:1005. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nbt.4238>
- Cameron DE, Collins JJ (2014) Tunable protein degradation in bacteria. *Nat Biotechnol* 32:1–8. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nbt.3053>
- Cayron J, Prudent E, Escoffier C, Gueguen E, Mandrand-Berthelot MA, Pignol D, Garcia D, Rodrigue A (2017) Pushing the limits of nickel detection to nanomolar range using a set of engineered bioluminescent *Escherichia coli*. *Environ Sci Pollut Res* 24:4–14. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-015-5580-6>
- Cerminati S, Soncini FC, Checa SK (2011) Selective detection of gold using genetically engineered bacterial reporters. *Biotechnol Bioeng* 108:2553–2560. <https://doi.org/10.1002/bit.23213>
- Certain LK, Way JC, Pezone MJ, Collins JJ (2017) Using engineered bacteria to characterize infection dynamics and antibiotic effects in vivo. *Cell Host Microbe* 22:263–268.e4. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chom.2017.08.001>
- Cervantes C, Ji G, Ramirez J, Silver S (1994) Resistance to arsenic compounds in microorganisms. *FEMS Microbiol Rev* 15:355–367. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1574-6976.1994.tb00145.x>
- Chang TMS, Prakash S (2001) Procedures for microencapsulation of enzymes, cells and genetically engineered microorganisms. *Mol Biotechnol* 17:249–260. <https://doi.org/10.1385/MB:17:3:249>
- Chang HJ, Mayonove P, Zavala A, De Visch A, Minard P, Cohen-Gonsaud M, Bonnet J (2018) A modular receptor platform to expand the sensing repertoire of bacteria. *ACS Synth Biol* 7:166–175. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acssynbio.7b00266>
- Chen J, Rosen BP (2014) Biosensors for inorganic and organic arsenicals. *Biosensors* 4:494–512. <https://doi.org/10.3390/bios4040494>
- Chen Y, Ho JML, Shis DL, Gupta C, Long J, Wagner DS, Ott W, Josić K, Bennett MR (2018) Tuning the dynamic range of bacterial promoters regulated by ligand-inducible transcription factors. *Nat Commun* 9:64. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-017-02473-5>
- Cheng AA, Lu TK (2012) Synthetic biology: an emerging engineering discipline. *Annu Rev Biomed Eng* 14:155–178. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-bioeng-071811-150118>
- Courbet A, Endy D, Renard E, Molina F, Bonnet J (2015) Detection of pathological biomarkers in human clinical samples via amplifying genetic switches and logic gates. *Sci Transl Med* 7:289ra83. <https://doi.org/10.1126/scitranslmed.aaa3601>
- Cox RS, Surette MG, Elowitz MB (2007) Programming gene expression with combinatorial promoters. *Mol Syst Biol* 3:145. <https://doi.org/10.1038/msb4100187>

- Daeffler KN, Galley JD, Sheth RU, Ortiz-Velez LC, Bibb CO, Shroyer NF, Britton RA, Tabor JJ (2017) Engineering bacterial thiosulfate and tetrathionate sensors for detecting gut inflammation. *Mol Syst Biol* 13:923. <https://doi.org/10.15252/msb.20167416>
- Dana GV, Kuiken T, Rejeski D, Snow AA (2012) Synthetic biology: four steps to avoid a synthetic-biology disaster. *Nature* 483:29–29. <https://doi.org/10.1038/483029a>
- Daniel R, Rubens JR, Sarpeshkar R, Lu TK (2013) Synthetic analog computation in living cells. *Nature* 497:619–623. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature12148>
- Danino T, Prindle A, Kwong GA, Skalak M, Li H, Allen K, Hasty J, Bhatia SN (2015) Programmable probiotics for non-invasive urinary detection of cancer. *Sci Transl Med* 7:1–36. <https://doi.org/10.1126/scitranslmed.aaa3519>
- Daunert S, Barrett G, Feliciano JS, Shetty RS, Shrestha S, Smith-Spencer W (2000) Genetically engineered whole-cell sensing systems: coupling biological recognition with reporter genes. *Chem Rev* 100:2705–2738. <https://doi.org/10.1021/cr990115p>
- De Mora K, Joshi N, Balint BL, Ward FB, Elfick A, French CE (2011) A pH-based biosensor for detection of arsenic in drinking water. *Anal Bioanal Chem* 400:1031–1039. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00216-011-4815-8>
- Didovyk A, Tonooka T, Tsimring L, Hasty J (2017) Rapid and scalable preparation of bacterial lysates for cell-free gene expression. *ACS Synth Biol* 6:2198–2208. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acssynbio.7b00253>
- Duan F, March JC (2010) Engineered bacterial communication prevents *Vibrio cholerae* virulence in an infant mouse model. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 107:11260–11264. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1001294107>
- Duyen TTM, Matsuura H, Ujii K, Muraoka M, Harada K, Hirata K (2017) Paper-based colorimetric biosensor for antibiotics inhibiting bacterial protein synthesis. *J Biosci Bioeng* 123:96–100. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbiosc.2016.07.015>
- Egbert RG, Klavins E (2012) Fine-tuning gene networks using simple sequence repeats. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 109:16817–16822. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1205693109>
- Ellefson JW, Ledbetter MP, Ellington AD (2018) Directed evolution of a synthetic phylogeny of programmable Trp repressors article. *Nat Chem Biol* 14:361–367. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41589-018-0006-7>
- Ellis T, Wang X, Collins JJ (2009) Diversity-based, model-guided construction of synthetic gene networks with predicted functions. *Nat Biotechnol* 27:465–471. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nbt.1536.DIVERSITY-BASED>
- Endy D (2005) Foundations for engineering biology. *Nature* 438:449–453. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature04342>
- Esvelt KM, Carlson JC, Liu DR (2011) A system for the continuous directed evolution of biomolecules. *Nature* 472:499–503. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature09929>
- Farzadfard F, Lu TK (2014) Genomically encoded analog memory with precise in vivo dna writing in living cell populations. *Science* 346:1256272–1256272. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1256272>
- Fernandez-Rodriguez J, Voigt CA (2016) Post-translational control of genetic circuits using Potyvirus proteases. *Nucleic Acids Res* 44:6493–6502. <https://doi.org/10.1093/nar/gkw537>
- Fernandez-Rodriguez J, Moser F, Song M, Voigt CA (2017) Engineering RGB color vision into *Escherichia coli*. *Nat Chem Biol* 13:706–708. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nchembio.2390>
- Folliard T, Steel H, Prescott TP, Wadhams G, Rothschild LJ, Papachristodoulou A (2017) A synthetic recombinase-based feedback loop results in robust expression. *ACS Synth Biol* 6:1663–1671. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acssynbio.7b00131>
- Friedland AE, Lu TK, Wang X, Shi D, Church G, Collins JJ (2009) Synthetic gene networks that count. *Science* 324:1199–1202. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1172005>
- Fritz G, Megerle JA, Westermayer SA, Brick D, Heermann R, Jung K, Rädler JO, Gerland U (2014) Single cell kinetics of phenotypic switching in the arabinose utilization system of *E. coli*. *PLoS One* 9:e89532. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0089532>

- Fujimoto H, Wakabayashi M, Yamashiro H, Maeda I, Isoda K, Kondoh M, Kawase M, Miyasaka H, Yagi K (2006) Whole-cell arsenite biosensor using photosynthetic bacterium *Rhodovulum sulfidophilum*: *Rhodovulum sulfidophilum* as an arsenite biosensor. *Appl Microbiol Biotechnol* 73:332–338. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00253-006-0483-6>
- Gardner TS, Cantor CR, Collins JJ (2000) Construction of a genetic toggle switch in *Escherichia coli*. *Nature* 403:339–342. <https://doi.org/10.1038/35002131>
- Gui Q, Lawson T, Shan S, Yan L, Liu Y (2017) The application of whole cell-based biosensors for use in environmental analysis and in medical diagnostics. *Sensors* 17:1623. <https://doi.org/10.3390/s17071623>
- Gupta S, Bram EE, Weiss R (2013) Genetically programmable pathogen sense and destroy. *ACS Synth Biol* 2:715–723. <https://doi.org/10.1021/sb4000417>
- Guzina J, Djordjevic M (2017) Mix-and-matching as a promoter recognition mechanism by ECF σ factors. *BMC Evol Biol* 17:1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12862-016-0865-z>
- Hakkila KM, Nikander PA, Junttila SM, Lamminmäki UJ, Virta MP (2011) Cd-specific mutants of mercury-sensing regulatory protein MerR, generated by directed evolution. *Appl Environ Microbiol* 77:6215–6224. <https://doi.org/10.1128/AEM.00662-11>
- Hao N, Krishna S, Ahlgren-Berg A, Cutts EE, Shearwin KE, Dodd IB (2014) Road rules for traffic on DNA – systematic analysis of transcriptional roadblocking in vivo. *Nucleic Acids Res* 42:8861–8872. <https://doi.org/10.1093/nar/gku627>
- Ho CL, Tan HQ, Chua KJ, Kang A, Lim KH, Ling KL, Yew WS, Thiery JP, Chang MW (2018) Engineered commensal microbes for diet-mediated colorectal-cancer chemoprevention. *Nat Biomed Eng* 2:27–37. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41551-017-0181-y>
- Holliger P, Hudson PJ (2005) Engineered antibody fragments and the rise of single domains. *Nat Biotechnol* 23:1126–1136. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nbt1142>
- Hooshangi S, Thiberge S, Weiss R (2005) Ultrasensitivity and noise propagation in a synthetic transcriptional cascade. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 102:3581–3586. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0408507102>
- Huang CW, Wei CC, Liao VHC (2015a) A low cost color-based bacterial biosensor for measuring arsenic in groundwater. *Chemosphere* 141:44–49. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chemosphere.2015.06.011>
- Huang CW, Yang SH, Sun MW, Liao VHC (2015b) Development of a set of bacterial biosensors for simultaneously detecting arsenic and mercury in groundwater. *Environ Sci Pollut Res* 22:10206–10213. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-015-4216-1>
- Hwang IY, Tan MH, Koh E, Ho CL, Poh CL, Chang MW (2014) Reprogramming microbes to be pathogen-seeking killers. *ACS Synth Biol* 3:228–237. <https://doi.org/10.1021/sb400077j>
- Hwang IY, Koh E, Kim HR, Yew WS, Chang MW (2016) Reprogrammable microbial cell-based therapeutics against antibiotic-resistant bacteria. *Drug Resist Updat* 27:59–71. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.drug.2016.06.002>
- Hynninen A, Tönismann K, Virta M (2010) Improving the sensitivity of bacterial bioreporters for heavy metals. *Bioeng Bugs* 1:132–138. <https://doi.org/10.4161/bbug.1.2.10902>
- Inniss MC, Silver PA (2013) Building synthetic memory. *Curr Biol* 23:R812–R816. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2013.06.047>
- Jiang F, Doudna JA (2017) CRISPR–Cas9 structures and mechanisms. *Annu Rev Biophys* 46:505–529. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-biophys-062215-010822>
- Joe MH, Lee KH, Lim SY, Im SH, Song HP, Lee IS, Kim DH (2012) Pigment-based whole-cell biosensor system for cadmium detection using genetically engineered *Deinococcus radiodurans*. *Bioprocess Biosyst Eng* 35:265–272. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00449-011-0610-3>
- Johns NI, Gomes ALC, Yim SS, Yang A, Blazejewski T, Smillie CS, Smith MB, Alm EJ, Kosuri S, Wang HH (2018) Metagenomic mining of regulatory elements enables programmable species-selective gene expression. *Nat Methods* 15:323–329. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nmeth.4633>
- Joshi N, Wang X, Montgomery L, Elfick A, French CE (2009) Novel approaches to biosensors for detection of arsenic in drinking water. *Desalination* 248:517–523. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.desal.2008.05.096>

- Jovanovic M, James EH, Burrows PC, Rego FGM, Buck M, Schumacher J (2011) Regulation of the co-evolved HrpR and HrpS AAA+ proteins required for *Pseudomonas syringae* pathogenicity. *Nat Commun* 2:177. <https://doi.org/10.1038/ncomms1177>
- Karig D, Weiss R (2005) Signal-amplifying genetic circuit enables in vivo observation of weak promoter activation in the Rhl quorum sensing system. *Biotechnol Bioeng* 89:709–718. <https://doi.org/10.1002/bit.20371>
- Kawano M, Aravind L, Storz G (2007) An antisense RNA controls synthesis of an SOS-induced toxin evolved from an antitoxin. *Mol Microbiol* 64:738–754. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2958.2007.05688.x>
- Kim HJ, Lim JW, Jeong H, Lee SJ, Lee DW, Kim T, Lee SJ (2016) Development of a highly specific and sensitive cadmium and lead microbial biosensor using synthetic CadC-T7 genetic circuitry. *Biosens Bioelectron* 79:701–708. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bios.2015.12.101>
- Kim HJ, Jeong H, Lee SJ (2018) Synthetic biology for microbial heavy metal biosensors. *Anal Bioanal Chem* 410:1191–1203. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00216-017-0751-6>
- King JMH, DiGrazia PM, Applegate B, Burlage R, Sanseverino J, Dunbar P, Larimer F, Sayler GS (1990) Rapid, sensitive bioluminescent reporter technology for naphthalene exposure and biodegradation. *Science* 249:778–781. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.249.4970.778>
- Kosuri S, Goodman DB, Cambray G, Mutalik VK, Gao Y, Arkin AP, Endy D, Church GM (2013) Composability of regulatory sequences controlling transcription and translation in *Escherichia coli*. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 110:14024–14029. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1301301110>
- Kotula JW, Kerns SJ, Shakel LA, Siraj L, Collins JJ, Way JC, Silver PA (2014) Programmable bacteria detect and record an environmental signal in the mammalian gut. *Proc Natl Acad Sci* 111:4838–4843. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1321321111>
- Kwon YC, Jewett MC (2015) High-throughput preparation methods of crude extract for robust cell-free protein synthesis. *Sci Rep* 5:1–8. <https://doi.org/10.1038/srep08663>
- Lasa I, Toledo-Arana A, Dobin A, Villanueva M, de los Mozos IR, Vergara-Irigaray M, Segura V, Fagegaltier D, Penades JR, Valle J, Solano C, Gingeras TR (2011) Genome-wide antisense transcription drives mRNA processing in bacteria. *Proc Natl Acad Sci* 108:20172–20177. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1113521108>
- Li L, Liang J, Hong W, Zhao Y, Sun S, Yang X, Xu A, Hang H, Wu L, Chen S (2015) Evolved bacterial biosensor for arsenite detection in environmental water. *Environ Sci Technol* 49:6149–6155. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.5b00832>
- Liu Q, Schumacher J, Wan X, Lou C, Wang B (2018) Orthogonality and burdens of heterologous and gate gene circuits in *E. coli*. *ACS Synth Biol* 7:553–564. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acssynbio.7b00328>
- Ma KC, Perli SD, Lu TK (2016) Foundations and emerging paradigms for computing in living cells. *J Mol Biol* 428:893–915. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmb.2016.02.018>
- Ma D, Shen L, Wu K, Diehnelt CW, Green AA (2018) Low-cost detection of norovirus using paper-based cell-free systems and synbody-based viral enrichment. *Synth Biol* 3:ysy018. <https://doi.org/10.1093/synbio/ysy018/5102817>
- Mahr R, Frunzke J (2016) Transcription factor-based biosensors in biotechnology: current state and future prospects. *Appl Microbiol Biotechnol* 100:79–90. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00253-015-7090-3>
- Maier JAH, Möhrle R, Jeltsch A (2017) Design of synthetic epigenetic circuits featuring memory effects and reversible switching based on DNA methylation. *Nat Commun* 8:15336. <https://doi.org/10.1038/ncomms15336>
- Mannan AA, Liu D, Zhang F, Oyarzún DA (2017) Fundamental design principles for transcription-factor-based metabolite biosensors. *ACS Synth Biol* 6:1851–1859. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acssynbio.7b00172>
- Merulla D, van der Meer JR (2016) Regulatable and modulable background expression control in prokaryotic synthetic circuits by auxiliary repressor binding sites. *ACS Synth Biol* 5:36–45. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acssynbio.5b00111>

- Merulla D, Hatzimanikatis V, van der Meer JR (2013) Tunable reporter signal production in feedback-uncoupled arsenic bioreporters. *Microb Biotechnol* 6:503–514. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1751-7915.12031>
- Mimee M, Tucker AC, Voigt CA, Lu TK (2015) Programming a human commensal bacterium, *Bacteroides thetaiotaomicron*, to sense and respond to stimuli in the Murine Gut Microbiota. *Cell Syst* 1:62–71. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cels.2015.06.001>
- Mimee M, Nadeau P, Hayward A, Carim S, Flanagan S, Jerger L, Collins J, McDonnell S, Swartwout R, Citorik RJ, Bulović V, Langer R, Traverso G, Chandrakasan AP, Lu TK (2018) An ingestible bacterial-electronic system to monitor gastrointestinal health. *Science* 360:915–918. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aas9315>
- Misra TK, Brown NL, Haberstroh L, Schmidt A, Goddette D, Silver S (1985) Mercuric reductase structural genes from plasmid R100 and transposon Tn501: functional domains of the enzyme. *Gene* 34:253–262. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-1119\(85\)90134-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-1119(85)90134-9)
- Moon TS, Clarke EJ, Groban ES, Tamsir A, Clark RM, Eames M, Kortemme T, Voigt CA (2011) Construction of a genetic multiplexer to toggle between chemosensory pathways in *Escherichia coli*. *J Mol Biol* 406:215–227. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmb.2010.12.019>
- Moon TS, Lou C, Tamsir A, Stanton BC, Voigt CA (2012) Genetic programs constructed from layered logic gates in single cells. *Nature* 491:249–253. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature11516>
- Mutalik VK, Guimaraes JC, Cambray G, Lam C, Christoffersen MJ, Mai QA, Tran AB, Paull M, Keasling JD, Arkin AP, Endy D (2013) Precise and reliable gene expression via standard transcription and translation initiation elements. *Nat Methods* 10:354–360. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nmeth.2404>
- Nassif N, Bouvet O, Noelle Rager M, Roux C, Coradin T, Livage J (2002) Living bacteria in silica gels. *Nat Mater* 1:42–44. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nmat709>
- Nealson KH, Myers CR, Wimpee BB (1991) Isolation and identification of manganese-reducing bacteria and estimates of microbial Mn(IV)-reducing potential in the Black Sea. *Deep Sea Res Part A* 38:S907–S920. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0198-0149\(10\)80016-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0198-0149(10)80016-0)
- Nealson KH, Belz A, McKee B (2002) Breathing metals as a way of life: geobiology in action. *Anton Leeuw Int J Gen Mol Microbiol* 81:215–222. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1020518818647>
- Nielsen AAK, Der BS, Shin J, Vaidyanathan P, Paralanov V, Strychalski EA, Ross D, Densmore D, Voigt CA (2016) Genetic circuit design automation. *Science* 352:aac7341. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aac7341>
- Nistala GJ, Wu K, Rao CV, Bhalerao KD (2010) A modular positive feedback-based gene amplifier. *J Biol Eng* 4:4. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1754-1611-4-4>
- Oberdoerffer P (2003) Unidirectional Cre-mediated genetic inversion in mice using the mutant loxP pair lox66/lox71. *Nucleic Acids Res* 31:140e. <https://doi.org/10.1093/nar/gng140>
- Olorunniji FJ, Rosser SJ, Stark WM (2016) Site-specific recombinases: molecular machines for the Genetic Revolution. *Biochem J* 473:673–684. <https://doi.org/10.1042/BJ20151112>
- Olson EJ, Hartsough LA, Landry BP, Shroff R, Tabor JJ (2014) Characterizing bacterial gene circuit dynamics with optically programmed gene expression signals. *Nat Methods* 11:449–455. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nmeth.2884>
- Papi RM, Chaitidou SA, Trikkas FA, Kyriakidis DA (2005) Encapsulated *Escherichia coli* in alginate beads capable of secreting a heterologous pectin lyase. *Microb Cell Factories* 4:35. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1475-2859-4-35>
- Pardee K, A G, Ferrante T, Cameron DE, Daleykeyser A, Yin P (2014) Paper-based synthetic gene networks. *Cell* 159:940–954. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cell.2014.10.004>
- Pardee K, Green AA, Takahashi MK, Braff D, Lambert G, Lee JW, Ferrante T, Ma D, Donghia N, Fan M, Daringer NM, Bosch I, Dudley DM, O'Connor DH, Gehrke L, Collins JJ (2016a) Rapid, low-cost detection of Zika virus using programmable biomolecular components. *Cell* 165:1255–1266. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cell.2016.04.059>
- Pardee K, Slomovic S, Nguyen PQ, Lee JW, Donghia N, Burrill D, Ferrante T, McSorley FR, Furuta Y, Vernet A, Lewandowski M, Boddy CN, Joshi NS, Collins JJ ((2016b)) Portable, on-demand biomolecular manufacturing. *Cell* 167:248–259.e12. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cell.2016.09.013>

- Peking iGEM (2013) Aromatics Scouts. <http://2013.igem.org/Team:Peking/Project/BioSensors>. Accessed 3 Jun 2018
- Pelechano V, Steinmetz LM (2013) Gene regulation by antisense transcription. *Nat Rev Genet* 14:880–893. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nrg3594>
- Pellinen T, Huovinen T, Karp M (2004) A cell-free biosensor for the detection of transcriptional inducers using firefly luciferase as a reporter. *Anal Biochem* 330:52–57. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ab.2004.03.064>
- Perez JG, Stark JC, Jewett MC (2016) Cell-free synthetic biology: engineering beyond the cell. *Cold Spring Harb Perspect Biol* 8:a023853. <https://doi.org/10.1101/cshperspect.a023853>
- Pinheiro VB, Taylor AI, Cozens C, Abramov M, Renders M, Zhang S, Chaput JC, Wengel J, Peak-Chew SY, McLaughlin SH, Herdewijn P, Holliger P (2012) Synthetic genetic polymers capable of heredity and evolution. *Science* 336:341–344. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1217622>
- Power B, Liu X, Germaine KJ, Ryan D, Brazil D, Dowling DN (2011) Alginate beads as a storage, delivery and containment system for genetically modified PCB degrader and PCB biosensor derivatives of *Pseudomonas fluorescens* F113. *J Appl Microbiol* 110:1351–1358. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2672.2011.04993.x>
- Pu J, Zinkus-Boltz J, Dickinson BC (2017) Evolution of a split RNA polymerase as a versatile biosensor platform. *Nat Chem Biol* 13:432–438. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nchembio.2299>
- Purnick PEM, Weiss R (2009) The second wave of synthetic biology: from modules to systems. *Nat Rev Mol Cell Biol* 10:410–422. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nrm2698>
- Randall A, Guye P, Gupta S, Duportet X, Weiss R (2011) Design and connection of robust genetic circuits. *Methods Enzymol* 497:159–186. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-385075-100007-X>
- Riglar DT, Giessen TW, Baym M, Kerns SJ, Niederhuber MJ, Bronson RT, Kotula JW, Gerber GK, Way JC, Silver PA (2017) Engineered bacteria can function in the mammalian gut long-term as live diagnostics of inflammation. *Nat Biotechnol* 35:653–658. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nbt.3879>
- Roquet N, Lu TK (2014) Digital and analog gene circuits for biotechnology. *Biotechnol J* 9:597–608. <https://doi.org/10.1002/biot.201300258>
- Roquet N, Soleimany AP, Ferris AC, Aaronson S, Lu TK (2016) Synthetic recombinase-based State machines in living cells. *Science* 353:aad8559. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aad8559>
- Rubens JR, Selvaggio G, Lu TK (2016) Synthetic mixed-signal computation in living cells. *Nat Commun* 7:11658. <https://doi.org/10.1038/ncomms11658>
- Saeidi N, Wong CK, Lo T-M, Nguyen HX, Ling H, Leong SSJ, Poh CL, Chang MW (2011) Engineering microbes to sense and eradicate *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*, a human pathogen. *Mol Syst Biol* 7:521. <https://doi.org/10.1038/msb.2011.55>
- Saha RP, Samanta S, Patra S, Sarkar D, Saha A, Singh MK (2017) Metal homeostasis in bacteria: the role of ArsR–SmtB family of transcriptional repressors in combating varying metal concentrations in the environment. *BioMetals* 30:459–503. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10534-017-0020-3>
- Salis HM, Mirsky EA, Voigt CA (2009) Automated design of synthetic ribosome binding sites to control protein expression. *Nat Biotechnol* 27:946–950. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nbt.1568>
- Schaerli Y, Gili M, Isalan M (2014) A split intein T7 RNA polymerase for transcriptional AND-logic. *Nucleic Acids Res* 42:12322–12328. <https://doi.org/10.1093/nar/gku884>
- Schnütgen F, Doerflinger N, Calléja C, Wendling O, Chambon P, Ghyselinck NB (2003) A directional strategy for monitoring Cre-mediated recombination at the cellular level in the mouse. *Nat Biotechnol* 21:562–565. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nbt811>
- Selifonova OV, Eaton RW (1996) Use of an ipb-lux fusion to study regulation of the isopropylbenzene catabolism operon of *Pseudomonas putida* RE204 and to detect hydrophobic pollutants in the environment. *Appl Environ Microbiol* 62:778–783
- Shalem O, Sanjana NE, Zhang F (2015) High-throughput functional genomics using CRISPR-Cas9. *Nat Rev Genet* 16:299–311. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nrg3899>
- Sharma J, Mahajan R, Gupta V (2010) Comparison and suitability of gel matrix for entrapping higher content of enzymes for commercial applications. *Indian J Pharm Sci* 72:223. <https://doi.org/10.4103/0250-474X.65010>

- Sheth RU, Yim SS, Wu FL, Wang HH (2017) Multiplex recording of cellular events over time on CRISPR biological tape. *Science* 358:1457–1461. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aao0958>
- Shi W, Dong J, Scott RA, Ksenzenko MY, Rosen BP (1996) The role of arsenic-thiol interactions in metalloregulation of the ars operon. *J Biol Chem* 271:9291–9297. <https://doi.org/10.1074/jbc.271.16.9291>
- Shin HJ (2012) Agarose-gel-immobilized recombinant bacterial biosensors for simple and disposable on-site detection of phenolic compounds. *Appl Microbiol Biotechnol* 93:1895–1904. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00253-011-3700-x>
- Shis DL, Bennett MR (2013) Library of synthetic transcriptional AND gates built with split T7 RNA polymerase mutants. *Proc Natl Acad Sci* 110:5028–5033. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1220157110>
- Siegfried K, Endes C, Bhuiyan AFMK, Kuppardt A, Mattusch J, van der Meer JR, Chatzinotas A, Harms H (2012) Field testing of arsenic in groundwater samples of Bangladesh using a test kit based on lyophilized bioreporter bacteria. *Environ Sci Technol* 46:3281–3287. <https://doi.org/10.1021/es203511k>
- Silver S, Phung LT (2005) Genes and enzymes involved in bacterial oxidation and reduction of inorganic arsenic. *Appl Environ Microbiol* 71:599–608. <https://doi.org/10.1128/AEM.71.2.599-608.2005>
- Siuti P, Yazbek J, Lu TK (2013) Synthetic circuits integrating logic and memory in living cells. *Nat Biotechnol* 31:448–452. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nbt.2510>
- Stocker J, Balluch D, Gsell M, Harms H, Feliciano J, Daunert S, Malik KA, van der Meer JR (2003) Development of a set of simple bacterial biosensors for quantitative and rapid measurements of arsenite and arsenate in potable water. *Environ Sci Technol* 37:4743–4750. <https://doi.org/10.1021/es034258b>
- Stoyanov JV, Browns NL (2003) The *Escherichia coli* copper-responsive copA promoter is activated by gold. *J Biol Chem* 278:1407–1410. <https://doi.org/10.1074/jbc.C200580200>
- Tang W, Liu DR (2018) Rewritable multi-event analog recording in bacterial and mammalian cells. *Science* 360:eaap8992. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aap8992>
- Tong H-W, Mutlu BR, Wackett LP, Aksan A (2014) Manufacturing of bioreactive nanofibers for bioremediation. *Biotechnol Bioeng* 111:1483–1493. <https://doi.org/10.1002/bit.25208>
- van der Meer JR, Belkin S (2010) Where microbiology meets microengineering: design and applications of reporter bacteria. *Nat Rev Microbiol* 8:511–522. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nrmicro2392>
- Volpetti F, Petrova E, Maerkl SJ (2017) A microfluidic biodisplay. *ACS Synth Biol* 6:1979–1987. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acssynbio.7b00088>
- Wackwitz A, Harms H, Chatzinotas A, Breuer U, Vogne C, van der Meer JR (2008) Internal arsenite bioassay calibration using multiple bioreporter cell lines. *Microb Biotechnol* 1:149–157. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1751-7915.2007.00011.x>
- Wan X, Volpetti F, Petrova E, French C, Maerkl SJ, Wang B (2019) Cascaded amplifying circuits enable ultrasensitive cellular sensors for toxic metals. *Nat Chem Biol*. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41589-019-0244-3>
- Wang B, Buck M (2012) Customizing cell signaling using engineered genetic logic circuits. *Trends Microbiol* 20:376–384. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tim.2012.05.001>
- Wang B, Buck M (2014) Rapid engineering of versatile molecular logic gates using heterologous genetic transcriptional modules. *Chem Commun* 50:11642–11644. <https://doi.org/10.1039/C4CC05264A>
- Wang B, Kitney RI, Joly N, Buck M (2011a) Engineering modular and orthogonal genetic logic gates for robust digital-like synthetic biology. *Nat Commun* 2:508. <https://doi.org/10.1038/ncomms1516>
- Wang Y, Yau YY, Perkins-Balding D, Thomson JG (2011b) Recombinase technology: applications and possibilities. *Plant Cell Rep* 30:267–285. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00299-010-0938-1>

- Wang B, Barahona M, Buck M (2013) A modular cell-based biosensor using engineered genetic logic circuits to detect and integrate multiple environmental signals. *Biosens Bioelectron* 40:368–376. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bios.2012.08.011>
- Wang B, Barahona M, Buck M (2014) Engineering modular and tunable genetic amplifiers for scaling transcriptional signals in cascaded gene networks. *Nucleic Acids Res* 42:9484–9492. <https://doi.org/10.1093/nar/gku593>
- Wang B, Barahona M, Buck M (2015) Amplification of small molecule-inducible gene expression via tuning of intracellular receptor densities. *Nucleic Acids Res* 43:1955–1964. <https://doi.org/10.1093/nar/gku1388>
- Waistein DM, Styczynski MP (2018) Development of a pigment-based whole-cell zinc biosensor for human serum. *ACS Synth Biol* 7:267–275. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acssynbio.7b00292>
- Way JC, Collins JJ, Keasling JD, Silver PA (2014) Integrating biological redesign: where synthetic biology came from and where it needs to go. *Cell* 157:151–161. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cell.2014.02.039>
- Webster DP, M a TA, Doud DFR, Chakravorty A, Holmes EC, Radens CM, Sureka S, J a G, Angenent LT (2014) An arsenic-specific biosensor with genetically engineered *Shewanella oneidensis* in a bioelectrochemical system. *Biosens Bioelectron* 62:320–324. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bios.2014.07.003>
- Wen KY, Cameron L, Chappell J, Jensen K, Bell DJ, Kelwick R, Kopniczky M, Davies JC, Filloux A, Freemont PS (2017) A cell-free biosensor for detecting quorum sensing molecules in *P. aeruginosa*-infected respiratory samples. *ACS Synth Biol* 6:2293–2301. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acssynbio.7b00219>
- Wright O, Stan G-B, Ellis T (2013) Building-in biosafety for synthetic biology. *Microbiology* 159:1221–1235. <https://doi.org/10.1099/mic.0.066308-0>
- Wright O, Delmans M, Stan GB, Ellis T (2015) GeneGuard: a modular plasmid system designed for biosafety. *ACS Synth Biol* 4:307–316. <https://doi.org/10.1021/sb500234s>
- Wu CH, Le D, Mulchandani A, Chen W (2009) Optimization of a whole-cell cadmium sensor with a toggle gene circuit. *Biotechnol Prog* 25:898–903. <https://doi.org/10.1002/btpr.203>
- Wu F, Zhang Q, Wang X (2018) Design of adjacent transcriptional regions to tune gene expression and facilitate circuit construction. *Cell Syst* 6:206–215.e6. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cels.2018.01.010>
- Xiang Y, Dalchau N, Wang B (2018) Scaling up genetic circuit design for cellular computing: advances and prospects. *Nat Comput* 17:833–853. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11047-018-9715-9>
- Xue H, Shi H, Yu Z, He S, Liu S, Hou Y, Pan X, Wang H, Zheng P, Cui C, Viets H, Liang J, Zhang Y, Chen S, Zhang HM, Ouyang Q (2014) Design, construction, and characterization of a set of biosensors for aromatic compounds. *ACS Synth Biol* 3:1011–1014. <https://doi.org/10.1021/sb500023f>
- Yang L, Nielsen AAK, Fernandez-Rodriguez J, McClune CJ, Laub MT, Lu TK, Voigt CA (2014) Permanent genetic memory with >1 byte capacity. *Nat Methods* 11:1261–1266. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nmeth.3147>
- Yu B, Yang M, Shi L, Yao Y, Jiang Q, Li X, Tang LH, Zheng BJ, Yuen KY, Smith DK, Song E, Huang JD (2012) Explicit hypoxia targeting with tumor suppression by creating an “obligate” anaerobic *Salmonella Typhimurium* strain. *Sci Rep* 2:436. <https://doi.org/10.1038/srep00436>
- Zhang F, Keasling J (2011) Biosensors and their applications in microbial metabolic engineering. *Trends Microbiol* 19:323–329. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tim.2011.05.003>
- Zhang F, Carothers JM, Keasling JD (2012) Design of a dynamic sensor-regulator system for production of chemicals and fuels derived from fatty acids. *Nat Biotechnol* 30:354–359. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nbt.2149>
- Zhang H, Sheng Y, Wu Q, Liu A, Lu Y, Yin Z, Cao Y, Zeng W, Ouyang Q (2013) Rational design of a biosensor circuit with semi-log dose-response function in *Escherichia coli*. *Quant Biol* 1:209–220. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40484-013-0020-4>

- Zhang H, Lin M, Shi H, Ji W, Huang L, Zhang X, Shen S, Gao R, Wu S, Tian C, Yang Z, Zhang G, He S, Wang H, Saw T, Chen Y, Ouyang Q (2014) Programming a Pavlovian-like conditioning circuit in *Escherichia coli*. Nat Commun 5:3102. <https://doi.org/10.1038/ncomms4102>
- Zong Y, Zhang HM, Lyu C, Ji X, Hou J, Guo X, Ouyang Q, Lou C (2017) Insulated transcriptional elements enable precise design of genetic circuits. Nat Commun 8:52. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-017-00063-z>