Kinetics and Fidelity of Psychrophilic DNA Polymerases

Yuan Xue[1], Ido Braslavsky[2], Stephen R. Quake[1,3,4]*

1. Department of Bioengineering, Stanford University, Stanford, CA, USA

2. The Robert H. Smith Faculty of Agriculture, Food and Environment, Institute of Biochemistry, Food Science, and Nutrition, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Rehovot 7610001, Israel

3. Department of Applied Physics, Stanford University, Stanford, CA, USA.

4. Chan Zuckerberg Biohub, Mission Bay, CA, USA.

KEYWORDS: **Polymerase fidelity. Psychrophilic DNA polymerase. Temperature effect on enzymes. Polymerase error rate.**

Abstract: The discovery of extremophiles has enabled development of groundbreaking biotechnology. While most of the extremophile research is focused on thermophiles, organisms that adapt to living in cold temperature, known as psychrophiles, remain under-studied. We expressed and purified DNA polymerases PIPI and PIPB from *Psychromonas ingrahamii*, a psychrophile that can grow below water's freezing temperature. We demonstrate that they have *in vitro* DNA replication activity at temperatures as low as -19ºC. To our knowledge, this is the coolest DNA polymerization reaction ever carried out in a laboratory. In exploring the behavior of a variety of polymerases as a function of temperature, we found that reaction temperature substantially increases substitution and deletion error rates of both psychrophilic and mesophilic DNA polymerases. Motif analysis further reveals that the substitution error profiles cluster according to phylogenetic similarity of polymerases. Our results provide a useful reference for

24 how reaction temperature, a crucial parameter of biochemistry, can affect the fidelity of DNA

25 polymerases adapted to a wide range of environment.

Introduction:

Life in cold environment is confronted with the thermodynamic obstacle of maintaining sufficient enzymatic activity; however, the abundance of various life-forms found in near or below freezing temperature suggests that biology has evolved ways to overcome such challenge. Contrary to what one would expect from naïve application of Arrhenius equation, life-forms that adapted to living in cold environment do not grow exponentially slower in the cold than their mesophilic cousins at room temperature[1,2]. This suggests that efficiency of psychrophilic enzymes are evolutionarily adapted to sustain relevant metabolism in low temperature[3–5]. Low temperature adaptation of enzyme is thought to increase the catalytic rate by increasing local flexibility of active site, thus lowering activation energy barrier[6–8]. This can be contrasted with high temperature adaptation which often confers global structural robustness to an enzyme by increasing intra-molecular interactions that maintain functional tertiary shape. Studies based on directed evolution have shown that structural stability and enzymatic efficiency can be optimized simultaneously and are thought to be mutually compatible properties[9,10]. Combining the observations helps to explain the general biochemical trend of cold-adapted enzymes (summarized in **Figure 1a**): an increase in enzyme's catalytic activity is often associated with a reduced binding affinity and a broader substrate specificity[11,12]. However, a direct test of these ideas on orthologous enzymes from organisms adapted to low, medium, and high temperatures has not yet been performed.

As DNA polymerase is a central component of cellular replication and biotechnological platforms[13], understanding how reaction temperature can affect fidelity is of vital interest. Polymerase error rate is tightly controlled to ensure the duplication of genetic material which can encode functional descendants. Replication error from DNA polymerase is a source of genetic variations and underlies the cause of many inheritable diseases[14–17]. Polymerase errors play a crucial role in biotechnology applications such as polymerase chain reaction (PCR) and multiple-displacement amplification (MDA)[18–20]. Polymerase errors can introduce base mismatches and indels at an exponential rate, significantly impairing downstream interpretation. In high-

throughput sequencing, replication errors of polymerase can reduce accuracy and precision of

base calling[21–23]. To test the effect of temperature on polymerase fidelity, we characterized error

rate of a variety of DNA polymerases as a function of temperature. Furthermore, we explored

how temperature adaptation affects polymerase fidelity at different reaction temperatures by

characterizing the error profiles of DNA polymerases of psychrophilic, mesophilic, and

thermophilic origins. Combining unique molecular indices (UMIs) and high-throughput

sequencing, we carried out a multiplexed measurement of substitution, insertion, and deletion

error rate at the single-molecule level for seven different DNA polymerases, some of which are

commonly used in molecular cloning and sequencing applications. Our data provide evidence

that the error rate of cold-adapted DNA polymerases are more sensitized to fluctuations in

reaction temperature than thermal-adapted ones. Our study reveals how temperature adaptation

affects psychrophilic DNA polymerase kinetics and fidelity which may enable biotechnology

development.

Materials and Methods:

Polymerase Cloning. *Psychromonas ingrahamii* 37 DNA Polymerases I and II sequences are

found on Joint Genome Institute, Integrated Microbial Genomes & Microbiomes (IMG/G) portal

(IMG id: 639633052). The sequences were codon optimized for E. coli expression. PIPI gene

fragment (1845 bp) was synthesized and cloned into pD454 T7 expression vector (Ampicillin

resistance) by ATUM (formerly DNA 2.0) to generate a maltose-binding protein (MBP) fusion

gene containing a single HRV 3C cleavage site. PIPB was synthesized by Integrated DNA

Technologies (iDT) as a single DNA fragment (2430 bp). The fragment was amplified in PCR

with primers containing 5'-NdeI and 3'-SalI sites, and the resulting product was digested and

ligated into linearized pMAL-c5x vector (New England Biolabs). All cloning products were first

subcloned in NEB-5α strains and then purified using ZymoPURE plasmid miniprep kits (Zymo

Research). The sequences of the expression constructs were all verified with Sanger sequencing

by Sequetech. Plasmid maps for the constructs used in this study are provided (**Supplemental**

text 1).

Polymerase Purification. Several expression and purification conditions had been attempted

to optimize yield and purity of active polymerase products. We first attempted to express a

glutathione S-transferase (GST)-PIPB fusion construct in BL-21 DE3 grown in Luria Broth (LB)

media. Isopropyl β-D-1-thiogalactopyranoside (IPTG) induction of protein expression was

carried out at 16ºC between 12 - 16 hours. Harvested cells were lysed with either 5 freeze-thaw

cycles or a sonicator. We screened a variety of lysis buffer and found that most of the protein

remained insoluble. We suspect that GST-tag does not promote protein solubility based on

previous reports[24]. In our second approach, we generated MBP-PIPI (112.4 kDa) and MBP-PIPB

(134.8 kDa) fusion genes on a pMAL-c5x vector expressed in Arctic Express DE3 (Agilent

Technologies), a bacterial expression cell line that overexpresses psychrophilic chaperones.

Instead of LB, we grew the bacteria in a defined media M9ZB (**Supplemental text 2**) at 37ºC

until OD600 of 2.5 and induced expression with 1M IPTG at 10ºC or 16ºC for 20-24 hours. Cells

were harvested in lysis buffer (20 mM Tris-HCl pH 7.50, 10% glycerol, 50 mM NaCl, 10 mM 2-

Mercaptoethanol) with the additions of 400 U of DNase I and 1X protease inhibitor cocktail (No

EDTA; ThermoFisher). Cells were lysed in French press homogenizer by passing through at 500

psi once, and at 10000 psi for three times. Clarified cell lysate was mixed with amylose resin at

4ºC for three hours. Resin was washed with 20 column volumes of chaperone removal buffer (20

mM Tris-HCl pH 7.50, 10% glycerol, 50 mM NaCl, 10 mM 2-Mercaptoethanol, 50 mM KCl, 5

mM ATP) and washed with 10 column volumes of lysis buffer (with no addition of DNase I or

protease inhibitor). Bound proteins were eluted by incubating at 4ºC for 3 hours with 10 mM of

maltose. MBP-PIPI was subjected to HRV-3C cleavage at 4ºC overnight. We did not cleave

MBP-PIPB as it was found to induce precipitation of the protein. Both proteins were further

purified in HiLoad 16/60 Superdex 200 preparatory grade size exclusion column (GE

Healthcare) to separate fractions of polymerase proteins from contaminating proteins. Purified

proteins were eluted in lysis buffer, concentrated in Amicon Ultra protein filters, and then stored

in -80ºC until experiments.

Protein quantification. Protein concentration was quantified by loading proteins on

denaturing SDS-PAGE gel and stained with SYPRO Red following the manufacturer's

recommended protocol (ThermoFisher). Linear dynamic range of the quantification was

established by separately staining a titration series of known amount of MBP-paramyosin-Sal. A

secondary quantification measurement with Bioanalyzer Protein Analysis Kits (Agilent)

provided similar concentration values as SYPRO Red assay (data not shown).

Polymerase Activity Assay. Polymerase activity from 5°C to 50°C was measured with

EvaEZ™ Fluorometric Polymerase Activity Assay Kit (Biotium) according to the provided

protocol. Briefly, assay mix and polymerase of known concentrations were equilibrated to the

reaction temperature separately for 5 minutes before mixing. Fluorescence signals of Eva

dsDNA binding dye and ROX reference dye were measured in Bio-rad 96 well qPCR machine

for 1 hour at constant reaction temperature with 30 seconds interval. Titrations of the polymerase

were performed at 20°C to ensure linear response of measured activity at the given polymerase

concentration. A positive control sample with saturating amount of Klenow Exo- polymerase

was included to ensure that maximal fluorescence signals remained constant over the course of

measurement at each reaction temperature. The initial slope of the fluorescence gain for each

polymerase is used to estimate the steady-state speed of replication. The slopes are then

normalized to the maximal slope measured across all temperature range for each corresponding

polymerase.

Gel Extension Assay. For measurement of subzero polymerase activity, we prepared 9.5 μL of

primed extension mix containing a final concentration in 10 μL volume of 10 nM primed

template with 5'-ATTOTM 633 fluorescent label (iDT) (**Supplemental text 1**), 50 μM dNTP, 10

mM MOPS pH 8.50, 30% glycerol, 1.5 mM MgCl2, 0.1 mg/mL BSA, 50 mM KCl. Reaction

master mix and polymerase were separately equilibrated to -19°C on a TropiCoolerTM (Boekel

Scientific) for 30 minutes, then they were rapidly mixed with pre-chilled pipette tips. One

microliter aliquot of the reaction was quenched in 9 μL of 90% formamide with 50 mM EDTA

pH 8.0 and heat denatured at 95°C for 5 minutes before cooling on ice. For exonuclease assay, a

similar reaction was prepared but without the addition of dNTP. After thermal equilibration, the

polymerase was mixed with the reaction master mix and incubated on the thermal cooler. One

microliter of the quenched mixture was resolved on 15% polyacrylamide TBE-Urea precast gels

(Bio-rad) at 195 constant voltage for 50 minutes. Gels were imaged on Typhoon 9410 imager

(GE).

Molecular Barcoding and Library Preparation. We purified homogeneous (< 10^{-9} single

nucleotide polymorphism per base) pUC19 plasmid template from a single clone of NEB-5α

(New England Biolabs) transformed with pUC19 grown in LB supplemented with ampicillin

antibiotic. About 1 μg of purified pUC19 was co-digested with 10 units of SapI and NdeI at 37°C

for 24 minutes. Digested pUC19 template fragment was purified twice with 0.35X (V:V) of

Ampure XP beads. Concentration and purity of the co-digested pUC19 template was determined

on Bioanalyzer using high-sensitivity dsDNA quantification kit. Applying UMI barcoding

strategy to measure polymerase errors on single-molecule level has been reported previously by

the Xie group[25]. We adapted their strategy to measure polymerase replication at different reaction

temperatures. All reactions were conducted in a buffer made up of 10 mM MOPS pH 8.50, 30%

glycerol, 1.5 mM MgCl2, 0.1 mg/mL BSA, 50 mM KCl unless otherwise stated. We used MOPS

buffer instead of Tris-based buffer as it has a much smaller ΔpKa/ΔT scaling which minimizes

changes in buffer acidity at different temperatures. We increased the UMI length to 15

nucleotides on both ends, effectively increasing the combinatorial space to 4^{30} which minimizes

the barcode collision rate between UMIs (**Supplemental text 1**). After annealing UMI index

primer to pUC19 template (100:1 molar ratio), we pre-incubated the reaction mixture in 96 well

plate at the desired reaction temperature for 2 minutes prior to the addition of polymerase

(volume of reaction mixture to volume of polymerase is 19:1). Reaction was quenched with 50

mM EDTA after giving sufficient time to complete the reaction. Reaction time for each

polymerase and condition was determined using fluorometric activity assays and qPCR

measurement. We then purified the reaction mixture with Ampure beads and synthesized the

complementary strand using the reverse UMI primer with Q5 DNA polymerase in its native

reaction buffer (NEB) by incubating at 72°C for 10 minutes which is followed by EDTA

quenching. We performed a second round of DNA purification and quantified molecular

concentration of the resulting products using qPCR. A total input of 20000 barcoded molecules

from each reaction was amplified in two rounds of 13 PCR cycles, with Ampure XP purification

between each successive round of amplification. Agilent Bioanalyzer dsDNA kit was used to

assess purity of the amplified product.

Replication Error Analysis. Library was sequenced on MiSeq using V3 2 x 300 bp chemistry

kit. Each read is sorted into groups according to reaction indices. Then each read is trimmed to

minima of 150 length and Q score of 20 (Phred+33 quality score), ensuring that the composite

reads will cover the entirety of template sequence. Reads with the same reaction indices are then

grouped according to their UMI barcodes and the barcodes are then stripped. Reads originating

from the same replicated molecule would share the same UMI barcode, thus consensus for each

position was determined by 90% majority within the UMI family that shares the same base.

Bases with less than 90% majority consensus may contain PCR-induced errors and thus are not

included for downstream analysis. Consensus sequence with non-matching bases in the first 5

positions are removed to avoid analysis of mis-primed products. We observed that the apparent

error rate for a polymerase decreased and plateaued as consensus number increased, and we

picked a minimum of 5 or 10 consensus threshold for each molecule to improve accuracy in

replication error calling. Consensus sequence from each UMI family is then aligned to the

reference sequence using BWA-MEM[26]. Substitution, insertion, and deletion errors are

determined by comparing the consensus sequence of each UMI molecule to the pUC19 reference

sequence without counting ambiguous assignments.

Dataset and code availability

Dataset and code to reproduce the analysis will be available on public repository.

Results:

Psychrophilic DNA polymerases can replicate nucleic acid below zero degree Celsius

To better understand the effect of temperature-adaptation on polymerase fidelity, we

characterized replication error rates of psychrophilic, mesophilic, and thermophilic DNA

polymerases across a wide range of reaction temperatures. As no commercial source was

available for psychrophilic DNA polymerases, we determined the coding sequences

bioinformatically, and optimized a recombinant cloning and purification strategy for DNA

polymerases I and II from *Psychromonas ingrahamii*, a gram-negative bacteria previously shown

to grow and replicate at -12°C in laboratory condition (**Supplementary Figure 1a**) (**Methods**)[27–

29]. We named the DNA polymerases I and II from this psychrophilic bacteria as *Psychromonas*

ingrahamii polymerase I *(*PIPI*)* and *Psychromonas ingrahamii* polymerase B *(*PIPB*)*,

respectively. PIPI was purified by maltose affinity column, cleaved off its tandem-fused maltose-

binding protein (MBP) tag, and then re-purified with size exclusion chromatography (**Methods**).

As we were unable to obtain a soluble version of PIPB after protease digestion of the fusion tag,

we used MBP-PIPB for all of our experiments. A graphical overview of our study is summarized

in **Figure 1b**.

To determine the temperature profile of polymerase replication, we adapted a dsDNA-

binding fluorescent dye to detect accumulation of extended products in real-time in the presence

of various DNA polymerases at different reaction temperature (**Methods)**. The increase in

fluorescence signal over time suggests that our purified psychrophilic polymerases are indeed

biochemically active (left panel in **Figure 2a**). As positive controls for comparison, we show the

temperature profiles of Klenow fragment lacking 3'→5' exonuclease domain (KleExo-), a

mesophilic DNA polymerase (center panel in **Figure 2a**), and Taq polymerase, a thermophilic

DNA polymerase commonly used in molecular assays (right panel in **Figure 2a**). Consistent

with previous report, Klenow and Taq DNA polymerases are maximally active at or above 37°C

[30,31]. Intriguingly, PIPI and MBP-PIPB exhibit characteristically distinct temperature profiles for

replication activity: PIPI reaches peak polymerase activity at 37°C, similar to KleExo- (left panel

in **Figure 2a**). As observed previously, the optimal temperature of enzyme activity can differ

from the temperature to which the host organism is adapted to[31,32]. On the other hand, polymerase

activity of MBP-PIPB is optimal at 20°C and becomes inactivated above 30°C. Combined, our

results show that the temperature profiles are distinct for the two psychrophilic DNA

polymerases, suggesting a different physiological requirement for their catalytic rates and

structural robustness. This may not be surprising as family A and B polymerases are thought to

carry out different roles *in vivo*.

As *Psychromonas ingrahamii* was characterized to grow and replicate at -12°C[28], we

hypothesized that its polymerases would remain active in cold environment. Using 5'-

fluorescently labeled, primed M13 phage template (**Methods**), we measured extension activity of

the two psychrophilic DNA polymerases at -19°C in aqueous solution supplemented with 30%

glycerol. We discover that PIPI retains higher apparent extension activity as it completed a 5-mer

extension within 7 hours, while MBP-PIPB did not (center panel in **Figure 2b**). MBP-PIPB

failed to complete 5-mer extension at -19°C up to 23 hours; however, the product lengths

noticeably increased (right panel in **Figure 2b**). As these two polymerases are predicted to

contain 3' → 5' exonuclease domains, we also determined their exonuclease activity (**Figure 2c**).

We find that MBP-PIPB can cleave single base on the timescale of minutes at 25°C, while PIPI

fails to cleave at up to 2 hours, suggesting its exonuclease activity is slower than MBP-PIPB or

inactive (**Supplementary Figure 1b**). The exonuclease activity of family B polymerases is

thought to play a role in DNA repair. It may help explain the apparent discrepancy in

polymerization rate at sub-zero temperature between the two polymerases.

Multiplexed measurement of polymerase error rate across reaction temperature

In order to profile polymerase errors across a range of reaction temperature and

conditions, we adapted a high-throughput multiplexed sequencing approach as illustrated in

Figure 3a [25]. Briefly, a reaction mixture containing homogeneous single-stranded DNA (ssDNA)

phage template (NEB) is equilibrated to the desired temperature prior to the addition of DNA

polymerase. Unless otherwise noted, we have used 3-(*N*-morpholino)propanesulfonic acid

(MOPS, pH 8.5) to buffer each reaction to pH changes, which can influence enzyme fidelity

independently of temperature[33]. After quenching and removal of the polymerase, the

complementary strand is then synthesized with high-fidelity Q5 DNA polymerase to minimize

errors introduced in the second strand. Both the first and second strand are synthesized using

DNA primers that encode a predefined library index and unique molecular index (UMI) to

barcode the identities of each reaction and individual molecules, respectively. The dsDNA

products are then PCR amplified, purified, and pooled at equimolar concentrations for

sequencing on a MiSeq 2 x 300 bp platform. We found no runoff amplification by-products in up

to 26 rounds of PCR amplification, while 20 rounds of PCR amplification failed to yield

sufficient DNA amount for downstream purification (**Supplementary Figure 2a**). The purified

libraries are pooled and sequenced on Illumina MiSeq platform. We deconvolved the sequenced

reads by their reaction indices and UMIs, removed sequencing errors by trimming reads with low

quality, and called consensus sequence of molecules as described in **Methods**. Quantification of

base counts with high sequence consensus reveals an uniform coverage along the entire M13

template, indicating no substantial positional effect on measurement dropout.

Reaction temperature increases error rate of psychrophilic and mesophilic DNA

polymerases

To quantify the error rate of each polymerase reaction, we determined base mismatch

(substitution error) or indel (deletion or insertion error) in each unique molecule. As insertion

rate is relatively low, we focused our analysis primarily on substitution and deletion rates of

psychrophilic, mesophilic, and thermophilic DNA polymerases in **Figures 4a-b**. Quantification

of Q5 DNA polymerase error rate in its native buffer (Q5NativeBuffer) at 72°C provides a

baseline for our measurement, revealing an average substitution, deletion, and insertion rates of

4.44×10^{-6}, 9.50×10^{-7}, and 1.37×10^{-7} per base, respectively, which agrees well with previously

reported values (**Table 1** and right panel in **Figure 4a**)[25,34]. Phusion (ThermoFisher), another

high-fidelity and commonly used thermophilic polymerase, has a similar substitution rate of 5.05

$\times 10^{-6}$ per base (**Table 1**) at 72°C in its native Phusion HF buffer (PhusionNativeBuffer;

ThermoFisher). We discover that the substitution rate of Phusion DNA polymerase increases by

more than a factor of two when switched from its native buffer to MOPS, a buffer with low

$\Delta pKa/\Delta T$ coefficient; furthermore, we notice an increased substitution rate of Phusion

polymerase in its native buffer (PhusionNativeBuffer) in lower reaction temperature. As the

composition of Phusion native buffer (ThermoFisher) is undisclosed, we postulate the $\Delta pKa/\Delta T$

of its buffering reagent may be high and thus its acidity can change substantially upon

temperature shift. which leads to changes in Phusion polymerase error rate. This would explain

why, relative to the Phusion native buffer, the substitution rate of Phusion in MOPS buffer

remains relatively invariant to temperature changes (**Table 1** and right panel in **Figure 4a**).

Supporting this hypothesis, we do not observe substantial differences in the substitution rate of

Q5 polymerase in MOPS buffer between 30°C and 72°C. Our finding thus suggests that

biological assays that involve the use of thermophilic polymerases at low temperature consider

the use of alternative buffering agent to ensure optimal fidelity.

Intriguingly, we observe a substantial temperature dependence for psychrophilic

polymerase and mesophilic polymerase error rate. The temperature effect is most dramatic on

PIPI and KleExo- whose substitution rate rose by more than 5 and 30 fold, respectively, between

reaction temperatures of 10°C and 50°C (**Tables 2-3**) (left and center panels in **Figures 4a-b**).

Similarly, the deletion rate also scales positively with reaction temperature for MBP-PIPB, PIPI,

and KleExo- (**Tables 2-3**) (left and center panels in **Figures 4a-b**). Curiously, the temperature

effect on substitution rate of KleLF and T4 polymerases is not monotonic, revealing a maxima of

error rate at 37°C (center panel in **Figures 2b**). In general, we find a log linear regression

describes well the correlation between substitution and deletion error rates across all polymerases

and reaction conditions (**Supplementary Figure 2b**), while insertion rate occurs at much lower

frequency compared to the other error types and remains largely temperature invariant (**Tables**

1-3). Next, we wondered if the substitution error spectrum is dependent on reaction temperature.

We show that reaction temperature had the strongest effect on substitution spectrum of KleExo-.

As expected, increase in reaction temperature is associated with increased frequency of

transversion relative to transition errors (**Figure 4c**). Meanwhile, reaction temperature had a

weak effect on the substitution spectrum of PIPI and MBP-PIPB and most other polymerases

(**Supplementary Figure 2c**).

Distinct mutational profiles are driven by polymerase family type

Polymerase replication error rate is context dependent[35,36]. We wondered whether

phylogenetically related polymerases that experienced vastly different temperature adaptation

histories would produce error profiles that are similar to each other across the range of reaction

temperature we tested. To validate the phylogenetic relations, we aligned the primary peptide

sequences of psychrophilic DNA polymerases to polymerases with known family assignment

(**Supplementary Figure 2d**). To analyze the relations between polymerase family and sequence

context of substitution errors, we convolved the errors by their corresponding +1 and -1 bases to

generate 3-mer error spectrum. We only kept 3-mer errors that occurred at greater than 20%

frequency in at least a single reaction, and removed the rest from further analysis. This filtering

step allows us to narrow down 60 distinct 3-mer errors (~32% of the entire 3-mer spectrum) and

focus on errors that are abundant in at least some of the reactions. We normalized the range of

error rate for each reaction: we divide the 3-mer error rate by error sum within the corresponding

reaction and then apply standardization such that the mean and standard deviation of each 3-mer

error rate are 0 and 1, respectively. Thus, a high Z-score indicates a particular error motif occurs

more frequently in some polymerase reactions than others and *vice versa*. Hierarchical clustering

of the standardized motif error rates reveals that error profiles cluster by the polymerase,

indicating good concordance of error profiles for reactions at different temperatures (**Figure 5a**).

Interestingly, we discover that error profiles of polymerase tended to cluster by their

phylogenetic homology in which errors generated by families A and B largely separated into

distinct clusters regardless of their respective temperature adaptation range. Our results thus

provide evidence that conservation of polymerase sequence is coupled to the frequency of error

profiles independent of temperature adaptation experience.

To identify mutational profiles that best explain the observed mutational profiles across

all the reactions, we performed principal component analysis on the standardized the 3-mer error

rate. This led us to identify principal components 1 and 3 that best explained the mutational

profiles of the polymerase families. Projecting the data onto these two principal components

reveals a natural boundary on this space that separates the mutational profiles between family A

and B (**Figure 5b**). Overall, high principal component 1 score is associated with mutational

profile of family B, while high principal component 3 score is associated with that of family A.

To identify mutational motifs that best distinguish each polymerase family, we trained a random

forest decision tree to classify origin of each 3-mer error motif (**Figure 5c**). We discover that

polymerase family A more frequently produced A $\rightarrow$ G transition preceded by G/C at -1 position.

On the other hand, polymerase family B more frequently produced pyrimidine (C/T) $\rightarrow$ A

transversion. In addition, the error position is often preceded by a purine (A/G) in the -1 position.

This suggests that conserved structural differences between the two polymerase families may

underlie the propensity for polymerase to generate distinct mutational signatures.

Discussion:

DNA polymerases are the biological machinery underlying transmission of genetic information and hold the key to many biotechnological innovations. While the majority of studies have focused on polymerases of mesophilic or thermophilic origins, we are one of the first to provide a comprehensive biochemical characterization of activity and fidelity of bacterial DNA polymerases across a wide temperature adaptation range. To our knowledge, this is the first demonstration that DNA extension can be accomplished with psychrophilic DNA polymerases below water's freezing temperature (0°C). This opens the door towards enabling more efficient nucleic acid amplification techniques directly on cryopreserved samples[37]. Reaction at low temperature is desirable as it can inhibit mammalian nuclease activity and reduce phototoxicity and DNA damages[23,38]. Thus, the development of low temperature biotechnology should in theory enable more accurate and precise measurement of biological attributes at a state that is closer to the "ground-truth". Ice may also provide an unexpected environment for biological reactions. As early as 1964, groups have observed that biochemical reactions can be substantially catalyzed in partially frozen aqueous system due to increased concentration of reactant in the aqueous portions. These observations suggest that ice slurry may be an unexpected environment for the origin of living systems[39–42]. Combined with cold-active enzymes, dynamic modulation of liquid-frozen phase may provide an under-exploited niche for biotechnology applications[43,44].

In this study, we have also explored one of the long standing questions in enzymology – is there a necessary trade-off between substrate specificity and activity? To address this question, we biochemically characterized bacterial DNA polymerase adapted to a wide range of environmental temperatures. Our results suggest that distinct temperature adaptation can differentially alter how the stability, kinetics, and fidelity of DNA polymerases change in response to fluctuations of environmental temperature. Our data shows that psychrophilic polymerases are more heat labile while thermophilic polymerases are largely heat resistant, as consistent with previous reports of other psychrophilic enzymes[45]. Furthermore, increased reaction temperature substantially increased the error rate of psychrophilic DNA polymerases and *E. coli* DNA polymerase I (Klenow fragments) but not that of thermophilic polymerases such as Phusion and Q5. Nucleic acid analogues are of interest to a wide range of synthetic

biology and biological engineering research as a mean to expand orthogonal signals or building

parts[46]. Most often, this is achieved through a combination of rational engineering and directed

evolution on mesophilic or thermophilic polymerase templates[47–50]. Our results shown here

suggest that using cold-adapted polymerases as a starting template may achieve higher substrate

promiscuity and thus greater incorporation rate of unnatural nucleotides. This holds the

possibility to improve most sequencing-by-synthesis sequencers available on the market as well

as accelerating the application of nucleic acids analogues.

Acknowledgments:

YX thanks professors James Berger and Daniel Herschlag for helpful advices and

discussions. YX thanks Richard Pfuetzner, Steven Wilson, Qiangjun Zhou, and Austin Wang for

sharing equipment and suggestions. YX thanks Norma Neff, Fabio Zanini, Felix Horns, Derek

Croote, Mark Kowarsky, Brian Yu, Bojk Berghuis, and Nimit Jain for discussions and

suggestions.

Table 1. Error rates (per base) for thermophilic DNA polymerases.

Origin	Reaction	Temperature (ºC)	Substitution rate (base^{-1})	Deletion rate (base^{-1})	Insertion rate (base^{-1})
Thermophile	Q5^{NB}	72	4.44 x 10^{-6}	9.50 x 10^{-7}	1.37 x 10^{-7}
	Q5	30	6.04 x 10^{-6}	7.45 x 10^{-7}	5.31 x 10^{-7}
	Q5	72	5.38 x 10^{-6}	1.56 x 10^{-7}	5.05 x 10^{-8}
	Taq	30	6.32 x 10^{-5}	2.27 x 10^{-6}	2.01 x 10^{-6}
	Taq	50	2.18 x 10^{-4}	2.18 x 10^{-5}	3.53 x 10^{-6}
	Phusion^{NB}	30	2.51 x 10^{-5}	1.82 x 10^{-8}	8.32 x 10^{-7}
	Phusion^{NB}	50	8.11 x 10^{-6}	ND	1.95 x 10^{-6}
	Phusion^{NB}	72	5.05 x 10^{-6}	ND	9.30 x 10^{-8}
	Phusion	30	2.02 x 10^{-5}	2.32 x 10^{-6}	4.81 x 10^{-7}
	Phusion	50	3.64 x 10^{-5}	2.46 x 10^{-6}	4.84 x 10^{-7}
	Phusion	72	1.24 x 10^{-5}	3.36 x 10^{-7}	5.11 x 10^{-7}

381 ^{NB}=reaction carried out in native buffer supplied by the manufacturer.

382 ND= Error frequency below the detectable error baseline.

384   Table 2. Error rates (per base) for psychrophilic DNA polymerases.

Origin	Reaction	Temperature (°C)	Substitution rate (base^{-1})	Deletion rate (base^{-1})	Insertion rate (base^{-1})
	MBP-PIPB	10	9.52×10^{-6}	1.84×10^{-6}	1.26×10^{-6}
	MBP-PIPB	20	2.55×10^{-5}	2.20×10^{-5}	1.09×10^{-6}
	PIPI	10	3.87×10^{-5}	1.48×10^{-6}	1.62×10^{-7}
Psychrophile	PIPI	20	6.34×10^{-5}	4.15×10^{-6}	2.20×10^{-7}
	PIPI	37	1.83×10^{-4}	1.59×10^{-5}	ND
	PIPI	50	2.11×10^{-4}	8.47×10^{-6}	ND

385   [ND]= Error frequency below the detectable error baseline.

386   Table 3. Error rates (per base) for mesophilic DNA polymerases.

Origin	Reaction	Temperature (ºC)	Substitution rate (base^{-1})	Deletion rate (base^{-1})	Insertion rate (base^{-1})
	KleExo-	10	4.20×10^{-5}	7.65×10^{-6}	3.38×10^{-7}
	KleExo-	20	6.91×10^{-5}	8.55×10^{-6}	ND
	KleExo-	37	1.07×10^{-3}	1.75×10^{-4}	4.39×10^{-7}
	KleExo-	50	1.38×10^{-3}	1.94×10^{-4}	3.38×10^{-6}
	KleLF	10	8.53×10^{-6}	ND	2.29×10^{-8}
Mesophile	KleLF	20	1.56×10^{-5}	1.12×10^{-7}	2.14×10^{-7}
	KleLF	37	2.99×10^{-5}	1.20×10^{-7}	1.43×10^{-7}
	KleLF	50	2.00×10^{-5}	ND	5.45×10^{-8}
	T4	10	3.25×10^{-5}	1.32×10^{-6}	2.37×10^{-8}
	T4	37	5.92×10^{-5}	1.17×10^{-6}	ND
	T4	50	1.45×10^{-5}	ND	ND

[ND] = Error frequency below the detectable error baseline.

Figure 1. (a) A schematic illustrating the apparent trade-off between enzymatic speed versus
fidelity in the context of temperature adaptation. **(b)** Graphical summary of the study.

Figure 2. **(a)** Normalized extension speed of purified psychrophilic, mesophilic, and
thermophilic DNA polymerases measured by a fluorometric assay. **(b)** Extension activity of
purified psychrophilic DNA polymerases carried out at -19ºC for 7 or 23 hours on a template
with 5 base gap. **(c)** Exonuclease activity of psychrophilic DNA polymerases carried out at room
temperature for 5, 10, or 20 minutes. Both measurements were repeated at least twice in two
independent experiments.

Figure 3. (a) A schematic illustrating the experimental overview of multiplexed single-molecule
measurement of polymerase error rate at various reaction temperature. Replication errors
(highlighted by blue cross) are distinguished from sequencing errors (highlighted by orange
cross) by comparing consensus sequence of individual molecules to the reference sequence of
M13 phage template.

Figure 4. Substitution **(a)** and deletion **(b)** error rates of psychrophilic (left), mesophilic (center),
and thermophilic (right) DNA polymerases as a function of reaction temperature. **(c)**
Temperature-dependent variation in substitution spectrum across MBP-PIPB (left), PIPI (center),
and KleExo- (right) polymeases.

Figure 5. **(a)** Heatmap of standardized 3-mer substitution rates ordered by hierarchical clustering. **(b)** Projection of polymerase reactions by principal components (PCs) 1 and 3 of standardized 3-mer substitution rates. Each dot is colored by the corresponding DNA polymerase and annotated with the reaction temperature. Dotted line is identity of PC1 and PC3 which separates substitution profiles between polymerase family A and B. **(c)** Motifs that distinguish error profiles between polymerase families A (blue) and B (red) are predicted by random forest classifier. Motifs predicted to have zero weights are removed and next we showcase here the top motifs with a difference in standard Z-score greater than 1. Logo plots reflect the frequency of non-zero weighted mutation motifs at -1, 0, and +1 positions that are enriched in polymerase families A (top) or B (bottom).

Supplementary Figure 1. (a) SDS-PAGE analysis of purified DNA polymerases. Lane L:
PrecisionPlus Ladder (Bio-rad). Lane 1: MBP-paramyosin protein control (NEB). Lane 2:
Klenow Exo- (NEB). Lane 3: Klenow LF (NEB). Lane 4: Q5 (NEB). Lane 5: Taq (NEB). Lane
6: MBP-PIPB (134.8 kDa). Lane 7: PIPI (69.9 kDa). **(b)** Exonuclease activity assay of PIPI and
MBP-PIPB at 25°C for 2 hours.

Supplementary Figure 2. (a) High-sensitivity Bioanalyzer DNA (Agilent) assay of replicated
products after 20 or 26 rounds of PCR amplification in the flow-through (FT) or elution fractions
of Ampure purification output. **(b)** Deletion and substitution rate (per base) is correlated as
modeled by linear regression (r^2: 0.98). **(c)** Substitution spectrum of mesophilic and thermophilic
DNA polymerases across reaction temperature. **(d)** Multiple sequence alignment (Clustal
Omega) of peptide sequences for polymerases used in this study. While Phusion DNA
polymerase sequence is undisclosed, it is expected to be a derivative of Pyrococcus DNA
polymerase II (Pfu). Family A cluster consists of Taq, PIPI, and Klenow polymerases. Family B
polymerases consist of T4, Pfu, and PIPB.

Corresponding Author

*Stephen R. Quake (steve@quake-lab.org)

Funding Sources

YX is supported by the Stanford Interdisciplinary Graduate Fellowship and Weiland Family

Fellowship. IB acknowledges support from Stanford University and from The Hebrew

University of Jerusalem. SRQ is supported by the Chan Zuckerberg Biohub.

References

1. Ratkowsky, D. A., Olley, J., McMeekin, T. A. & Ball, A. Relationship between temperature and growth rate of bacterial cultures. *J. Bacteriol.* **149**, 1–5 (1982).

2. Ingraham, J. L. & Stokes, J. L. Psychrophilic Bacteria. *J. Bacteriol.* **76**, 75–80 (1958).

3. Svingor, Á., Kardos, J., Hajdú, I., Németh, A. & Závodszky, P. A better enzyme to cope with cold: Comparative flexibility studies on psychrotrophic, mesophilic, and thermophilic IPMDHS. *J. Biol. Chem.* **276**, 28121–28125 (2001).

4. Ingraham, J. L. & Bailey, G. F. Comparative Study of Effect of Temperature on Metabolism of Psychrophilic and Mesophilic Bacteria. *J. Bacteriol.* **77**, 609–613 (1959).

5. Wintrode, P. L., Miyazaki, K. & Arnold, F. H. Cold adaptation of a mesophilic subtilisin-like protease by laboratory evolution. *J. Biol. Chem.* **275**, 31635–31640 (2000).

6. Lonhienne, T., Gerday, C. & Feller, G. Psychrophilic enzymes: Revisiting the thermodynamic parameters of activation may explain local flexibility. *Biochim. Biophys. Acta - Protein Struct. Mol. Enzymol.* **1543**, 1–10 (2000).

7. Lonhienne, T. *et al.* Modular structure, local flexibility and cold-activity of a novel chitobiase from a psychrophilic antarctic bacterium. *J. Mol. Biol.* **310**, 291–297 (2001).

8. Liang, Z. X. *et al.* Evidence for increased local flexibility in psychrophilic alcohol dehydrogenase relative to its thermophilic homologue. *Biochemistry* **43**, 14676–14683 (2004).

9. Miyazaki, K., Wintrode, P. L., Grayling, R. A., Rubingh, D. N. & Arnold, F. H. Directed evolution study of temperature adaptation in a psychrophilic enzyme. *J. Mol. Biol.* **297**, 1015–1026 (2000).

10. Nguyen, V. *et al.* Evolutionary drivers of thermoadaptation in enzyme catalysis. **294**, 289–294 (2017).

11. Tsigos, I., Velonia, K., Smonou, I. & Bouriotis, V. Purification and characterization of an alcohol dehydrogenase from the Antarctic psychrophile Moraxella sp. TAE123. *Eur. J. Biochem.* **254**, 356–362 (1998).

12. D'Amico, S., Sohier, J. S. & Feller, G. Kinetics and Energetics of Ligand Binding Determined by Microcalorimetry: Insights into Active Site Mobility in a Psychrophilic α-Amylase. *J. Mol. Biol.* **358**, 1296–1304 (2006).

468   13.   Loeb, L. A. & Monnat, R. J. DNA polymerases and human disease. *Nat. Rev. Genet.* **9**,
469   594–604 (2008).

470   14.   Copeland, W. C. Inherited Mitochondrial Diseases of DNA Replication. *Annu. Rev. Med.*
471   **59**, 131–146 (2008).

472   15.   Broughton, B. C. *et al.* Molecular analysis of mutations in DNA polymerase η in
473   xeroderma pigmentosum-variant patients. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **99**, 815–820
474   (2002).

475   16.   Donigan, K. A. *et al.* Human POLB gene is mutated in high percentage of colorectal
476   tumors. *J. Biol. Chem.* **287**, 23830–23839 (2012).

477   17.   Cabelof, D. C. *et al.* Haploinsufficiency in DNA polymerase β increases cancer risk with
478   age and alters mortality rate. *Cancer Res.* **66**, 7460–7465 (2006).

479   18.   Aschenbrenner, J. & Marx, A. DNA polymerases and biotechnological applications. *Curr.*
480   *Opin. Biotechnol.* **48**, 187–195 (2017).

481   19.   Dean, F. B., Nelson, J. R., Giesler, T. L. & Lasken, R. S. Rapid amplification of plasmid
482   and phage DNA using Phi29 DNA polymerase and multiply-primed rolling circle
483   amplification. *Genome Res.* **11**, 1095–1099 (2001).

484   20.   Chen, M. *et al.* Comparison of Multiple Displacement Amplification (MDA) and Multiple
485   Annealing and Looping-Based Amplification Cycles (MALBAC) in single-cell
486   sequencing. *PLoS One* **9**, 1–12 (2014).

487   21.   Schmitt, M. W. *et al.* Detection of ultra-rare mutations by next-generation sequencing.
488   *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **109**, 14508–14513 (2012).

489   22.   Smith, T., Heger, A. & Sudbery, I. UMI-tools: Modeling sequencing errors in Unique
490   Molecular Identifiers to improve quantification accuracy. *Genome Res.* **27**, 491–499
491   (2017).

492   23.   Potapov, V. & Ong, J. L. Examining sources of error in PCR by single-molecule
493   sequencing. *PLoS One* **12**, 1–19 (2017).

494   24.   Hammarstrom, M., Hellgren, N., Van den Berg, S., Berglund, H. & Hard, T. Rapid
495   screening for improved solubility of small human proteins produced as fusion proteins in
496   Escherichia coli. *Protein Sci.* xx–xxv (2001) doi:10.4018/978-1-4666-6371-8.

497   25.   Lee, D. F., Lu, J., Chang, S., Loparo, J. J. & Xie, X. S. Mapping DNA polymerase errors
498   by single-molecule sequencing. *Nucleic Acids Res.* **44**, e118 (2016).

26.   Li, H. Aligning sequence reads, clone sequences and assembly contigs with BWA-MEM.
00, 1–3 (2013).

27.   Breezee, J., Cady, N. & Staley, J. T. Subfreezing growth of the sea ice bacterium
'Psychromonas ingrahamii'. *Microb. Ecol.* **47**, 300–304 (2004).

28.   Auman, A. J., Breeze, J. L., Gosink, J. J., Kämpfer, P. & Staley, J. T. Psychromonas
ingrahamii sp. nov., a novel gas vacuolate, psychrophilic bacterium isolated from Arctic
polar sea ice. *Int. J. Syst. Evol. Microbiol.* **56**, 1001–1007 (2006).

29.   Riley, M. *et al.* Genomics of an extreme psychrophile, Psychromonas ingrahamii. *BMC*
Genomics **9**, 1–19 (2008).

30.   Lawyer, F. C. *et al.* High-level expression, purification, and enzymatic characterization of
full-length Thermus aquaticus DNA polymerase and a truncated form deficient in 5′ to 3′
exonuclease activity. *Genome Res.* **2**, 275–287 (1993).

31.   Brown, H. S. & Licata, V. J. Enthalpic switch-points and temperature dependencies of
DNA binding and nucleotide incorporation by Pol i DNA polymerases. *Biochim. Biophys.*
Acta - Proteins Proteomics **1834**, 2133–2138 (2013).

32.   Piotrowski, Y., Gurung, M. K. & Larsen, A. N. Characterization and engineering of a
DNA polymerase reveals a single amino-acid substitution in the fingers subdomain to
increase strand-displacement activity of A-family prokaryotic DNA polymerases. *BMC*
Mol. Cell Biol. **20**, 1–11 (2019).

33.   Ling, L. L., Keohavong, P., Dias, C. & Thilly, W. G. Optimization of the polymerase
chain reaction with regard to fidelity: Modified T7, Taq, and vent DNA polymerases.
Genome Res. **1**, 63–69 (1991).

34.   Pezza, J. A., Kucera, R. & Sun, L. Polymerase Fidelity: What is it, and what does it mean
for your PCR? *New England Biolabs (NEB) Tools & Resources.* vol. 3 4–5 (2010).

35.   de Paz, A. M. *et al.* High-resolution mapping of DNA polymerase fidelity using
nucleotide imbalances and next-generation sequencing. *Nucleic Acids Res.* **46**, e78 (2018).

36.   Schroeder, J. W., Hirst, W. G., Szewczyk, G. A. & Simmons, L. A. The Effect of Local
Sequence Context on Mutational Bias of Genes Encoded on the Leading and Lagging
Strands. *Curr. Biol.* **26**, 692–697 (2016).

37.   Guillaumet-Adkins, A. *et al.* Single-cell transcriptome conservation in cryopreserved cells
and tissues. *Genome Biol.* **18**, 1–15 (2017).

38.　Adam, M., Potter, A. S. & Potter, S. S. Psychrophilic proteases dramatically reduce
single-cell RNA-seq artifacts: A molecular atlas of kidney development. *Dev.* **144**, 3625–
3632 (2017).

39.　Butler, A. R. & Bruice, T. C. Catalysis in Water and Ice. A Comparison of the Kinetics of
Hydrolysis of Acetic Anhydride, β-Propiolactone, and p-Nitrophenyl Acetate and the
Dehydration of 5-Hydro-6-hydroxydeoxyuridine in Water and in Ice. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*
86, 313–319 (1964).

40.　Bruice, T. C. & Butler, A. R. Catalysis in Water and Ice. II.1 The Reaction of
Thiolactones with Morpholine in Frozen Systems. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **86**, 4104–4108
(1964).

41.　Alburn, H. E. & Grant, N. H. Reactions in Frozen Systems. II.1 Enhanced
Hydroxylaminolysis of Simple Amides. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **87**, 4174–4177 (1965).

42.　Grant, N. H. Biochemical Reactions In Essentially Nonaqueous Systems. **6**, 182–187
(1969).

43.　Hobbs, P. V. *Ice Physics*. (Oxford University Press, 2010).

44.　Preis, S. G. *et al.* Labyrinth ice pattern formation induced by near-infrared irradiation. *Sci.*
Adv. **5**, (2019).

45.　Siddiqui, K. S. & Cavicchioli, R. Cold-Adapted Enzymes. *Annu. Rev. Biochem.* **75**, 403–
433 (2006).

46.　Hirao, I. *et al.* An unnatural hydrophobic base pair system: Site-specific incorporation of
nucleotide analogs into DNA and RNA. *Nat. Methods* **3**, 729–735 (2006).

47.　Gardner, A. F. *et al.* Therminator DNA Polymerase: Modified nucleotides and unnatural
substrates. *Front. Mol. Biosci.* **6**, 1–9 (2019).

48.　Chen, T. & Romesberg, F. E. Directed polymerase evolution. *FEBS Lett.* **588**, 219–229
(2014).

49.　Xia, G. *et al.* Directed evolution of novel polymerase activities: mutation of a DNA
polymerase into an efficient RNA polymerase. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **99**, 6597–
602 (2002).

50.　 Laos, R., Thomson, J. M. & Benner, S. A. DNA polymerases engineered by directed
evolution to incorporate nonstandard nucleotides. *Front. Microbiol.* **5**, 1–14 (2014).

Figure 1

a

fast

open   closed

activity

Psychrophilic
enzymes?

fidelity

Thermophilic
enzymes?

slow

b

JGI
Integrated microbial genomes

**ATGATCGAT
CGTAGCGG...**

identify psychrophililc
DNA polymerase sequences

codon optimize
for *E. coli* expression

construct in vector
with MBP-tag

express in
cold-adapted *E. coli*

measure

kinetics

HPLC purification
tag-removal

vary reaction temperature

grow at 37°C
induce at 10-16°C

error rate

Figure 2

Figure 3

a

experimental overview

reaction index
UMI
forward primer
test polymerase

vary reaction temperature

243 bp

M13 phage ssDNA template

first strand synthesis

replication error

Q5 high-fidelity polymerase

reverse primer

second strand synthesis

PCR amplify & sequence

computational overview

sequencing or PCR errors

group by UMI

Identify consensus errors & quantify error rate

consensus error

Figure 4

Figure 5

Supplementary Figure 1

Supplementary Figure 2

Table 1. Error rates (per base) for thermophilic DNA polymerases.

Origin	Reaction	Temperature ($^{\circ}$C)	Substitution rate (base^{-1})	Deletion rate (base^{-1})	Insertion rate (base^{-1})
Thermophile	Q5^{NB}	72	4.44×10^{-6}	9.50×10^{-7}	1.37×10^{-7}
	Q5	30	6.04×10^{-6}	7.45×10^{-7}	5.31×10^{-7}
	Q5	72	5.38×10^{-6}	1.56×10^{-7}	5.05×10^{-8}
	Taq	30	6.32×10^{-5}	2.27×10^{-6}	2.01×10^{-6}
	Taq	50	2.18×10^{-4}	2.18×10^{-5}	3.53×10^{-6}
	Phusion^{NB}	30	2.51×10^{-5}	1.82×10^{-8}	8.32×10^{-7}
	Phusion^{NB}	50	8.11×10^{-6}	ND	1.95×10^{-6}
	Phusion^{NB}	72	5.05×10^{-6}	ND	9.30×10^{-8}
	Phusion	30	2.02×10^{-5}	2.32×10^{-6}	4.81×10^{-7}
	Phusion	50	3.64×10^{-5}	2.46×10^{-6}	4.84×10^{-7}
	Phusion	72	1.24×10^{-5}	3.36×10^{-7}	5.11×10^{-7}

[NB]=reaction carried out in native buffer supplied by the manufacturer.

[ND]= Error frequency below the detectable error baseline.

Table 2. Error rates (per base) for psychrophilic DNA polymerases.

Origin	Reaction	Temperature (°C)	Substitution rate (base^{-1})	Deletion rate (base^{-1})	Insertion rate (base^{-1})
Psychrophile	MBP-PIPB	10	9.52×10^{-6}	1.84×10^{-6}	1.26×10^{-6}
	MBP-PIPB	20	2.55×10^{-5}	2.20×10^{-5}	1.09×10^{-6}
	PIPI	10	3.87×10^{-5}	1.48×10^{-6}	1.62×10^{-7}
	PIPI	20	6.34×10^{-5}	4.15×10^{-6}	2.20×10^{-7}
	PIPI	37	1.83×10^{-4}	1.59×10^{-5}	ND
	PIPI	50	2.11×10^{-4}	8.47×10^{-6}	ND

ND= Error frequency below the detectable error baseline.

Table 3. Error rates (per base) for mesophilic DNA polymerases.

Origin	Reaction	Temperature ($^{\circ}$C)	Substitution rate (base^{-1})	Deletion rate (base^{-1})	Insertion rate (base^{-1})
Mesophile	KleExo-	10	4.20×10^{-5}	7.65×10^{-6}	3.38×10^{-7}
	KleExo-	20	6.91×10^{-5}	8.55×10^{-6}	ND
	KleExo-	37	1.07×10^{-3}	1.75×10^{-4}	4.39×10^{-7}
	KleExo-	50	1.38×10^{-3}	1.94×10^{-4}	3.38×10^{-6}
	KleLF	10	8.53×10^{-6}	ND	2.29×10^{-8}
	KleLF	20	1.56×10^{-5}	1.12×10^{-7}	2.14×10^{-7}
	KleLF	37	2.99×10^{-5}	1.20×10^{-7}	1.43×10^{-7}
	KleLF	50	2.00×10^{-5}	ND	5.45×10^{-8}
	T4	10	3.25×10^{-5}	1.32×10^{-6}	2.37×10^{-8}
	T4	37	5.92×10^{-5}	1.17×10^{-6}	ND
	T4	50	1.45×10^{-5}	ND	ND

[ND] = Error frequency below the detectable error baseline.