Autotrophic adaptive laboratory evolution of the acetogen *Clostridium autoethanogenum*

delivers the gas-fermenting strain LAbrini with superior growth, products, and robustness

Henri Ingelman[a,*], James K. Heffernan[b,*], Audrey Harris[c,*], Steven D. Brown[c], Kurshedaktar Majibullah Shaikh[a],

Asfand Yar Saqib[a], Marina J. Pinheiro[a,1], Lorena Azevedo de Lima[a,2], Karen Rodriguez Martinez[b], Ricardo A.

Gonzalez-Garcia[b], Grant Hawkins[c], Jim Daleiden[c], Loan Tran[c], Hunter Zeleznik[c], Rasmus O. Jensen[c], Vinicio

Reynoso[c], Heidi Schindel[c], Jürgen Jänes[d], Séan D. Simpson[c], Michael Köpke[c], Esteban Marcellin[b,#], Kaspar

Valgepea[a,#]

[a]ERA Chair in Gas Fermentation Technologies, Institute of Technology, University of Tartu, 50411 Tartu, Estonia

[b]Australian Institute for Bioengineering and Nanotechnology (AIBN), The University of Queensland, 4072 St. Lucia, Australia

[c]LanzaTech Inc., 60077 Skokie, USA

[d]Institute of Molecular Systems Biology, ETH Zürich, 8049 Zürich, Switzerland

*These authors contributed equally to this work.

[1]Present address: Libbs Farmacêutica, 01140-050 São Paulo, Brazil

[2]Present address: Braskem S/A, 13086-530 Campinas, Brazil

[#]Correspondence: Esteban Marcellin, e.marcellin@uq.edu.au; Kaspar Valgepea, kaspar.valgepea@ut.ee

Running title: Autotrophic adaptive laboratory evolution of an acetogen

ABSTRACT

Microbes able to convert gaseous one-carbon (C1) waste feedstocks are increasingly important to

transition to the sustainable production of renewable chemicals and fuels. Acetogens are interesting

biocatalysts since gas fermentation using *Clostridium autoethanogenum* has already been

commercialised. However, most acetogen strains need complex nutrients, display slow growth, and

are not robust for routine bioreactor fermentations. In this work, we used three different and

independent adaptive laboratory evolution (ALE) strategies to evolve the wild-type *C.*

autoethanogenum to grow faster, without yeast extract and to be robust in operating continuous

bioreactor cultures. Multiple evolved strains with improved phenotypes were isolated on a minimal

medium with one strain, named "LAbrini" (LT1), exhibiting superior performance regarding the

maximum specific growth rate, product profile, and robustness in continuous cultures. Whole-genome

sequencing of the evolved strains identified 25 mutations. Of particular interest are two genes that

acquired seven different mutations across the three ALE strategies, potentially as a result of

convergent evolution. Reverse genetic engineering of sporulation-related mutations in genes

CLAU_3129 (*spo0A*) and CLAU_1957 recovered all three superior features of our ALE strains through

triggering significant proteomic rearrangements. This work provides a robust *C. autoethanogenum*

strain to accelerate phenotyping and genetic engineering and to better understand acetogen

metabolism, which we named "LAbrini".

Keywords: adaptive laboratory evolution, gas fermentation, chemostat, reverse genetic engineering, whole-genome sequencing.

1. INTRODUCTION

One-carbon (C1) gas (CH_4, CO_2, CO) emissions from burning fossil fuels are the main contributors to climate change (1). Alarmingly, this continuing trend might lead to irreversible climate change and a significant loss of biodiversity (2). To tackle and possibly reverse these horrific trends, a circular bioeconomy with decarbonised energy sectors, sustainable chemical and fuel production, and integrated waste management must replace our linear take-make-waste economy (3). While solar and wind are leading the way for decarbonising energy generation, the improvement of various biocatalysts allowing the "up-cycling" of waste C1 feedstocks is considered one of the key strategies for sustainable production of chemicals and fuels towards achieving carbon neutrality (4).

One attractive route toward recycling waste carbon into products is gas fermentation (5). The ideal biocatalysts for this bioprocess are bacteria termed acetogens. Acetogens use the energy-efficient Wood–Ljungdahl pathway (WLP) to fix carbon oxides (CO_2 and CO) into acetyl-CoA from a wide range of feedstocks (6). Notably, the model-acetogen *Clostridium autoethanogenum* is already used in commercial-scale ethanol production (7) and has been successfully piloted for acetone and isopropanol production (8). However, the lack of non-commercial acetogen strains capable of growing on a minimal medium has slowed the understanding of acetogen metabolism and rational metabolic engineering. The strains currently publicly available uptake gas slowly, grow slowly, require yeast extract (YE), and are challenging to run in continuous bioreactor cultures. Minimal growth medium (e.g. without YE) is required for accurate quantification of carbon distribution and metabolic modelling to understand metabolism and predict phenotypes (9, 10). Faster gas uptake and faster growth would speed up the phenotyping and genetic engineering of acetogens (6, 11). A more robust strain in operating continuous bioreactor cultures (12, 13) would ease generating high-quality steady-state data. Also, the use of various *C. autoethanogenum* strains for academic research complicates cross-comparison between laboratories that using a standard and user-friendly strain could homogenise. A publicly available acetogen strain with the above-mentioned improved features would benefit the academic community enormously.

Adaptive laboratory evolution (ALE) is a powerful and elegant approach for obtaining strains with improved traits. Evolution's reliance on natural selection to enrich mutants with increased fitness allows strain optimisation without requiring *a priori* knowledge of the genetic alterations necessary to effect such changes (14). Genes that accumulate mutations across multiple ALEs are under stronger

selection pressure and serve as attractive targets for further genetic engineering studies (15). Such convergent evolution is a fascinating phenomenon where distinct lineages evolve similar traits or functions independently, often in response to analogous environmental challenges. Observing and comparing these adaptations can shed light on the underlying principles of convergent evolution at the molecular and metabolic levels. ALE has recently been used also for engineering and improving autotrophic growth capabilities. For example, ALE was used to convert the natively heterotrophic workhorse microbes *Escherichia coli* (16) and *Pichia pastoris* (17) to CO_2-fixing organisms. In acetogens, ALE has improved tolerance towards methanol in *Sporomusa ovata* (18), cyanide in *Clostridium ljungdahlii* (19), benzene, toluene, and xylenes in *C. autoethanogenum* (20), and acetate in *Clostridium* sp. AWRP (21). ALE was also recently used in *Clostridium carboxidivorans* to expand its product spectrum and improve growth on CO_2+H_2 (22) and in *Eubacterium limosum* for higher CO tolerance and faster growth (23, 24). Additionally, *C. ljungdahlii* and *C. autoethanogenum* have been adapted by continuous bioreactor cultivation to grow without YE (25, 26), but it is not clear if the phenotype was the result of physiological adaptation (i.e. reversible) or evolution (i.e. permanent).

In this work, we used three different and independent ALE strategies across three continents to obtain superior *C. autoethanogenum* strains that can grow faster, without YE on minimal medium, and are robust for operating continuous bioreactor cultures. As a result, multiple evolved strains with improved phenotypes were isolated, with one strain – named "LAbrini" (LT1) – exhibiting superior performance in terms of maximum specific growth rate (μ_{max}), product profile, and robustness in bioreactor cultures. Genome sequencing revealed 25 mutations with two genomic "hot-spot" regions across the evolved strains, and reverse genetic engineering of sporulation-related mutations recovered all three superior features of our ALE strains. This work provides the robust *C. autoethanogenum* strain LAbrini to the academic community to accelerate phenotyping and genetic engineering and facilitate the generation of high-quality steady-state datasets. Additionally, our work showcases the synergistic benefits of ALE, mutation analysis, and reverse engineering for shaping superior gas-fermenting strains.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

2.1. Starting bacterial strain for adaptive laboratory evolution (ALE)

The starting strain for all three ALEs (see next section) was *Clostridium autoethanogenum* strain JA1-1 (27) deposited in the German Collection of Microorganisms and Cell Cultures (DSMZ) as DSM 10061 and stored as a glycerol stock at –80°C.

2.2. Three adaptive laboratory evolution (ALE) workflows

2.2.1. University of Tartu (UT) ALE workflow – bottle ALE on CO

Glycerol stock of DSM 10061 was revived in PETC-MES medium (28) supplemented with 5 g/L of fructose, 1.5 g/L of YE, and 0.4 g/L of cysteine-HCl·H_2O as the reducing agent. Cells were sub-cultured from exponential growth phase into the same medium but with fructose replaced by CO as the carbon source: this culture was Round 1 of UT ALE (Fig. 1a). Cells were then sub-cultured from exponential growth phase to the same medium with CO (Round 2). Starting from Round 3, each round was carried out in 2–4 replicate bottles. The culture with the fastest growth was sub-cultured to the next round from exponential growth phase. During Rounds 3–5, YE was removed from the medium stepwise: first to 0.5 g/L (Round 3), then to 0.05 g/L (Round 4), and no YE starting from Round 5 of UT ALE. Serial sub-culturing was stopped after 35 rounds when the decrease of maximum specific growth rate (μ_{max}) during UT ALE had levelled off (Fig. 1b).

Bottle cultivations were carried out with 50 mL medium in 250 mL Schott bottles incubated horizontally at 37°C with orbital shaking at 120 RPM under strictly anaerobic conditions. Culture bottle headspace was pressurised to 140 kPa with a 60% CO and 40% Ar gas mixture (AS Eesti AGA). Additionally, a "swap ALE" was performed where the culture was transferred between the previous CO mixture and syngas (50% CO, 20% CO_2, 20% H_2, 10% Ar; AS Eesti AGA) (Supplementary Fig. 1). Growth was tracked by measuring culture optical density (OD) at 600 nm. Maximum specific growth rate (μ_{max}) was calculated using 3–5 data points from the exponential phase (except for a few cultures using two data points indicated in Fig. 1b) that yielded a correlation coefficient $R^2 > 0.98$ between culture time and natural logarithm (ln) of OD. At the time of sub-culturing, cultures were sampled for extracellular metabolome analysis and occasionally cryo-preserved in glycerol.

Glycerol stocks made from Round 26 (110 generations; blue marker in Fig. 1b) and 35 (142 generations; yellow marker in Fig. 1b) were used to obtain single colony isolates by plating the mixed populations on Round 1 medium with agar (12 g/L) and incubation at 37°C under autotrophic conditions (same gas mixture as for UT ALE). Ten colonies were screened in bottles under the same conditions as in Round 5 of UT ALE (e.g. CO without YE), and three isolates named UT1 (from Round 26) and UT2 and UT3 (from Round 35) were selected for further characterisation (see below) based on μ_{max}, or ethanol or 2,3-butanediol (2,3-BDO) yields per biomass (see Results for details). The latter yields (mmol of product/gram of dry cell weight [gDCW]) were estimated by linear regression between the respective product (mmol/L) and biomass concentrations (gDCW/L) that were measured during exponential growth phase with correlation coefficients $R^2 > 0.95$.

2.2.2. University of Queensland (UQ) ALE workflow – bottle and bioreactor ALE on syngas

Glycerol stock of DSM 10061 was revived as in Round 1 of UT ALE, and the bottle was pressurised to

125 kPa with CO_2. Cells were sub-cultured in single replicate bottles from the exponential growth

phase into the same medium but with a gradual reduction of fructose (i.e. 2.5, twice 1, and 0 g/L),

with 190 kPa syngas (50% CO, 20% CO_2, 20% H_2, 10% Ar; BOC Australia) replacing the carbon source

(Series 1 of UQ ALE). Next, YE was gradually removed from the medium over 8 bottles (i.e. twice 1.5,

twice 1, 0.5, twice 0.25, and 0 g/L). The first YE-free culture was cryo-preserved before pausing the

ALE experiment (Series 2 of UQ ALE; grey markers in Fig. 1d). The latter glycerol stock was revived in

the same medium as in Round 1 of UT ALE and bottle pressurised to 140 kPa with syngas before sub-

culturing in YE-free medium 3-times with 190 kPa and 4-times with 140 kPa syngas (Series 3 of UQ

ALE; orange markers in Fig. 1d).

Bottle cultivations were carried out with either 25 or 100 mL medium (125 or 500 mL bottles) and

incubated horizontally at 37°C with orbital shaking at 200 RPM under strictly anaerobic conditions. At

the time of sub-culturing, strains were occasionally cryo-preserved. Growth was tracked by measuring

culture OD at 600 nm and μ_{max} was calculated using three data points from the exponential phase that

yielded a correlation coefficient $R^2 > 0.99$ between culture time and ln of OD.

The final culture of Series 3 was used as the inoculum for a bioreactor ALE experiment, where the

culture was grown on syngas predominantly under chemostat operation at pH 5 (29). Other

parameters (e.g. dilution rate, agitation, gas flow rates) were varied based on culture growth (Series

4 of UQ ALE; blue markers in Fig. 1d). After obtaining steady-states at high biomass concentrations

and ~2,300 h of fermentation, the bioreactor culture was plated on solid medium (Round 1 of UT ALE

medium with 12 g/L agar) and incubated at 37°C under autotrophic conditions to obtain single

colonies. Initially, pure CO at 70 kPa was used, but since only a few colonies appeared after 12 days,

the headspace was replaced with syngas, and plates were incubated for an additional 7 days, after

which 12 colonies were screened in bottles under the same conditions as at the end of Series 2 and 3

of UQ ALE (e.g. syngas without YE). Three isolates named UQ1, UQ2, and UQ3 were selected for further

characterisation (see below) based on μ_{max}, or ethanol or 2,3-BDO yields per biomass (see Results for

details). The latter yields (mmol of product/gDCW) were estimated with individual replicate (single

colony revival) product (mmol/L) and biomass concentrations (gDCW/L), measured during the mid-

/late-exponential growth phase.

2.2.3. LanzaTech (LT ALE) workflow – chemical mutagenesis and bioreactor ALE on syngas

Glycerol stock of DSM 10061 was revived in the same medium as in Round 1 of UT ALE and cultured

using anaerobic techniques as described previously (8). Chemical mutagenesis was performed by

growing cells anaerobically in bottles at 37°C with shaking until mid-exponential growth phase and

then exposing cells to the chemical mutagen N-methyl-N'-nitro-N-nitrosoguanidine (NTG) as described

before (30), except that after treatment cells were washed with anaerobic medium lacking YE and

then transferred and cultured in a chemostat. Bioreactor chemostat gas fermentation with

C. autoethanogenum has been described before (8) and for selection and adaptation *via* gas

fermentation no YE was added to the medium. The culture was grown for approximately 50 days to a

final dilution rate (D) of 1 day^{-1} on the gas mixture of 53% CO, 7% H$_2$, 15% CO$_2$, and 25% N$_2$ before

single colony isolation and glycerol stock preparation.

2.3. Characterisation of single colonies from evolved cultures

2.3.1. Bottle experiments

We carried out additional bottle experiments to more accurately characterise the single colonies

isolated from the evolved cultures. We used the same conditions as for Round 5 in UT ALE (e.g. CO

without YE) for UT ALE isolates and LT1 (UT1, UT2, UT3, LT1) and the same conditions as for Series 2

in UQ ALE (i.e., syngas without YE) for UQ ALE isolates and LT1 (UQ1, UQ2, UQ3, LT1). We also cultured

the ALE starting strain JA1-1 for comparison with YE (Round 2 conditions in UT ALE) and without YE

(Round 5 conditions in UT ALE) on CO and syngas with UT ALE cultivation conditions. These cultures

were sampled frequently from the exponential phase to enable a more accurate estimation of μ_{max}

and product yields. μ_{max} was calculated using 3$-$12 data points from the exponential phase that yielded

a correlation coefficient $R^2 > 0.99$ between culture time and ln(OD). Product yields for UT isolates, LT1,

and JA1-1 (mmol of product/gDCW) were estimated as described in section 2.2.1 with correlation

coefficients $R^2 > 0.94$. For UQ isolates and LT1 on syngas, product yields were calculated from the

difference of two time points in mid-exponential growth.

2.3.2. Bioreactor chemostat cultures

Cells were grown either on CO (60% CO and 40% Ar; AS Eesti AGA) for UT1, UT2, UT3, and RE2 (see

below) or syngas (50% CO, 20% H2, 20% CO2, and 10% Ar; AS Eesti AGA) for UQ1 and LT1 in a

chemically defined medium without YE as described before (29). Cells were grown under strictly

anaerobic conditions at 37°C and at pH 5 maintained by 2.5 M or 5 M NH$_4$OH. Chemostat continuous

cultures were performed in 1.4 L Multifors bioreactors (Infors AG) at a working volume of 750 mL

connected to a Hiden HPR-20-QIC mass spectrometer (Hiden Analytical) for online high-resolution off-

gas analysis. The system was equipped with peristaltic pumps; mass flow controllers (MFCs); pH,

oxidation-reduction potential (ORP), and temperature sensors. Antifoam (435530; Sigma-Aldrich) was

continuously added to the bioreactor at 10 µL/h to avoid foaming.

Chemostat cultures were run at D ~0.5, ~1, and ~2 day^{-1} (μ~0.02, ~0.04, and ~0.08 h^{-1}) across

various isolates with variable gas-liquid mass transfer (gas flow rate and agitation) to maintain similar

steady-state biomass concentrations (Table 1). In total, 33 biologically independent steady-states

were achieved after OD, gas uptake and production rates had been stable (<15% variability) for at
least three working volumes. Bioreactor off-gas analysis using a mass spectrometer for determination
of specific gas uptake (CO and H_2) and production rates (CO_2 and ethanol) (mmol/gDCW/day) and
determination of carbon recoveries and balances have been described before (29).

2.4. Biomass concentration analysis

Biomass concentration in gDCW/L was determined by measuring culture OD at 600 nm and using the
correlation coefficient between culture OD and DCW established at 0.23 (UT and LT ALE isolates) or
0.21 (UQ ALE isolates) using the methodology described before (31).

2.5. Extracellular metabolome analysis

Analysis of exo-metabolome was performed using filtered broth samples stored at -20°C until analysis.
Organic acids and alcohols were analysed by HPLC (Shimadzu Prominence-I LC-2030 plus system) using
a Rezex™ ROA-Organic Acids H+ (8%) 300 ×7.8 mm column (00H-0138-K0; Phenomenex) and a guard
column (03B-0138-K0; Phenomenex). Twenty microlitres of the sample were injected using an auto-
sampler and eluted isocratically with 0.5 mM H_2SO4 at 0.6 mL/min for 30 min at 45°C. Compounds
were detected by a refractive index detector (RID-20A; Shimadzu) and identified and quantified using
relevant standards using the software LabSolution (Shimadzu). We note that cells produced 2R,3R-
butanediol.

2.6. Whole-genome sequencing (WGS) and mutation analysis

We performed whole-genome sequencing (WGS) for isolated clones UT1, UT2 and UT3 (UT ALE); UQ1,
UQ2, and UQ3 (UQ ALE); LT1 (LT ALE); and also the ALE starting strain JA1-1 (DSM 10061) to ensure
the accurate determination of mutations that appeared during ALE experiments. Genomic DNA for
sequencing was extracted from exponential phase cultures of UT and UQ isolates using the
MasterPure Gram Positive DNA Purification Kit (MGP04100; Biosearch Technologies) or Qiagen
DNeasy Powersoil Pro Kit (47016; Qiagen) following the manufacturer's instructions. Genomic DNA
for the LT1 strain was extracted with a phenol-chloroform extraction protocol. Purified DNA was
quantified for UT and UQ isolates using the NanoDrop™ 1000 instrument (Thermo Scientific) or the
Qubit 2.0 instrument (Invitrogen). DNA sequencing was performed using the MiSeq v2 Micro 300
cycles sequencing kit (MS-103-1002; Illumina) on the MiSeq sequencer (Illumina) with 2 × 151 bp
paired-end dual indexed (2 × 8 bp) reads or using the Nextera DNA Flex Library Preparation Kit
(20018705; Illumina) on the NovaSeq6000 sequencer (Illumina) with 2 x 150 bp paired-end reads. For
LT1, DNA processing and sequencing was outsourced to third parties to generate 150 bp pair-end

reads using the NovaSeq 6000 Illumina platform and continuous long reads from the PacBio Sequel II
instrument, which were used to produce a genome assembly (see below).

WGS data analysis, including trimming, filtering, mapping assembly, and annotation, was carried
out using the tool breseq version 0.37.0 (32) with default settings for detecting missing coverage
evidence and new sequence junctions and following parameters: limit fold coverage, 500; require
match fraction, 0.95; polymorphism frequency cutoff, 1; polymorphism reject indel homopolymer
length, 0; polymorphism reject surrounding homopolymer length, 0; polymorphism minimum variant
coverage each strand, 1; polymorphism prediction base quality cutoff, 30; polymorphism minimum
total coverage, 2; and polymorphism minimum total coverage each strand, 1. With paired-end read
overlaps ignored, the total genome coverage was 50.78 for LT1, 410.67–551.11 for UQ isolates, 88.35–
92.70 for UT isolates, and 75.30 for JA1-1. Mean mapping quality was 58.99 for LT1, 58.95–59.07 for
UQ isolates, 59.32–59.34 for UT isolates, and 59.3274 for JA1-1. High-quality reads were mapped
against the NCBI reference genome assembly ASM148472v1 (GenBank CP012395.1) for *C.*
autoethanogenum JA1-1 (33). Two mutations were excluded from further analysis as they were
considered non-relevant: one mutation was present in all isolates and the starting strain JA1-1, and
one mutation was present in JA1-1 only.

Additionally, for LT1, the Illumina data was used to polish the PacBio genome assembly with the
Pilon v1.24 tool (34). The polished assembly was deemed to be highly accurate based on the
observation that no 100% frequency variants were predicted by breseq v0.35.1 (32) using the polished
assembly and Illumina data as inputs. The validated LT1 assembly was then deposited to the NCBI
genome submission portal (Genbank CP110420) for annotation with the NCBI Prokaryotic Genome
Annotation Pipeline. See Supplementary Table 1 for a comparison of strain LT1 (LAbrini) gene
identifiers (IDs or locus_tags) with previously published complete assemblies of *C. autoethanogenum*
JA1-1 genome sequences (33, 35).

2.7. Transcriptome analysis of UT isolate bioreactor chemostat cultures

Transcriptome analysis for the steady-state chemostat cultures of UT isolates listed in Table 1 was
performed using RNA sequencing (RNA-seq). In addition, the transcriptome of the non-steady-state
culture of UT2 at D = 1 day^{-1} without apparent "CO toxicity" (end of culture in Supplementary Fig. 2;
see text below for details) was also determined. This enabled the comparison of the transcriptome of
the "CO toxicity" steady-state culture of UT2 at D = 1 day^{-1} with a "non-CO toxicity" culture at the
same D.

Ten millilitres of culture were pelleted by centrifugation (5,000 × g for 3 min at 4°C) and
resuspended in 5 mL of RNAlater (76106; Qiagen). Samples were stored at 4°C overnight, centrifuged
(4,000 × g for 10min at 4°C), and pellets stored at -80°C until RNA extraction. Thawed pellets were

resuspended in RLT buffer (74104; Qiagen) containing β-mercaptoethanol and lysed with acid-washed

glass beads (G4649; Merck) using the Precellys® 24 instrument with liquid nitrogen cooling (Bertin

Technologies). Total RNA was extracted using the RNeasy mini kit (74104, Qiagen) with off-column

TURBO^TM DNase treatment (AM2239; Invitrogen), followed by purification and enrichment using the

RNA Clean and Concentrator^TM kit (R1018, Zymo). The efficiency of the total RNA purification and DNA

removal was verified using the NanoDrop^TM 1000 instrument (Thermo Scientific) and the quality of

RNA extracts was checked using the TapeStation 2200 equipment (Agilent Technologies). Total RNA

concentration was determined using the Qubit 2.0 instrument (Q32866; Invitrogen). Next, ribosomal

RNA (rRNA) was removed using the QIAseq FastSelect −5S/16S/23S Kit (335925; Qiagen) and stranded

mRNA libraries were prepared using the QIAseq Stranded RNA Lib Kit (180743; Qiagen). RNA

sequencing was performed using the NextSeq MID150 sequencing kit (20024904; Illumina) on the

NextSeq500 sequencer (Ilumina) with 2 x 75 bp paired-end dual indexed (2 x 8 bp) reads.

The quality of raw NextSeq reads was verified using MultiQC (36) and adapter sequences were

trimmed using the Cutadapt Python package (version 2.10; (37)) allowing a minimum read length of

35 nt. The resulting high-quality paired-end reads were mapped to the NCBI reference genome

assembly ASM148472v1 (GenBank CP012395.1) for *C. autoethanogenum* JA1-1 (33) using the align

function within Rsubread package (version 2.4.2; (38)). Then, four .bam files per sample were merged

using Samtools (version 1.10; (39)) and genomic features were assigned using the featureCounts

functions within Rsubread. Transcript abundances were determined as described before (29). Genes

were determined to be differentially expressed by fold-change > 1.5 and q-value < 0.05 after false

discovery rate correction (FDR) (40) (Supplementary Table 2). RNA-seq data has been deposited in the

NCBI Gene Expression Omnibus repository under accession number GSE225123.

2.8. Reverse genetic engineering of mutations in JA1-1

The detailed steps of our CRISPR/Cas9-aided homologous recombination workflow for genetic

engineering include designing and selecting sgRNAs, plasmid construction and electroporation into *C.*

autoethanogenum JA1-1, screening and plasmid curing, and confirmation of transformants were

described before (28). Briefly, the homology arms (HAs) for the CLAU_3129 (*spo0A*) deletion plasmid

were obtained by PCR amplifying the 1 kb upstream and downstream regions of the *spo0A* gene. The

derived 5' and 3' HA fragments were fused using overlap extension PCR and moved into the backbone

plasmid to create an intermediate plasmid pGFT104. Two unique sgRNAs targeting the *spo0A* gene

were selected and cloned into plasmid pGFT104 using a quick-change PCR protocol (41), resulting in

plasmids pGFT106 and pGFT107. Nine transformant colonies were screened altogether and the

selected isolate named RE1. A similar approach was employed for constructing the plasmid (pGFT088)

for generating the SNP in CLAU_1957 (mutation #10 in UT1), wherein the HAs arms were obtained by

PCR amplifying the 1kb upstream and downstream regions of the target nucleotide and the SNP was

incorporated into the HAs using the quick-change PCR protocol. Only one sgRNA was identified and

used where the SNP was part of the PAM sequence, thus disrupting it after homologous recombination

to prevent Cas9 from cleaving the target site again. Seven transformant colonies were screened and

the selected isolate was named RE2. Supplementary Table 3 lists the primers used and Supplementary

Table 4 the strains and plasmids used or constructed in the genetic engineering part of the current

study. See Supplementary File 1 (pGFT106), Supplementary File 2 (pGFT107), and Supplementary File

3 (pGFT088) for plasmid maps.

Growth characterisation of the reverse engineered strains RE1 and RE2 was carried out as

described in section 2.3. For autotrophic bottle cultures, strains were grown using same conditions as

for Round 5 in UT ALE and for RE1 additionally on syngas. Correlation coefficient R^2 values for μ_{max} and

product yield calculations were in the same limits as stated in section 2.3.1 with the exception of the

acetate yield for one RE1 CO culture being $R^2 = 0.9$.

2.9. Proteome analysis of reverse engineered strains and JA1-1

Proteome analysis was carried out from three bioreplicate cultures for each of the two reverse

engineered strains RE1 and RE2, and JA1-1. Strains were grown using UT ALE cultivation conditions on

syngas and medium of Round 2 in UT ALE (with YE). Cultures were sampled at OD~0.4 and μ_{max} was

calculated using 4–5 data points from the exponential phase that yielded a correlation coefficient R^2

> 0.98 between culture time and ln of OD.

Sampling, sample preparation, LC-MS/MS analysis using data-independent acquisition (DIA), and

DIA MS data analysis were performed as described before (28). Briefly, cell pellets were treated with

a chaotrope-based lysis buffer and bead beating, lysates alkylated and processed, and proteins

digested. Peptides were then analysed on a Ultimate 3500 RSLCnano system (Dionex) and a Q-Exactive

HF (Thermo Fisher Scientific) mass spectrometer. Analysis of DIA MS data was performed using the

DIA-NN software suite (42) and the protein sequence database of assembly ASM148472v1 for *C.*

autoethanogenum JA1-1 (NCBI Genbank CP012395.1) (33). This allowed us to confidently quantitate

31,449 peptides and 2,257 proteins across all samples, and 27,030 peptides and 2,152 proteins on

average within each sample after removing shared peptides from analysis.

Protein expression fold-changes (FC) with q-values between RE1 and JA1-1, and RE2 and JA1-1

were determined using the software Perseus (43) with Student's T-test. Only proteins quantified with

at least two peptides (2,215 across all samples) were used to ensure higher quantification accuracy.

Proteins were considered to be differentially expressed by a FC > 2 and a q-value < 0.05 after FDR

correction (40). Differentially expressed proteins are presented in Supplementary Table 5. Proteomics

data have been deposited to the ProteomeXchange Consortium

(http://proteomecentral.proteomexchange.org) via the PRIDE partner repository (44) with the data
set identifier PXD047330.

2.10.   Sporulation tests for reverse engineered strains and JA1-1

Autotrophic cultures for sporulation tests were the same as described for proteome analysis while
heterotrophic cultures were grown in 10 mL of YTF (28) in 50ml serum bottles and incubated
horizontally at 37°C with orbital shaking at 120 RPM under strictly anaerobic conditions. Samples from
the stationary phase during ~40 and ~20 days of autotrophic and heterotrophic incubation,
respectively, were observed on glass slips covered with an agarose pad using phase-contrast
microscopy (Zeiss Observer Z1) at ×1000 magnification. Heterotrophic cultures were also plated
before and after heat-shock (bottles stored for 10 min in a 80°C water bath) on YTF agar (28) and
plates were photographed after colonies appeared in 7-8 days.

3. RESULTS

3.1. Autotrophic adaptive laboratory evolution (ALE) of *Clostridium autoethanogenum* JA1-1 for improved growth phenotypes

Three different autotrophic ALE strategies were employed across three facilities (Fig. 1a; see Materials
and Methods for details) to improve the wild-type *Clostridium autoethanogenum* JA1-1 strain's
growth phenotype. For the ALE experiment at the University of Tartu (UT ALE), serial propagation of
batch bottle cultures was employed for 142 generations with the gradual removal of YE at the start.
For the ALE experiment done at The University of Queensland (UQ ALE), firstly, serial propagation of
batch cultures in serum bottles for 107 generations was used with the gradual removal of YE at the
start. After that, the evolved population was transferred into a continuous bioreactor culture, where
it was grown for another 109 generations without YE. Moreover, for the third ALE experiment done
at LanzaTech, Inc. (LT ALE), cells from a bottle culture were exposed to the chemical mutagen NTG
after which the culture was transferred into a continuous bioreactor culture and grown without YE for
~50 days. The UT ALE experiment was conducted on CO, while the LT and UQ ALE experiments were
done on syngas (CO, CO_2, H_2).

Fig. 1. Autotrophic adaptive laboratory evolution (ALE) of *Clostridium autoethanogenum* JA1-1 for improved growth phenotypes executed with three strategies across three facilities. (a) Overview of the different ALE strategies employed. See text for details. Created with BioRender.com. (b) Change of maximum specific growth rate (μ_{max}) with batch culture generations during UT ALE on CO. Blue and yellow circles denote cultures used for isolating single colonies (see text for details). For cultures with generations ~43, ~48, ~96, and ~105, μ_{max} was calculated using two data points from the exponential phase instead of using 3–5 data points as for the rest. (c) Change of acetate/ethanol (Cmol) with μ_{max} in combined batch data from UT (UT ALE and UT "swap ALE"; see text for details). (d) Change of μ_{max} in batch or dilution rate (D) in bioreactor (BR) continuous cultures with culture generations during UQ ALE on syngas. (e) Change of acetate/ethanol, biomass concentration (biomass), and D over fermentation time during the continuous culture of UQ ALE on syngas. Numbers next to triangles (panel b) or circles (panel d) denote yeast extract (YE) concentrations. gDCW, gram of dry cell weight.

In UT ALE, serial propagation of CO bottle cultures allowed the YE in the media to be removed stepwise by the fourth subculture (Fig. 1b). Notably, a sudden ~2-fold increase of μ_{max} was observed during YE removal for the third sub-culture (first bottle with reduced YE, 0.5 g/L). The population reached its peak μ_{max} of 0.10 h^{-1} (~4.6-fold higher compared to the start) by the ~93rd generation, after which a declining μ_{max} trend was observed (Supplementary Fig. 3). This phenomenon was previously observed when carrying out ALE under stable conditions (45, 46). We also tested if higher μ_{max} values could be reached when transferring the ALE culture between CO and syngas ("UT swap ALE"), but this did not occur (Supplementary Fig. 1). Intriguingly, combined data from UT (UT ALE and "UT swap ALE") revealed a declining trend of the acetate/ethanol ratio with faster growth (Fig. 1c).

In UQ ALE, the experiment was started with four fructose batch cultures and then transferred to
syngas bottles with stepwise removal of YE (Fig. 1d). The increase of μ_{max} during YE removal was not
as abrupt as in UT ALE but the increasing trend was clear and the final batch bottle culture with ~107
generations reached a μ_{max} of 0.08 h^{-1} (~3.2-fold higher compared to first syngas bottle). Then, the
evolved population was transferred to a chemostat bioreactor system where additional selective
pressure was applied by changing the dilution rate (D; i.e. μ under steady-state) for ~109 generations.
We obtained a stable culture at high biomass concentrations and D = 1.8 day^{-1} (μ = 0.08 h^{-1}) and the
UQ ALE bioreactor culture seemed to excrete less acetate compared to ethanol with faster growth
above D = 1 day^{-1} (Fig. 1e).

In LT ALE, *C. autoethanogenum* was first treated with the chemical mutagen NTG during growth
with YE after which the culture was used to inoculate a continuous bioreactor culture to a final D of 1
day^{-1} without YE for ~50 days (Fig. 1a). For all the three ALE strategies, ALEs were terminated once
significant changes in evolving population phenotypes were no longer observed (e.g. μ_{max} and
maximum biomass in bottle cultures, gas data in continuous cultures).

3.2. Isolated ALE clones exhibit enhanced growth characteristics and metabolite production patterns

Next, we plated the evolved mixed populations to isolate single clones for detailed characterisation
and for evaluating the level of phenotypic heterogeneity within the mixed populations. For UT ALE,
we isolated clones from both the culture with peak μ_{max} of ~0.10 (blue marker in Fig. 1b) and the last
ALE bottle with lower μ_{max} (yellow marker in Fig. 1b). Ten colonies were isolated for both UT and UQ
ALE, respectively, for preliminary comparison of growth and by-product patterns in batch cultures
with the same gas and media as in ALE. Notably, all isolates could be grown without the presence of
YE, thus fulfilling the first aim of our work. For UT ALE, we expected that isolates from the peak μ_{max}
population (blue marker) would grow faster than isolates from the last slower-growing population
(yellow marker): this was not, however, observed (Supplementary Fig. 4a). Variability in μ_{max} of UQ
ALE isolate batch cultures was also seen (Supplementary Fig. 4b). Similarly, phenotypic heterogeneity
in terms of by-product patterns within isolates of both UT and UQ ALE was observed (Supplementary
Fig. 4c-d). In particular, some isolates of UT ALE showed lower acetate/ethanol ratios, while three
isolates from UQ ALE with high ethanol production were detected. As a result, three isolates from
both UT (UT1, UT2, UT3) and UQ ALE (UQ1, UQ2, UQ3) were selected for further detailed
characterisation based on μ_{max} and intriguing metabolite production patterns in the preliminary screen
(indicated with asterisks on Supplementary Fig. 4). From LT ALE, one isolate termed LT1 was selected
for further study.

We grew the seven selected isolates in autotrophic batch bottle cultures without YE with frequent

sampling to more accurately compare growth and by-product patterns. UT and UQ ALE isolates were

grown on the gas they were evolved on, CO and syngas, respectively; the isolate obtained through

chemical mutagenesis – LT1 – was grown on both. For comparison, the starting wild-type strain for all

ALE strategies – *C. autoethanogenum* JA1-1 – was also cultured on both gases but with YE

supplementation as we could not observe growth on CO without YE after 520 h. On CO, isolate UT3

had the highest μ_{max} (0.08 h^{-1}) among UT ALE while LT1 showed the fastest growth on CO with a μ_{max}

of 0.10 h^{-1} (Fig. 2a). In comparison, the starting ALE strain JA1-1 showed a μ_{max} of 0.02 h^{-1} (with YE)

that is ~2- to ~4-fold lower than all the evolved isolates tested on CO. During growth on syngas, UQ1,

UQ3, and LT1 showed similar growth (μ_{max} ~0.08 h^{-1}) that was ~1.3- and ~3-fold higher than for UQ2

and JA1-1 (with YE), respectively (Fig. 2b). All evolved isolates grew faster than the starting strain, thus

fulfilling the second aim of our work of obtaining faster-growing strains.

Fig. 2. Autotrophic characterisation of selected isolates from UT, UQ, and LT ALE, and the wild-type *C. autoethanogenum*

starting strain of ALE (JA1-1) in batch cultures. (a) Maximum specific growth rate (μ_{max}) of UT and LT ALE isolates and JA1-1

in CO batch cultures. (b) μ_{max} of UQ and LT ALE isolate LT1 and JA1-1 in syngas batch cultures. (c) Production yields

(mmol/gDCW) of growth by-products and acetate/ethanol (Cmol) of UT and LT ALE isolate LT1 and JA1-1 in CO batch cultures.

(d) Production yields (mmol/gDCW) of growth by-products and acetate/ethanol of UQ and LT ALE isolate LT1 in syngas batch

cultures. All data for UT, UQ, and LT1 are from yeast extract (YE)-free medium, JA1-1 data are from medium with YE. Bars

show average ± standard deviation between bioreplicates, except for LT1 production yields (two bioreplicates). gDCW, gram

of dry cell weight; 2,3-BDO, 2,3-butanediol.

Frequent sampling also enabled us to accurately determine production yields (mmol/gDCW) for

the detected growth by-products acetate, ethanol, and 2,3-BDO. Notably, the lowest acetate/ethanol

ratios were detected on CO for isolates LT1 (0.27) and UT1 (0.32) that were ~4- and ~3-fold lower than

for JA1-1 (1.05) (Fig. 2c). While UT1 showed the highest ethanol production yield with the lowest μ_{max}

of the evolved strains, the fastest growing UT ALE isolate UT3 showed the highest acetate production

yield and acetate/ethanol of 4.14 (Fig. 2a and c). The production yield of 2,3-BDO was the highest for

LT1, making the strain overall the most favourable on CO in terms of reduced by-products (Fig. 2c).

Importantly, LT1 demonstrated preferable metabolite production also during growth on syngas in

comparison with UQ isolates (Fig. 2d): it showed a >6-fold higher ethanol production yield with the

lowest acetate production yield, translating into a low acetate/ethanol ratio of 0.10. UQ1 and LT1

showed the highest 2,3-BDO production yields. Interestingly, higher acetate production yields for UT

and UQ isolates correlate well with higher μ_{max}. At the same time, LT1 achieves fast growth with

significantly lower acetate production (Supplementary Fig. 5). These extracellular metabolomics data

support the notion that evolving acetogens in the presence of C1 substrates trigger rearrangements

in central carbon metabolism (18).

3.3. **Bioreactor continuous gas fermentation cultures show the superiority of isolate LT1**

We next tested the performance and robustness of all UT ALE isolates, LT1, and UQ1 in continuous

gas fermentation bioreactor as this is the industrially relevant condition (7). Steady-state continuous

cultures also provide the necessary data to describe the cell's physiological state (e.g., μ, gas uptake,

by-products, carbon distribution) (47). In total, 33 biologically independent steady-states were

achieved across chemostat cultures for strains grown on CO or syngas at D ranging from ~0.5 to ~2

day^{-1} (D = μ at steady-state) (Table 1).

Table 1. Summary of 33 steady state chemostat cultures of UT, LT1, and UQ1 isolates.

Strain	Feed gas	Gas flow rate (mL/min)	Agitation (RPM)	D (day $^{-1}$)	Biomass concentration (gDCW/L)	Number of replicates
UT2	CO	35	690	1.00 ± 0.00	0.52 ± 0.03	3
UT3*	CO	28	570	0.49 ± 0.01	1.03 ± 0.15	3
UT1	CO	28	570	0.53 ± 0.00	1.13 ± 0.06	3
UT2	CO	24	570	0.52 ± 0.01	0.88 ± 0.09	4
LT1	Syngas	50	675	0.99 ± 0.04	1.41 ± 0.09	4
LT1	Syngas	72	800	1.97 ± 0.11	1.50 ± 0.07	4
LT1	Syngas	35	525	0.50 ± 0.06	0.42 ± 0.05	2
UQ1	Syngas	35	525	0.50 ± 0.06	0.47 ± 0.05	2
RE2	CO	21	570	0.50 ± 0.02	0.97 ± 0.12	4
RE2	CO	45	680	0.96 ± 0.01	1.66 ± 0.07	4

We initially aimed to run all strains at D = 1 day^{-1} but failed after multiple attempts to obtain

steady-state at D = 1 day^{-1} on CO for UT2 at CO uptake rates (COUR) of ~1200 mmol/L/day and biomass

concentrations of ~1.5 gDCW/L. We did obtain steady-state at D = 1 day^{-1} for UT2 at COUR ~400

mmol/L/day, and interestingly CO uptake could only be increased after strongly decreasing the CO%

in the bioreactor headspace through changing gas-liquid mass transfer (Supplementary Fig. 2;

between ~380 to ~440 h), but no steady-state was obtained. Thus UT2 might have struggled due to

CO toxicity. For this "CO toxicity" steady-state of UT2 at D = 1 day^{-1} (Table 1; up to ~380 h on

Supplementary Fig. 2), transcriptome analysis revealed a starkly different transcriptional profile

compared to all other cultures (Supplementary Fig. 6). The transcriptional profile was also very distinct

from the unstable "non-CO toxicity" phase of the same culture operated at same D (from ~480 h on

Supplementary Fig. 2). Notably, we detected strong up-regulation of numerous hypothetical, putative

membrane, and sporulation-related proteins and down-regulation of the HytA-E/FdhA complex

components (Supplementary Table 2). After these challenges with UT2 cultures and gas uptake with

UQ1 at D = 1 day^{-1}, we used D = 0.5 day^{-1} to compare strains across gases.

For UT3 though, we could obtain steady-state data at D = 0.5 day^{-1} only regarding gas uptake and

production since acetate and ethanol production were highly sensitive to any operational activities to

the culture (e.g. halting agitation for a volume check, sampling 1% of culture volume). Furthermore,

adjustment of gas-liquid mass transfer was needed even after obtaining target agitation and gas flow

(Fig. 3). In striking comparison, operating LT1 cultures was straightforward. Thus we additionally

achieved steady-states at D = 1 and 2 day^{-1} at high COUR and biomass concentrations (Fig. 3). The

COUR for LT1 growing on syngas at D = 1 day^{-1} is triple of the steady-state value of UT2 on CO

(Supplementary Fig. 7). Moreover, faster gas-liquid mass transfer ramping and higher Ds also meant

that two steady-states were achieved for LT1 with half the time it took to achieve one steady-state for

UT3 (Fig. 3). The robustness of LT1 is highly relevant for the acetogen gas fermentation field as it makes

it significantly less challenging to operate continuous gas fermentation cultures to obtain high-quality

data. Thus a robust strain for bioreactor continuous gas fermentation was obtained that fulfils the

third aim of our work.

Fig. 3. Robustness of strain LT1 in terms of operation of bioreactor continuous gas fermentation cultures. LT1 data are for the chemostats that achieved steady-states at specific growth rates (μ) of 1 and 2 day^{-1}. See Table 1 for more details on LT1 and UT3 chemostats. COUR, CO uptake rate (mmol/L/day); RPM, rounds per minute.

A comparison of steady-state data from the bioreactor runs demonstrates that various metabolic rearrangements took place during the three ALE strategies (Fig. 4). Different from the batch data (Fig. 2), UT strains showed similar growth characteristics in CO chemostats (D = 0.5 day^{-1}) except for 2,3-BDO production (Fig. 4). While the acetate concentration for UT2 was lower most likely due to lower biomass concentration (Fig. 4a), specific by-product production rates (Fig. 4b) and specific gas rates (Fig. 4c) showed similar values, except for the specific production rate of 2,3-BDO ($q_{2,3-BDO}$; mmol/gDCW/day). Chemostat results were different from batch data also when comparing UQ1 and LT1 in syngas chemostats at D = 0.5 day^{-1} (Fig. 4). The two strains showed very similar performance at the same D both in terms of by-product production and gas uptake and production. Notably, LT1 outperformed all strains concerning acetate/ethanol ratios by showing values <1 at D = 1 and 2 day^{-1} (Fig. 4a). The ability to achieve higher biomass concentrations for LT1 D = 1 and 2 day^{-1} cultures also translated into the highest ethanol and 2,3-BDO levels (Fig. 4a) and due to faster growth also to higher specific production rates (q_{EtOH} and $q_{2,3-BDO}$) (Fig. 4b). LT1 cultures at D = 1 and 2 day^{-1} also show the highest carbon flux to the reduced ethanol and 2,3-BDO products across the various strains and steady-states (Fig. 5). Similarly to the latter strain, the specific H$_2$ uptake rate (q_{H2}) for LT1 did not increase proportionally with D (Fig. 4c), suggesting another avenue for improving *C. autoethanogenum* performance through ALE, i.e. improving H$_2$ uptake.

Fig. 4. Characterisation of selected isolates from UT, UQ, and LT ALE in autotrophic chemostat cultures. (a) Biomass and by-

product concentrations and acetate/ethanol (Ace/EtOH). (b) Specific by-product production rates (mmol/gDCW/day). (c)

Specific gas uptake (CO, H_2) and production (CO_2) rates. CO chemostat data for UT1 and UT2 are from dilution rate (D) 0.5

day^{-1}; for syngas chemostat data, the number following D denotes D value in day^{-1}. UT3 reached steady-state only regarding

gas uptake and production. Bars show average ± standard deviation between four (UT2, LT1 D1, LT1 D2), three (UT1), or two

(UQ1 D0.5, LT1 D0.5) bioreplicates. See Table 1 for details. gDCW, gram of dry cell weight; 2,3-BDO, 2,3-butanediol; q, specific

rate.

Fig. 5. Carbon balances of selected isolates from UT, UQ, and LT ALE in autotrophic chemostat cultures. The number following

D (dilution rate) denotes D value in day^{-1}. Carbon flow into CO_2 for UQ1 D0.5 and LT1 D0.5 were calculated by subtracting

measured carbon flows into other products and biomass from 100%. Carbon recoveries for UT strains and LT D1 and D2 were

normalised to 100% to have a fair comparison of carbon distributions between different conditions. Bars show average ±

standard deviation between four (UT2, LT1 D1, LT1 D2), three (UT1), or two (UQ1 D0.5, LT1 D0.5) bioreplicates. See Table 1

for details. 2,3-BDO, 2,3-butanediol.

The evolved strain LT1 fulfilled all the aims of our work to create an improved model-acetogen

strain available to the public: it grows without complex nutrients on minimal medium, shows high gas

uptake enabling faster growth, and is robust in terms of operating continuous bioreactor gas

fermentation cultures. Additionally, the metabolic feature of high carbon flux into reduced growth by-

products makes LT1 an attractive chassis for metabolic engineering. We have thus deposited the LT1

strain at the DSMZ strain collection (DSM 115981) for public use and propose to make it the model-

acetogen strain named *C. autoethanogenum* LAbrini (i.e. Laboratory Adapted Abrini). The improved

characteristics of LAbrini hold promise for speeding up phenotyping and engineering of acetogens. For

example, we currently map genotype-phenotype links for every gene in LAbrini using a systems-level

approach.

3.4. **Genetic mutations associated with improved phenotypes**

We next used whole-genome DNA sequencing (WGS) to identify genetic mutations during the three

ALE strategies, which may have led to different phenotypes. WGS data also allows the comparison of

genetic variability between the evolved strains. We sequenced the starting strain JA1-1 and seven key

evolved strains (UT1, UT2, UT3, UQ1, UQ2, UQ3, and LT1) and performed mutation analysis after high-

quality genome assemblies (see Material and Methods). The starting strain for our three ALE strategies

was sequenced to ensure we reliably detected genetic mutations that appeared during ALE instead of

relying only on the published genome sequences for *C. autoethanogenum* JA1-1 (33, 35).

In total, 25 mutations were detected across the evolved strains, with 21 affecting protein-coding

sequences (CDSs) (Fig. 6; Supplementary Table 6). 17 of the 25 mutations were single nucleotide

polymorphisms (SNPs). Eight were deletions, while four being ≥ 168 bp (Fig. 6b). Two hot-spots were

detected in the genome that accrued mutations during multiple ALE strategies: mutations #19–23

around genome position 548,800 (all in the same CDS) and mutations #4–5 around position 3,469,400

(both in the same CDS) (Fig. 6). These two genes are examples of convergent evolution under stronger

autotrophic selection pressure across different ALE strategies. Principal component analysis (PCA) of

all the WGS data confirmed that strains isolated from the same population (from UT or UQ ALE) are

closely related (Supplementary Fig. 8). Comparison of the genomes of the superior strain LT1 and

starting strain JA1-1 showed similar but not identical values: length of 4,349,910 nt, 3,942 CDSs, and

31.1% GC content for LT1; and 4,352,446 nt; 3,964 CDSs; 31.1% GC content for JA1-1.

Strain	Mut#	Position	Mutation	FC	AAC	Gene ID	Description of protein product
LT1	1.	4,203,213	Δ2,717 bp	CDS		CLAU_3832-3830	Pyrimidine-nucleoside phosphorylase (3832); phosphopentomutase (3831); nucleoside transporter domain protein (3830)
	5.	3,469,046	C→A	CDS	A11E	CLAU_3129	Sporulation transcriptional activator Spo0A
	13.	1,744,062	G→T	CDS	*401L	CLAU_1579	Carbon-monoxide dehydrogenase (acceptor)
	14.	1,651,616	G→T	CDS	S207I	CLAU_1506	Ribonuclease PH
	25.	81,706	A→G	NC			
UT shared	3.	3,533,188	G→A	CDS	E194K	CLAU_3194	Histidine kinase
	9.	2,333,941	G→T	NC			
	16.	1,323,289	T→C	NC			
UT1	10.	2,150,981	G→A	CDS	G94D	CLAU_1957	Two component transcriptional regulator winged helix family
	19.	549,451	Δ231 bp	CDS		CLAU_0471	Amino acid permease
UT2	11.	2,146,875	(A)9→8	CDS		CLAU_1953	Transcription-repair coupling factor
	23.	548,344	G→T	CDS	E392*	CLAU_0471	Amino acid permease
UT3	7.	2,605,812	G→A	CDS	G87R	CLAU_2375	Putative signal transduction protein with CBS and DRTGG domain-containing protein
	22.	548,364	Δ527 bp	CDS		CLAU_0471	Amino acid permease
UQ shared	4.	3,469,766	C→A	CDS	P251H	CLAU_3129	Sporulation transcriptional activator Spo0A
	12.	2,083,514	(CAGCAC)2→1	CDS		CLAU_1904	Ribosomal protein S12
	24.	86,954	(T)8→7	NC			
UQ1	6.	3,426,938	Δ168 bp	CDS		CLAU_3080-3079	Pseudouridine synthase (3080); lipoprotein signal peptidase (3079)
	15.	1,565,636	G→T	CDS	K56N	CLAU_1423	Ferric uptake regulator Fur family
	17.	1,200,575	C→A	CDS	A54E	CLAU_1076	Cobalamin synthesis protein cbiG
	18.	733,832	(18-bp)5→2	CDS		CLAU_0649	Putative secreted protein containing bacterial Ig-like domain
	21.	548,603	T→G	CDS	C305W	CLAU_0471	Amino acid permease
UQ2	8.	2,414,456	A→G	CDS	T25A	CLAU_2202	Transcriptional regulator AbrB family
	21.	548,603	T→G	CDS	C305W	CLAU_0471	Amino acid permease
UQ3	2.	3,683,989	C→A	CDS	S195Y	CLAU_3345	Methyl-accepting chemotaxis protein
	8.	2,414,456	A→G	CDS	T25A	CLAU_2202	Transcriptional regulator AbrB family
	20.	549,237	G→A	CDS	W94*	CLAU_0471	Amino acid permease

Fig. 6. Whole-genome sequencing of the selected isolates from UT, UQ, and LT ALE and identified mutations relative to the wild-type *C. autoethanogenum* starting strain of ALE (JA1-1). (a) Distribution of the identified 25 mutations across the circular genome of JA1-1. The number denotes mutation shown in panel b (column Mut#) and colour matches the shading of mutation in panel b (exceptions are black numbers with white shading in panel b). Yellow layers are protein-coding sequences (CDS) on forward (inner) and reverse (outer) strands. (b) Details of the 25 mutations identified in the seven ALE strains. Mutations with colour shading appeared in the same genes across multiple ALE strategies, i.e. convergent mutations, while the non-convergent mutation in bold font (#8) appeared in two isolates within one ALE strategy (details shown only for the first occurrence); shading colours match colour of numbers (Mut#) on panel a. The bases within the parentheses in column "Mutation" denote the repeat sequence that decreased from the number of repeats indicated on the left of the arrow (→) to the number indicated on the right. See Supplementary Table 6 for additional details on mutations. Mut#, mutation number; FC, feature class; AAC, amino acid change; Gene ID, gene identifier; SNP, single nucleotide polymorphism; Δ, deletion; NC, non-coding; *, stop codon.

The first hot-spot at ~548,800 position is a proposed amino acid permease (CLAU_0471; function predicted based on conserved domain PotE) that was affected by two deletions and three different SNPs: one 231 bp deletion in UT1 and one 527 bp deletion in UT3; two hits in UQ isolates and one in UT2 (mutations #19–23 in Fig. 6b and Supplementary Table 6). Interestingly, nucleotides in the ALE starting strain JA1-1 at these three SNP positions of CLAU_0471 are fully conserved across homologs of Clostridia species (Supplementary Fig. 9). The second hot-spot at position ~3,469,400 is the sporulation transcription factor *spo0A* (CLAU_3129) that was affected by a G-to-T SNP at two different locations in UQ and LT ALE (mutations #4–5 in Fig. 6b and Supplementary Table 6). Similarly to the mutations in the first hot-spot (Supplementary Fig. 9), nucleotides in the starting strain JA1-1 at both

positions of the second hot-spot are highly conserved across homologs of Clostridia species

(Supplementary Fig. 10). UQ1 acquired a 168 bp deletion (mutation #6) across genes encoding for a

lipoprotein signal peptidase (CLAU_3079) and a pseudouridine synthase (CLAU_3080) that are

involved in sporulation (48) and pyrimidine metabolism, respectively (Fig. 6b and Supplementary Table

6). Interestingly, the latter gene was upregulated under butanol stress in a *spo0A* overexpression

mutant strain in *Clostridium acetobutylicum* (49). Pyrimidine metabolism seems to have played an

important role in improving strain phenotypes in our ALE approaches as the large 2,717 bp deletion in

LT1 (mutation #1) resulted in the deletion of two genes (CLAU_3830 and 3831) and truncation of one

gene (CLAU_3832) that are associated with pyrimidine metabolism (Fig. 6b and Supplementary Table

6).

Among the other spatially dispersed mutations in the genome, the mutation potentially most

relevant to the improved phenotype of LT1 is a SNP (mutation #13) in the carbon monoxide

dehydrogenase gene AcsA (CLAU_1579) that encodes for the CODH subunit of the CODH/acetyl-CoA

synthase (ACS) protein complex (Fig. 6b and Supplementary Table 6). Mutation #13 removes the AcsA

stop codon, resulting in a putative translational fusion product. Interestingly, while NTG treatment

during LT ALE did not result in significantly more mutations for LT1 than what appeared during UT and

UQ ALE, all but one mutation appeared in unique genes compared to UT and UQ strains (Fig. 6b). The

only CDS mutation (#3) present in all UT ALE strains was found in a predicted histidine kinase

(CLAU_3194), which is interesting as some histidine kinases regulate sporulation and metabolism in

Clostridia (50). Notably, one SNP appeared during UQ ALE in a usually highly conserved position in

Clostridia species (Supplementary Fig. 11) - mutation #8 in an AbrB family transcriptional regulator

(CLAU_2202) (Fig. 6b and Supplementary Table 6). Interestingly, CLAU_2202 is among the top 100

abundant proteins in *C. autoethanogenum* (51). Other potentially relevant mutations in CDSs

appeared in a ribosomal protein S12 (mutation #12), and transcription-associated genes (mutations

#10, #11, and #15). A homolog of the Ferric uptake regulator of Fur family (CLAU_1423) that acquired

mutation #15 in our work – the putative transcriptional regulator PerR – has acquired numerous

mutations within the ALE experiments compiled in the ALEdb database (52). Future advances in

quantifying genotype-to-phenotype links in acetogens will assist in interpreting the genetic changes

we detected and improve experimental evidence-based (vs. computationally derived) annotation of

C. autoethanogenum genome.

3.5. Reverse genetic engineering recovers superior features of our ALE strains

The causality of mutations observed during ALE can be evaluated by reconstructing the genetic

modifications in the starting strain of ALE, i.e. using reverse genetic engineering. Observation of

convergent evolution by appearance of mutations in *spo0A* during both LT and UQ ALE (Fig. 6b) is likely

significant due to the role of *spo0A* as a master regulator of sporulation and solventogenesis in

Clostridia (53–56). Interestingly, mutation #10 observed during UT ALE (in UT1) occurred in a two-

component transcriptional regulator CLAU_1957 (based on GenBank CP012395.1 annotation; (33))

that could be potentially involved in sporulation processes (e.g. phosphorelay, sporulation activator;

(57)) based on predictions using protein sequence or structure homology by DeepFRI (58), ProteinInfer

(59), and UNIPROT database (60) (Supplementary Table 7; UniProtKB U5RXC5). Furthermore, this

mutation is predicted to have occurred in a response regulator receiver domain (one of the two

predicted domains) (61). Therefore, we targeted to mutate *spo0A* or CLAU_1957 in our ALE starting

strain JA1-1 to investigate whether alterations to cellular sporulation processes could, at least

partially, replicate the improved phenotypes obtained during our ALE: faster growth, growth without

complex nutrients, and robustness in continuous culture operation.

We used CRISPR/Cas9-aided homologous recombination (28) for reverse genetic engineering of

JA1-1. Mutations #4 and #5 occurred across LT and UQ ALE (Fig. 6b) in the linker domain between the

activator domains and in the receiver domain of Spo0A, respectively (62). Mutations in the same

domains in other Clostridia have led to the same phenotype as *spo0A* deletion, i.e. non-sporulating

cells (63–65). We thus aimed to investigate the effects of both mutations #4 and #5 through *spo0A*

deletion. Both of the two sgRNAs we used yielded 100% gene deletion efficiency as *spo0A* was deleted

in all screened colonies (Supplementary Fig. 12 and Supplementary File 4 and 5); this strain was named

RE1. Mutation #10 was a SNP in CLAU_1957, and we identified only one potential sgRNA that would

realize the G-to-A mutation and disrupt the PAM sequence, thus preventing Cas9 from cleaving the

target site again after successful homologous recombination. This sgRNA yielded 100% gene-editing

efficiency as all screened colonies showed the desired SNP (Supplementary File 6 and 7); this strain

was named RE2. Strikingly, RE1 autotrophic batch bottle cultures without YE showed >4-fold faster

growth than JA1-1 with YE and similar values on both CO and syngas as LT1 (Fig. 7a and Fig. 2). We

cultured RE2 on CO, i.e. same gas feed as used for UT1 characterization (ALE strain with same SNP as

RE2), and also this reverse engineered strain displayed significantly faster growth (>3-fold) without YE

compared to JA1-1 with YE and similar μ_{max} to UT1 (Fig. 7a and Fig. 2).

Fig. 7. Autotrophic characterization of reverse engineered strains RE1 and RE2 in batch and chemostat cultures. (a) Maximum

specific growth rate (μ_{max}) in bottle batch cultures with yeast extract (YE)-free medium. (b) Production yields (mmol/gDCW)

of growth by-products and acetate/ethanol (Ace/EtOH) of strain RE1 in bottle batch cultures. (c) RE2 growth characteristics

in CO chemostats at dilution rate (D) 0.5 and 1 day^{-1}. See Fig. 4 legend for parameter details. Bars show average ± standard

deviation between four (panel c), three (RE2 CO, RE1 CO, and CO data on panel b), or two (RE1 Syngas and Syngas data on

panel b) bioreplicates. gDCW, gram of dry cell weight; 2,3-BDO, 2,3-butanediol; q, specific rate.

Quantification of by-product patterns of RE1 in autotrophic bottle cultures (Fig. 7b) showed similar

yields to JA1-1 on CO (see Fig. 2c; growth with YE) and higher acetate/ethanol ratios compared to LT1

(see Fig. 2c and d) while ethanol and acetate production did not coincide in RE1. The performance of

RE2 was tested in bioreactor continuous cultures as we experienced significant difficulties with

growing UT strains to high biomass concentrations on CO (see section 3.3 above). We efficiently

operated the culture at D = 0.5 day^{-1} and achieved steady-state at high gas uptake rates and biomass

concentrations at D = 1 day^{-1} (double of UT and UQ strains; see Table 1) (Fig. 7c). The robustness of

RE2 in continuous cultures was surprising since just one SNP was introduced into the JA1-1

background. Despite the significant difference in bioreactor operation between UT1 and RE2 cultures,

the two strains displayed somewhat similar growth characteristics (e.g. biomass concentration,

specific by-product production rates, specific gas rates) at D = 0.5 day^{-1} except >4-fold higher 2,3-BDO

production for RE2 (Fig. 4 and 7c). Comparison of RE2 performance at D = 1 day^{-1} is only possible with

LT1 data (Table 1). RE2 showed lower production of acetate and ethanol (Fig. 4 and 7c), though LT1

cultures were fed with syngas (RE2 with CO). This is also reflected in the carbon balance where

significantly more carbon is diverted to CO_2 for RE2 (Supplementary Fig. 13 and Fig. 5), which is

consistent with another strain of *C. autoethanogenum* diverting more carbon to CO_2 on CO compared

to syngas (9). Higher D led to similar effects for RE2 and LT1 (Fig. 4 and 7c). In conclusion,

reconstructing mutations in two sporulation-related genes was sufficient to recover all three superior

features of our ALE strains.

We tested next if the reverse engineered mutations in sporulation-related genes might have

affected sporulation in the strains. For this, we cultured RE1, RE2, and JA1-1 both autotrophically and

heterotrophically and used microscopy to detect potential differences in sporulation from stationary

phase samples. We also plated heterotrophic cultures before and after a heat-shock with the aim to

observe potential heat-resistant spores. Neither microscopy (Supplementary Fig. 14 and 15) nor

plating (Supplementary Fig. 16) identified any spores or sporulating cells for any of the strains

(including JA1-1). Although the authors who isolated *C. autoethanogenum* JA1-1 report it as a spore-

former (27), a recent work also failed to detect JA1-1 forming spores (66). The latter and our

observations are supported by a review on Clostridial sporulation concluding that sporulation is rarely

observed in acetogens (62).

Mutations in sporulation-related genes have led to significant effects on Clostridial phenotypes

other than sporulation (62). We thus profiled the proteomic response of JA1-1 to the reverse

engineered mutations as functional genomics has been informative for interpreting genotype-

phenotype links in engineered strains. For this, JA1-1, RE1, and RE2 were grown in syngas bottle

cultures with YE in the media as JA1-1 does not grow without YE. We note that these proteome

expression patterns are affected by variable μ_{max} values (Fig. 8a) and potential differences in

consumption of YE components between the strains. Our analysis identified 284 differentially

expressed proteins (fold-change > 2 and q-value < 0.05) between RE1 and JA1-1, and 514 between

RE2 and JA1-1 (Supplementary Table 5). Proteomic responses to either mutation were similar in

general (Fig. 8b; Supplementary Fig. 17) and shared 205 differentially expressed proteins potentially

due to the 66-fold down-regulation of Spo0A in RE2 (Fig. 8c; Supplementary Table 5). Notably,

peptides for five sporulation-related proteins highly expressed in JA1-1 (CLAU_1942, 1946, 3117,

3233, 3248) were not detected in either engineered strain (also not for Spo0A in RE1). At the same

time, three histidine kinases and two phosphatases potentially linked to Spo0A regulation were up-

regulated in both RE1 and RE2 (Fig. 8c), including CLAU_3194 that was mutated in all UT isolates

(mutation #3 in Fig. 6b). Phosphate metabolism was further affected by 12 differentially expressed

kinases not shared between the two strains (Supplementary Table 5).

Regarding functionalities specifically relevant for acetogens, repression of the electron-bifurcating

hydrogenase HytA-E complex was potentially compensated by induction of hydrogenase CLAU_1535

and its associated proteins in both strains (Fig. 8c). In addition, a formate dehydrogenase (CLAU_2907)

and the methylene-THF dehydrogenase (CLAU_1574) in the WLP were down-regulated in both strains.

Also redox metabolism was markedly affected by both mutations as oxidoreductases, proteins

involved in ethanol metabolism and electron transfer were differentially expressed in both strains

compared to JA1-1 (Fig. 8c). The necessary transcriptional changes needed to recover the superior

phenotypes of our ALE strains through reverse engineering could potentially have been realised

through 2-to-10-fold up-regulation of seven and/or 2-to-6-fold down-regulation of two transcriptional

regulators shared for both strains (Supplementary Table 5). Mutations in either sporulation-related

gene thus lead to significant proteomic rearrangements in *C. autoethanogenum*.

Fig. 8. Proteomic responses of the wild-type *C. autoethanogenum* starting strain of ALE (JA1-1) to the reversed engineered

mutations in syngas bottle cultures. (a) Maximum specific growth rate (μ_{max}) for reverse engineered strains RE1, RE2, and

JA1-1 with yeast extract (YE) in medium. Bars show average ± standard deviation between three bioreplicates. (b) Principal

component analysis (PCA) of protein MS intensities for the three bioreplicate cultures of RE1, RE2, and JA1-1. PC, principal

component. (c) Potential key proteins differentially expressed (fold-change > 2 and q-value < 0.05) for both RE1 vs JA1-1 and

RE2 vs JA1-1 comparisons. Protein IDs are preceded with CLAU_. See Supplementary Table 5 for data.

4. DISCUSSION

While gas fermentation using *C. autoethanogenum* has been deployed commercially for ethanol

production (7), non-commercial acetogen strains struggle to grow on minimal medium, show slow gas

uptake and growth, and are challenging to run in continuous bioreactor cultures. To overcome these

limitations, we used three different and independent ALE strategies in this work to obtain strains with

improved phenotypes of which the strain named LAbrini (LT1) showed superior performance in

acetogen gas fermentation. We characterised the evolved strains using bottle and bioreactor cultures,

gas analysis, metabolomics, transcriptomics, and DNA sequencing. Finally, reverse genetic engineering

of sporulation-related mutations recovered all three superior features of our ALE strains.

During one of the ALEs (UT), we noticed a declining μ_{max} during the last ⅓ of the ALE (Fig. 1b). This

implies that evolutionary pressures other than towards growing faster were involved in this ALE

approach of serial batch culture propagation. Similar trends have been seen before (45, 46).

Additionally, UT ALE populations showed a declining trend of acetate/ethanol with faster growth (Fig.

1c). Some isolates of the ALE populations of this work displayed faster growth coupled with higher

acetate production (Supplementary Fig. 5). These observations at isolate and population levels suggest

that cells can find various metabolic routes across different ALE approaches to achieve faster growth,

as noted before (67, 68). We hypothesise that cross-feeding between subpopulations took place

similar to previous bacterial ALEs (69–72). Future co-culturing experiments of isolates with different

phenotypes (e.g. high and low acetate producers) might shed light on these possibilities.

Characterisation of evolved strains in batch and chemostat cultures revealed that batch bottle

cultures might fail to predict performance in continuous cultures. For example, UT1 and UT2 showed

nearly identical q_{EtOH} and acetate/ethanol ratios in chemostats after very different results in batch

cultures and only LT1 could thrive above D = 0.5 day^{-1} while most evolved strains showed similar μ_{max}

in batch cultures, which was > 0.5 day^{-1}. Furthermore, efforts to operate UT1 chemostats at higher D

and gas-liquid mass transfer seemed to have been compromised by CO toxicity (see below), which

was not present in batch cultures with lower gas-liquid mass transfer. These results emphasise the

importance of testing novel strains (e.g. acquired using ALE or metabolic engineering) in industrially-

relevant continuous fermentation conditions (7). We also note that the isolation of LT1 from a

chemostat culture after NTG mutagenesis could have contributed towards LT1 superior performance

in our bioreactor continuous cultures. Thus, isolating evolved strains from operational conditions

similar to those where the strain would eventually be used for scientific investigation or industrial

exploitation could be valuable. When comparing our different ALE approaches, the combination of

NTG with selective pressure during continuous cultivation in LT ALE proved to be the most successful

strategy. NTG treatment presumably introduced high genetic diversity, setting the stage for

subsequent selection under operational conditions. Indeed, LT1 was superior to UQ ALE isolates that

were also obtained from chemostats but without prior treatment with a mutagen. These results

support the effectiveness of NTG-induced mutagenesis combined with selective pressure in microbes

(73, 74).

Transcriptome analysis of the potential "CO toxicity" state of UT1 chemostat at D = 1 day^{-1}

revealed a distinct transcriptional profile compared to other cultures, including UT1 in a "non-CO

toxicity" but unstable culture at D = 1 day^{-1}. UT1 in the "CO toxicity" state showed strong up-regulation

of numerous hypothetical and sporulation-related proteins (Supplementary Table 2). These proteins

serve as promising candidates for potential overexpression to play a role in mitigating CO toxicity.

Intriguingly, we also observed ~2-fold down-regulation of components of the HytA-E/formate

dehydrogenase (FdhA) complex (75), which plays a key role in CO_2 reduction to formate in *C.*

autoethanogenum using NADPH and reduced ferredoxin (Fd) or H_2 (29, 75, 76). Wang and co-workers

who purified the complex hypothesised that it might also protect cells from over-reduction of NADP

and Fd pools during growth on CO (75). They propose that lowered CO oxidation increases the CO

concentration in cells that inhibits CO_2 reduction to formate by the complex that lowers reoxidation

of Fd. The solution for avoiding this over-reduction state is NADPH and Fd reoxidation by HytA-E

through proton reduction to H_2. Our results are consistent with their hypothesis as we detected H_2

production when trying to improve COUR of the UT1 "CO toxicity" culture by decreasing gas-liquid

mass transfer, i.e. CO oxidation (Supplementary Fig. 2). We thus hypothesise that such regulation

could be linked to the down-regulation of HytA-E/FdhA complex component genes. The metabolism

of *C. autoethanogenum* thus displays reactional plasticity in choosing electron sinks to drive CO_2

reduction as proposed before (75, 77). Such flexibility would realise growth advantages under

changing environmental conditions.

Our ALE experimental data analysis confirmed previous observations that different ALE

approaches often lead to similarly improved phenotypes but through various underlying genetic

changes (67–69, 71, 72). Interestingly, a proposed amino acid permease (CLAU_0471) was affected in

all the isolated strains in two different ALE approaches (UT and UQ) by two distinct deletions and three

SNPs. It is unclear why a proposed amino acid permease was under such strong selective pressure

when the complex nutrient YE was removed from the medium. The other gene that was mutated

during two of the ALEs (LT and UQ) was *spo0A* (CLAU_3129) which is considered a master regulator of

sporulation and solventogenesis in Clostridia (53–56). Down-regulation or inactivation of *spo0A* in *C.*

acetobutylicum causes a reduction in sporulation and increased solvent production (78, 79). However,

in other Clostridia Spo0A can improve fitness (65) and regulate metabolic and virulence factors outside

the sporulation process (80). Interestingly, mutation #10 in a predicted phosphorelay regulator

(CLAU_1957) and mutation #3 in a proposed histidine kinase (CLAU_3194) could be linked to affect

sporulation in UT1 as latter regulators are involved in phosphorylation circuits involving histidine

kinases (81) and as similar kinases regulate sporulation and solventogenesis in *Clostridium beijerinckii*

and *C. acetobutylicum* (50, 82). Additionally, both histidine kinases (53, 54) and CLAU_1957 (83) could

affect Spo0A directly. Mutations in two-component sensor systems composed of histidine kinases and

response regulators that appeared in ALE experiments with other bacteria were postulated to be

related to general adaptation to the growth environment (84). Sporulation could have also been

affected during UQ ALE (in UQ1) by truncation of a lipoprotein signal peptidase (CLAU_3079), which

is involved in sporulation of *Clostridium difficile* (48) and deletion of the gene pseudouridine synthase

(CLAU_3080) that was upregulated in a *spo0A* overexpression mutant strain in *C. acetobutylicum* (49).

Notably, protein expression of CLAU_3080 was up-regulated 3-fold in our RE2 strain (Supplementary

Table 5). Both reverse engineered mutations triggered widespread proteomic rearrangements

demonstrating their effects beyond the sporulation process. Similarly, altered expression of genes in

Clostridial sporulation networks regulate gene expression across various metabolic functions (54, 62).

We hypothesise that mutations in the above-described genes could have emerged from selective

pressure towards faster growth since suppressing sporulation functionalities would save cells valuable

energy to grow faster, for instance, through conserving a phosphate group (54). This is consistent with

our reverse engineering results of strains with mutations in *spo0A* or CLAU_1957 growing significantly

faster than wild-type *C. autoethanogenum*. The specific regulatory mechanisms governing the

proteome changes that realised the superior phenotypes remain to be elucidated.

The CODH/ACS complex realises CO oxidation/CO_2 reduction and acetyl-CoA synthesis (85), and

its activity is essential for the autotrophic growth of *C. autoethanogenum* (86). The *acsA* (CLAU_1579)

stop codon removal in strain LT1 has been reported in an independent study that observed

translational readthrough at the protein level (86). The *C. autoethanogenum* AcsA protein is uniquely

truncated compared to other acetogens. The other potential key genetic modification in LT1 seems to

be associated with pyrimidine metabolism evidenced by the large 2,717 bp deletion affecting three

genes in pyrimidine metabolism. This could realise a faster supply of RNA monomers, allowing higher

translation rates and faster growth. Thus, the superior performance of LAbrini in continuous

bioreactor cultures and its ability to grow in the absence of YE is due to its genotype and the selection

strategy employed in its development. While growth without YE has been reported for acetogens

before (25, 26), it is unclear if these phenotypes resulted from physiological adaptation or evolution.

Further studies are required to link mutations to its phenotype, key structural/functional attributes of

the ACS/CODH enzyme complex, and regulation.

CONCLUSIONS

Our work is important for two reasons. First, we offer a superior model-acetogen strain – LAbrini

– for the community that grows fast without complex nutrients, is robust for continuous gas

fermentation cultures, and shows high carbon flux to reduced by-products. These strain characteristics

will speed up both phenotyping and metabolic engineering of acetogens. Second, our comprehensive

ALE approach with three strategies offers insights into convergent evolution trajectories in acetogens

and highlights novel engineering targets for improved phenotypes. Further work is needed to validate

the causality of other mutations uncovered in our ALEs by reconstructing mutations of interest, both

in combination and in isolation, and assaying their contribution to observed phenotypes. Future ALE

experiments with LAbrini should potentially be designed to select for improved H_2 uptake, CO

tolerance, and by-product tolerance.

DECLARATION OF INTEREST

LanzaTech has interest in commercial gas fermentation with *C. autoethanogenum*. AH, SB, GH, JD, LT,

HZ, ROJ, VR, HS, SDS, and MK are employees of LanzaTech.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This work was funded by the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme

under grant agreement N810755 and the Estonian Research Council's grant agreement PSG289.

Australian Government funding through its investment agency, the Australian Research Council,

towards the ARC Centre of Excellence in Synthetic Biology (CE200100029) is gratefully acknowledged.

We acknowledge support from the Australian Centre for Ecogenomics for Whole Genome Sequencing

of UQ strains. We thank Kristina Reinmets and Ugochi Jennifer Nwaokorie for their valuable comments

on the manuscript, Shilpa Nagaraju for help with Supplementary Table 1, and Nastassia Shtaida for

help with microscopy.

DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

RNA sequencing data have been deposited in the NCBI Gene Expression Omnibus repository under

accession number GSE225123. Proteomics data have been deposited to the ProteomeXchange

Consortium (http://proteomecentral.proteomexchange.org) via the PRIDE partner repository (44)

with the data set identifier PXD047330.The genome assembly of strain LT1 ("LAbrini") has been

deposited to the NCBI genome submission portal with reference Genbank CP110420.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

Conceptualization: HI, JKH, AH, EM, SB and KV; Methodology: HI, JKH, AH, SB, KMS, AYS, MJP, LAL,

KRM, RAGG, GH, JD, LT, HZ, ROJ, VR, HS, JJ, MK, EM, and KV; Formal analysis: HI, JKH, AYS, MJP, LAL,

KRM, SB, VR, HS, JJ, and KV; Investigation: HI, JKH, AH, SB, KMS, AYS, MJP, LAL, KRM, RAGG, GH, JD,

LT, HZ, ROJ, and KV; Resources: SDS, MK, EM, and KV; Writing – Original Draft: HI and KV; Writing –

Review & Editing: HI, JKH, AH, SB, KMS, AYS, MJP, LAL, KRM, RAGG, LT, HZ, ROJ, VR, JJ, SDS, MK, EM,

and KV; Supervision: MK, EM, and KV; Project Administration: MK, EM, and KV; Funding Acquisition:

SDS, MK, EM, and KV.

REFERENCES

1.   IEA, 2022. World Energy Outlook 2022. https://www.iea.org/reports/world-energy-outlook-
2022

2.   IPCC, 2021. Climate Change 2021: the Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group
I to the Sixth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change.

3.   Kircher M. 2021. Bioeconomy – present status and future needs of industrial value chains. N
Biotechnol 60:96–104.

4.   Zhang J, Liang Guo, Cong Gao, Song W, Wu J, Liu L, Chen Xiulai. 2022. Metabolic engineering
strategies for microbial utilization of C1 feedstocks. Syst Microbiol Biomanufacturing 2022 3: 122–136.

5.   Fackler N, Heijstra BD, Rasor BJ, Brown H, Martin J, Ni Z, Shebek KM, Rosin RR, Simpson SD,
Tyo KE, Giannone RJ, Hettich RL, Tschaplinski TJ, Leang C, Brown SD, Jewett MC, Köpke M. 2021.
Stepping on the Gas to a Circular Economy: Accelerating Development of Carbon-Negative Chemical
Production from Gas Fermentation. Annu Rev Chem Biomol Eng 12:439–470.

6.   Pavan M, Reinmets K, Garg S, Mueller AP, Marcellin E, Köpke M, Valgepea K. 2022. Advances
in systems metabolic engineering of autotrophic carbon oxide-fixing biocatalysts towards a circular
economy. Metab Eng 71:117–141.

7.   Köpke M, Simpson SD. 2020. Pollution to products: recycling of 'above ground' carbon by gas
fermentation. Curr Opin Biotechnol 65:180–189.

8.   Liew FE, Nogle R, Abdalla T, Rasor BJ, Canter C, Jensen RO, Wang L, Strutz J, Chirania P, De
Tissera S, Mueller AP, Ruan Z, Gao A, Tran L, Engle NL, Bromley JC, Daniell J, Conrado R, Tschaplinski
TJ, Giannone RJ, Hettich RL, Karim AS, Simpson SD, Brown SD, Leang C, Jewett MC, Köpke M. 2022.
Carbon-negative production of acetone and isopropanol by gas fermentation at industrial pilot scale.
Nat Biotechnol 40:335–344.

9.   Valgepea K, de Souza Pinto Lemgruber R, Abdalla T, Binos S, Takemori N, Takemori A, Tanaka
Y, Tappel R, Köpke M, Simpson SD, Nielsen LK, Marcellin E. 2018. H_2 drives metabolic rearrangements
in gas-fermenting *Clostridium autoethanogenum*. Biotechnol Biofuels 11:55.

10.   Valgepea K, Loi KQ, Behrendorff JB, Lemgruber R de SP, Plan M, Hodson MP, Köpke M, Nielsen
LK, Marcellin E. 2017. Arginine deiminase pathway provides ATP and boosts growth of the gas-
fermenting acetogen *Clostridium autoethanogenum*. Metab Eng 41:202–211.

11.   Bourgade B, Minton NP, Islam MA. 2021. Genetic and metabolic engineering challenges of C1-
gas fermenting acetogenic chassis organisms. FEMS Microbiol Rev fuab008:1–20.

12.   Mahamkali V, Valgepea K, Lemgruber R de SP, Plan M, Tappel R, Köpke M, Simpson SD, Nielsen
LK, Marcellin E. 2020. Redox controls metabolic robustness in the gas-fermenting acetogen
Clostridium autoethanogenum. Proc Natl Acad Sci 117:13168–13175.

13.   Klask C, Kliem-Kuster N, Molitor B, Angenent LT. 2020. Nitrate Feed Improves Growth and
Ethanol Production of *Clostridium ljungdahlii* With CO_2 and H_2, but Results in Stochastic Inhibition
Events. Front Microbiol 11:2019.12.15.877050.

14.   Sandberg TE, Salazar MJ, Weng LL, Palsson BO, Feist AM. 2019. The emergence of adaptive
laboratory evolution as an efficient tool for biological discovery and industrial biotechnology. Metab
Eng 56:1–16.

15.   Dragosits M, Mattanovich D. 2013. Adaptive laboratory evolution - principles and applications
for biotechnology. Microb Cell Fact 12:64.

16.   Gleizer S, Ben-Nissan R, Bar-On YM, Antonovsky N, Noor E, Zohar Y, Jona G, Krieger E,
Shamshoum M, Bar-Even A, Milo R. 2019. Conversion of *Escherichia coli* to Generate All Biomass
Carbon from CO_2. Cell 179:1255-1263.e12.

17.   Gassler T, Sauer M, Gasser B, Egermeier M, Troyer C, Causon T, Hann S, Mattanovich D, Steiger
MG. 2019. The industrial yeast *Pichia pastoris* is converted from a heterotroph into an autotroph
capable of growth on CO_2. Nat Biotechnol 38:210–216.

18.   Tremblay PL, Höglund D, Koza A, Bonde I, Zhang T. 2015. Adaptation of the autotrophic
acetogen *Sporomusa ovata* to methanol accelerates the conversion of CO_2 to organic products. Sci
Rep 5:1–11.

19.   Oswald F, Zwick M, Omar O, Hotz EN, Neumann A. 2018. Growth and product formation of
Clostridium ljungdahlii in presence of cyanide. Front Microbiol 9:1–12.

20.   Piatek P, Olsson L, Nygård Y. 2020. Adaptation during propagation improves *Clostridium
autoethanogenum* tolerance towards benzene, toluene and xylenes during gas fermentation.
Bioresour Technol Reports 12:100564.

21.   Kwon SJ, Lee J, Lee HS. 2022. Metabolic changes of the acetogen *Clostridium* sp. AWRP
through adaptation to acetate challenge. Front Microbiol 13:982442.

22.   Antonicelli G, Ricci L, Tarraran L, Fraterrigo Garofalo S, Re A, Vasile NS, Verga F, Pirri CF, Menin
B, Agostino V. 2023. Expanding the product portfolio of carbon dioxide and hydrogen-based gas
fermentation with an evolved strain of *Clostridium carboxidivorans*. Bioresour Technol 387:129689.

23.   Kang S, Song Y, Jin S, Shin J, Bae J, Kim DR, Lee J-K, Kim SC, Cho S, Cho BK. 2020. Adaptive
Laboratory Evolution of *Eubacterium limosum* ATCC 8486 on Carbon Monoxide. Front Microbiol
11:402.

24.   Jin S, Kang S, Bae J, Lee H, Cho B-K. 2022. Development of CO gas conversion system using
high CO tolerance biocatalyst. Chem Eng J 449:137678.

25.   Martin ME, Richter H, Saha S, Angenent LT. 2015. Traits of selected *Clostridium* strains for
syngas fermentation to ethanol. Biotechnol Bioeng 113:531–539.

26.   Schulz S, Molitor B, Angenent LT. 2023. Acetate augmentation boosts the ethanol production

rate and specificity by *Clostridium ljungdahlii* during gas fermentation with pure carbon monoxide.

Bioresour Technol 369:128387.

27.   Abrini J, Naveau H, Nyns E-J. 1994. *Clostridium autoethanogenum*, sp. nov., an anaerobic

bacterium that produces ethanol from carbon monoxide. Arch Microbiol 161:345–351.

28.   Nwaokorie UJ, Reinmets K, de Lima LA, Pawar PR, Shaikh KM, Harris A, Köpke M, Valgepea K.

2023. Deletion of genes linked to the C1-fixing gene cluster affects growth, by-products, and proteome

of *Clostridium autoethanogenum*. Front Bioeng Biotechnol 11:717.

29.   Valgepea K, de Souza Pinto Lemgruber R, Meaghan K, Palfreyman RW, Abdalla T, Heijstra BD,

Behrendorff JB, Tappel R, Köpke M, Simpson SD, Nielsen LK, Marcellin E. 2017. Maintenance of ATP

Homeostasis Triggers Metabolic Shifts in Gas-Fermenting Acetogens. Cell Syst 4:505-515.e5.

30.   Otte B, Grunwaldt E, Mahmoud O, Jennewein S. 2009. Genome shuffling in *Clostridium diolis*

DSM 15410 for improved 1,3-propanediol production. Appl Environ Microbiol 75:7610–7616.

31.   Peebo K, Valgepea K, Nahku R, Riis G, Õun M, Adamberg K, Vilu R. 2014. Coordinated

activation of PTA-ACS and TCA cycles strongly reduces overflow metabolism of acetate in *Escherichia*

coli. Appl Microbiol Biotechnol 98:5131–5143.

32.   Deatherage DE, Barrick JE. 2014. Identification of Mutations in Laboratory-Evolved Microbes

from Next-Generation Sequencing Data Using breseq, p. 165–188. In Methods in molecular biology

(Clifton, N.J.).

33.   Humphreys CM, McLean S, Schatschneider S, Millat T, Henstra AM, Annan FJ, Breitkopf R,

Pander B, Piatek P, Rowe P, Wichlacz AT, Woods C, Norman R, Blom J, Goesman A, Hodgman C, Barrett

D, Thomas NR, Winzer K, Minton NP. 2015. Whole genome sequence and manual annotation of

Clostridium autoethanogenum, an industrially relevant bacterium. BMC Genomics 16:1085.

34.   Walker BJ, Abeel T, Shea T, Priest M, Abouelliel A, Sakthikumar S, Cuomo CA, Zeng Q, Wortman

J, Young SK, Earl AM. 2014. Pilon: An integrated tool for comprehensive microbial variant detection

and genome assembly improvement. PLoS One 9:e112963.

35.   Brown SD, Nagaraju S, Utturkar S, De Tissera S, Segovia S, Mitchell W, Land ML, Dassanayake

A, Köpke M. 2014. Comparison of single-molecule sequencing and hybrid approaches for finishing the

genome of *Clostridium autoethanogenum* and analysis of CRISPR systems in industrial relevant

Clostridia. Biotechnol Biofuels 7:40.

36.   Ewels P, Magnusson M, Lundin S, Käller M. 2016. MultiQC: Summarize analysis results for

multiple tools and samples in a single report. Bioinformatics 32:3047–3048.

37.   Martin M. 2011. Cutadapt removes adapter sequences from high-throughput sequencing

reads. EMBnet.journal 17:10.

38.   Liao Y, Smyth GK, Shi W. 2019. The R package Rsubread is easier, faster, cheaper and better
for alignment and quantification of RNA sequencing reads. Nucleic Acids Res 47:e47–e47.

39.   Li H, Handsaker B, Wysoker A, Fennell T, Ruan J, Homer N, Marth G, Abecasis G, Durbin R.
2009. The Sequence Alignment/Map format and SAMtools. Bioinformatics 25:2078–2079.

40.   Benjamini Y, Hochberg Y. 1995. Controlling the False Discovery Rate: A Practical and Powerful
Approach to Multiple Testing. J R Stat Soc Ser B 57:289–300.

41.   Liu H, Naismith JH. 2008. An efficient one-step site-directed deletion, insertion, single and
multiple-site plasmid mutagenesis protocol. BMC Biotechnol 8:91.

42.   Demichev V, Messner CB, Vernardis SI, Lilley KS, Ralser M. 2019. DIA-NN: neural networks and
interference correction enable deep proteome coverage in high throughput. Nat Methods 17:41–44.

43.   Tyanova S, Temu T, Sinitcyn P, Carlson A, Hein MY, Geiger T, Mann M, Cox J. 2016. The Perseus
computational platform for comprehensive analysis of (prote)omics data. Nat Methods 13:731–740.

44.   Perez-Riverol Y, Bai J, Bandla C, García-Seisdedos D, Hewapathirana S, Kamatchinathan S,
Kundu DJ, Prakash A, Frericks-Zipper A, Eisenacher M, Walzer M, Wang S, Brazma A, Vizcaíno JA. 2022.
The PRIDE database resources in 2022: a hub for mass spectrometry-based proteomics evidences.
Nucleic Acids Res 50:D543–D552.

45.   Wiser MJ, Ribeck N, Lenski RE. 2013. Long-Term Dynamics of Adaptation in Asexual
Populations. Science 342:1364–1367.

46.   LaCroix RA, Sandberg TE, O'Brien EJ, Utrilla J, Ebrahim A, Guzman GI, Szubin R, Palsson BO,
Feist AM. 2015. Use of adaptive laboratory evolution to discover key mutations enabling rapid growth
of *Escherichia coli* K-12 MG1655 on glucose minimal medium. Appl Environ Microbiol 81:17–30.

47.   Adamberg K, Valgepea K, Vilu R. 2015. Advanced continuous cultivation methods for systems
microbiology. Microbiol 161:1707–1719.

48.   Fimlaid KA, Jensen O, Donnelly ML, Francis MB, Sorg JA, Shen A. 2015. Identification of a Novel
Lipoprotein Regulator of *Clostridium difficile* Spore Germination. PLOS Pathog 11:e1005239.

49.   Alsaker KV, Spitzer TR, Papoutsakis ET. 2004. Transcriptional Analysis of *spo0A* Overexpression
in *Clostridium acetobutylicum* and Its Effect on the Cell's Response to Butanol Stress. J Bacteriol
186:1959–1971.

50.   Xin X, Cheng C, Du G, Chen L, Xue C. 2020. Metabolic Engineering of Histidine Kinases in
Clostridium beijerinckii for Enhanced Butanol Production. Front Bioeng Biotechnol 8:214.

51.   Valgepea K, Talbo G, Takemori N, Takemori A, Ludwig C, Mahamkali V, Mueller AP, Tappel R,
Köpke M, Simpson SD, Nielsen LK, Marcellin E. 2022. Absolute Proteome Quantification in the Gas-
Fermenting Acetogen *Clostridium autoethanogenum*. 7:e00026-22.

52.   Phaneuf PV, Gosting D, Palsson BO, Feist AM. 2019. Aledb 1.0: A database of mutations from

adaptive laboratory evolution experimentation. Nucleic Acids Res 47:D1164–D1171.

53.   Steiner E, Dago AE, Young DI, Heap JT, Minton NP, Hoch JA, Young M. 2011. Multiple orphan

histidine kinases interact directly with Spo0A to control the initiation of endospore formation in

Clostridium acetobutylicum. Mol Microbiol 80:641–654.

54.   Paredes CJ, Alsaker KV, Papoutsakis ET. 2005. A comparative genomic view of clostridial

sporulation and physiology. Nat Rev Microbiol 3:969–978.

55.   Dürre P. 2016. Physiology and sporulation in clostridium. Bact Spore From Mol to Syst 313–

329.

56.   Kolek J, Diallo M, Vasylkivska M, Branska B, Sedlar K, López-Contreras AM, Patakova P. 2017.

Comparison of expression of key sporulation, solventogenic and acetogenic genes in *C. beijerinckii*

NRRL B-598 and its mutant strain overexpressing *spo0A*. Appl Microbiol Biotechnol 101:8279–8291.

57.   Hoch JA. 1993. Regulation of the phosphorelay and the initiation of sporulation in *Bacillus*

subtilis. Annu Rev Microbiol 47:441–465.

58.   Gligorijević V, Renfrew PD, Kosciolek T, Leman JK, Berenberg D, Vatanen T, Chandler C, Taylor

BC, Fisk IM, Vlamakis H, Xavier RJ, Knight R, Cho K, Bonneau R. 2021. Structure-based protein function

prediction using graph convolutional networks. Nat Commun 12:1–14.

59.   Sanderson T, Bileschi ML, Belanger D, Colwell LJ. 2023. ProteInfer, deep neural networks for

protein functional inference. Elife 12:e80942.

60.   Bateman A, Martin MJ, Orchard S, Magrane M, Ahmad S, Alpi E, Bowler-Barnett EH, Britto R,

Bye-A-Jee H, Cukura A, Denny P, Dogan T, Ebenezer TG, Fan J, Garmiri P, da Costa Gonzales LJ, Hatton-

Ellis E, Hussein A, Ignatchenko A, Insana G, Ishtiaq R, Joshi V, Jyothi D, Kandasaamy S, Lock A, Luciani

A, Lugaric M, Luo J, Lussi Y, MacDougall A, Madeira F, Mahmoudy M, Mishra A, Moulang K, Nightingale

A, Pundir S, Qi G, Raj S, Raposo P, Rice DL, Saidi R, Santos R, Speretta E, Stephenson J, Totoo P, Turner

E, Tyagi N, Vasudev P, Warner K, Watkins X, Zaru R, Zellner H, Bridge AJ, Aimo L, Argoud-Puy G,

Auchincloss AH, Axelsen KB, Bansal P, Baratin D, Batista Neto TM, Blatter MC, Bolleman JT, Boutet E,

Breuza L, Gil BC, Casals-Casas C, Echioukh KC, Coudert E, Cuche B, de Castro E, Estreicher A, Famiglietti

ML, Feuermann M, Gasteiger E, Gaudet P, Gehant S, Gerritsen V, Gos A, Gruaz N, Hulo C, Hyka-

Nouspikel N, Jungo F, Kerhornou A, Le Mercier P, Lieberherr D, Masson P, Morgat A, Muthukrishnan

V, Paesano S, Pedruzzi I, Pilbout S, Pourcel L, Poux S, Pozzato M, Pruess M, Redaschi N, Rivoire C, Sigrist

CJA, Sonesson K, Sundaram S, Wu CH, Arighi CN, Arminski L, Chen C, Chen Y, Huang H, Laiho K,

McGarvey P, Natale DA, Ross K, Vinayaka CR, Wang Q, Wang Y, Zhang J. 2023. UniProt: the Universal

Protein Knowledgebase in 2023. Nucleic Acids Res 51:D523–D531.

61.   Paysan-Lafosse T, Blum M, Chuguransky S, Grego T, Pinto BL, Salazar GA, Bileschi ML, Bork P,

Bridge A, Colwell L, Gough J, Haft DH, Letunić I, Marchler-Bauer A, Mi H, Natale DA, Orengo CA,

Pandurangan AP, Rivoire C, Sigrist CJA, Sillitoe I, Thanki N, Thomas PD, Tosatto SCE, Wu CH, Bateman

A. 2023. InterPro in 2022. Nucleic Acids Res 51:D418–D427.

62.   Diallo M, Kengen SWM, López-Contreras AM. 2021. Sporulation in solventogenic and

acetogenic clostridia. Appl Microbiol Biotechnol 105:3533–3557.

63.   Sandoval NR, Venkataramanan KP, Groth TS, Papoutsakis ET. 2015. Whole-genome sequence

of an evolved *Clostridium pasteurianum* strain reveals Spo0A deficiency responsible for increased

butanol production and superior growth. Biotechnol Biofuels 8:227.

64.   DiCandia MA, Edwards AN, Jones JB, Swaim GL, Mills BD, McBride SM. 2022. Identification of

Functional Spo0A Residues Critical for Sporulation in *Clostridioides difficile*. J Mol Biol 434:167641.

65.   Humphreys JR, Debebe BJ, Diggle SP, Winzer K. 2023. *Clostridium beijerinckii* strain

degeneration is driven by the loss of Spo0A activity. Front Microbiol 13:1075609.

66.   Piatek P, Humphreys C, Raut MP, Wright PC, Simpson S, Köpke M, Minton NP, Winzer K. 2022.

Agr Quorum Sensing influences the Wood-Ljungdahl pathway in *Clostridium autoethanogenum*. Sci

Rep 12:411.

67.   Fong SS, Joyce AR, Palsson B. 2005. Parallel adaptive evolution cultures of *Escherichia coli* lead

to convergent growth phenotypes with different gene expression states. Genome Res 15:1365–1372.

68.   Barrick JE, Yu DS, Yoon SH, Jeong H, Oh TK, Schneider D, Lenski RE, Kim JF. 2009. Genome

evolution and adaptation in a long-term experiment with *Escherichia coli*. Nature 461:1243–1247.

69.   Helling RB, Vargas CN, Adams J. 1987. Evolution of *Escherichia coli* during growth in a constant

environment. Genetics 116:349–358.

70.   Rozen DE, Lenski RE. 2000. Long-Term Experimental Evolution in *Escherichia coli*. VIII.

Dynamics of a Balanced Polymorphism. Am Nat 155:24–35.

71.   Good BH, McDonald MJ, Barrick JE, Lenski RE, Desai MM. 2017. The dynamics of molecular

evolution over 60,000 generations. Nature 551:45–50.

72.   Treves DS, Manning S, Adams J. 1998. Repeated evolution of an acetate-crossfeeding

polymorphism in long-term populations of *Escherichia coli*. Mol Biol Evol 15:789–797.

73.   Lee DH, Feist AM, Barrett CL, Palsson B. 2011. Cumulative number of cell divisions as a

meaningful timescale for adaptive laboratory evolution of *Escherichia coli*. PLoS One 6:e26172.

74.   Bennett RK, Gregory GJ, Gonzalez JE, Har JRG, Antoniewicz MR, Papoutsakis ET. 2021.

Improving the Methanol Tolerance of an *Escherichia coli* Methylotroph via Adaptive Laboratory

Evolution Enhances Synthetic Methanol Utilization. Front Microbiol 12:638426.

75.   Wang S, Huang H, Kahnt J, Mueller AP, Köpke M, Thauer RK. 2013. NADP-Specific Electron-

Bifurcating [FeFe]-Hydrogenase in a Functional Complex with Formate Dehydrogenase in *Clostridium*

autoethanogenum Grown on CO. J Bacteriol 195:4373–4386.

76.   Mock J, Zheng Y, Mueller AP, Ly S, Tran L, Segovia S, Nagaraju S, Köpke M, Dürre P, Thauer RK.

2015. Energy conservation associated with ethanol formation from H_2 and CO_2 in *Clostridium*

autoethanogenum involving electron bifurcation. J Bacteriol 197:2965–2980.

77.   Lemaire ON, Jespersen M, Wagner T. 2020. CO_2-Fixation Strategies in Energy Extremophiles:

What Can We Learn From Acetogens? Front Microbiol 11:1–8.

78.   Li Q, Chen J, Minton NP, Zhang Y, Wen Z, Liu J, Yang H, Zeng Z, Ren X, Yang J, Gu Y, Jiang W,

Jiang Y, Yang S. 2016. CRISPR-based genome editing and expression control systems in *Clostridium*

acetobutylicum and *Clostridium beijerinckii*. Biotechnol J 11:961–972.

79.   Harris LM, Welker NE, Papoutsakis ET. 2002. Northern, morphological, and fermentation

analysis of *spo0A* inactivation and overexpression in *Clostridium acetobutylicum* ATCC 824. J Bacteriol

184:3586–3597.

80.   Talukdar PK, Olguín-Araneda V, Alnoman M, Paredes-Sabja D, Sarker MR. 2015. Updates on

the sporulation process in *Clostridium* species. Res Microbiol 166:225–235.

81.   Loomis WF, Shaulsky G, Wang N. 1997. Histidine kinases in signal transduction pathways of

eukaryotes. J Cell Sci 110:1141–1145.

82.   Xu M, Zhao J, Yu L, Tang IC, Xue C, Yang ST. 2015. Engineering *Clostridium acetobutylicum* with

a histidine kinase knockout for enhanced n-butanol tolerance and production. Appl Microbiol

Biotechnol 99:1011–1022.

83.   Fujita M, Losick R. 2003. The master regulator for entry into sporulation in *Bacillus subtilis*

becomes a cell-specific transcription factor after asymmetric division. Genes Dev 17:1166–1174.

84.   Lim HG, Eng T, Banerjee D, Alarcon G, Lau AK, Park MR, Simmons BA, Palsson BO, Singer SW,

Mukhopadhyay A, Feist AM. 2021. Generation of *Pseudomonas putida* KT2440 Strains with Efficient

Utilization of Xylose and Galactose via Adaptive Laboratory Evolution. ACS Sustain Chem Eng 9:11512–

11523.

85.   Lemaire ON, Wagner T. 2021. Gas channel rerouting in a primordial enzyme: Structural

insights of the carbon-monoxide dehydrogenase/acetyl-CoA synthase complex from the acetogen

Clostridium autoethanogenum. Biochim Biophys Acta - Bioenerg 1862:148330.

86.   Liew F, Henstra AM, Winzer K, Köpke M, Simpson SD, Minton NP. 2016. Insights into CO_2

Fixation Pathway of *Clostridium autoethanogenum* by Targeted Mutagenesis. MBio 7:e00427-16.