A discovery platform to identify inducible synthetic circuitry from varied microbial sources.

Clare M. Robinson[1,2], David Carreño[1,2], Tim Weber[1,†], Yangyumeng Chen[1], David T. Riglar[1,2,*]

[1] Department of Infectious Disease, Imperial College London, London, SW72AZ, UK.
[2] The Francis Crick Institute, London, NW11AT, UK.
[†] Current address: Department of Molecular Life Sciences, University of Zurich, Zurich, CH-8057, Switzerland.

*To whom correspondence should be addressed: d.riglar@imperial.ac.uk.

Abstract:

Gut microbes encode a variety of systems for molecular sensing and controlling conditional gene expression within the mammalian gut. Synthetic biology approaches such as whole-cell biosensing and 'sense-and-respond' therapeutics aim to tap into this vast sensing repertoire to drive clinical and pre-clinical applications. An ongoing constraint is the limited number of well-characterized inducible circuit components to specifically sense *in vivo* conditions of interest, such as disease. Here, we extend the flexibility and power of a biosensor screening platform using bacterial memory circuits encoded in a gut commensal *E. coli*. We construct libraries driven by potential sensory components derived from a combination of *E. coli* promoters or bacterial two-component systems (TCSs) sourced from diverse gut bacteria. Each is tagged with unique DNA barcodes using a pooled construction method. Using our pipeline, we evaluate sensor activity and performance heterogeneity across *in vitro* and *in vivo* conditions including using a mouse inflammation model. We demonstrate the method's ability to identify biosensors of interest, including the identification of unannotated TCSs. Following the optimisation of library construction, analysis, and delivery to account for the challenges of working with engineered bacteria within a conventional mammalian gut microbiome, we identify and validate several further biosensors of interest responding to the murine gut environment, and specifically during inflammatory conditions. This approach can be applied to transcriptionally activated sensing elements of any type and will allow for rapid development of new biosensors that can advance synthetic biology approaches for complex environments.

Introduction:

A longstanding vision for synthetic biology is the development of bacterial whole-cell biosensors and 'sense-and-respond' live biotherapeutic products. These systems promise to autonomously sense and induce reporters or therapeutics under defined spatial, dietary and disease conditions [1,2]. Potential applications include diagnostics, disease monitoring and biotherapeutics [2]. However, well-characterised biosensing circuits for the mammalian gut remain limited, hindering the complete fulfilment of this vision[3,4].

Synthetic genetic memory circuits, which convert transient signals into sustained responses, for example through transcriptional switches [5,6] or DNA editing [7-10], are powerful tools for non-invasive biosensor reporting and actuation. In rodent models, such circuits have been used to successfully track inflammatory signals [6,8,10,11], record microbial response to dietary perturbations [7,8], detect tumour DNA [12], and actuate sustained biotherapeutic secretion [10]. However, due to the extended, often permanent, nature of the response, input signals typically need to show low background activation combined with strong induction dynamics for best compatibility with these approaches.

We previously developed a high-throughput memory system (HTMS) in mouse commensal *Escherichia coli* NGF-1 [13] to screen *E. coli* promoters as biosensor candidates within the mouse gut [11]. We now expand the power and flexibility of this screening platform to accommodate a diversity of sensory components from varied microbial sources (Figure 1A). These include multi-gene heterologous two-component systems (TCSs), for which we develop a custom computational pipeline for rapid identification of cloning-compatible systems, and shorter native promoter-only-based sensors, identified from previous studies to sense conditions of interest [8,11]. Sensors are constructed by multiplexed golden gate assembly and integrated into the HTMS chassis (Figure 1B). Incorporating unique DNA barcodes into each sensor allows simultaneous testing of variable-sized sensors and flexibility for library combination and re-combination.

Memory recording is based on λ-phage's lysis-lysogeny switch [5]. In the chassis' memory 'OFF' state, *cI* represses β-galactosidase (*lacZ*) and streptomycin/spectinomycin adenyltransferase (*aadA*) reporter cassettes (Figure 1C, left). Upon exposure to an inducing signal, the sensing component triggers expression of cI dominant negative (cI^{DN}), switching cells into memory 'ON' states, in which the repression of *cro*, *lacZ* and *aadA* is relieved (Figure 1C, right). Repression of *cI* by cro maintains switching status irrespective of the presence of the induction signal, resulting in cellular 'memory'. Activated sensors can be identified from a large library through selection by growth in spectinomycin followed by massive parallel sequencing (Figure 1D).

Bacterial TCSs are modular signalling pathways capable of detecting various molecular signals [14]. They are typically composed of a membrane-bound histidine kinase (HK) and partner response regulator (RR) that control the transcription of target genes [15]. While it is not expected that all TCSs will function in a heterologous host exactly as they do in their native host, we and others have successfully transferred sensing capacities between bacterial species. We previously developed a memory biosensor to the inflammatory biomarker tetrathionate, driven by a heterologously expressed TCS from *Salmonella enterica* subsp. *enterica* serovar Typhimurium (herein *S.* Typhimurium), which controlled λ-memory induction through the diverging promoter for the neighbouring ttr$_{BCA}$ operon [6]. Given the ability of TCSs to facilitate non-native sensing capacities in heterologous hosts, they are ideal targets for sensors to diversify engineered chassis biosensing capacity using a screening approach.

Here, we build two new libraries of sensor components: the first focused on TCSs from diverse bacterial origins (Library 1) and a second predominantly containing *E. coli* derived sensors targeted to be responsive to the mammalian gut (Library 2). We test these libraries *in vitro* and *in vivo* in the murine gut, identifying and validating several new sensors of interest. Included are those responsive to the gut environment both generally and specifically during inflammation. Together, this work advances methodology for the application of library-based screens of synthetic biology components in *in vivo* gut contexts and validates the power of this approach for identifying context-dependent sensors that can actuate synthetic circuits within the mammalian gut.

82
Figure 1. A high-throughput transcriptional screening pipeline based on an engineered memory circuit to identify
novel inducible circuits A) Various sensing components can be combined and B) assembled, along with unique DNA
barcodes, by multiplexed golden gate assembly to drive switching of C) a λ-phage-based memory circuit. In the
presence of an activating stimulus, cI^{DN} is expressed and inhibits *cI*, de-repressing *cro* and allowing expression of
reporter genes *lacZ* and *aadA*. Cro expression maintains this memory ON state irrespective of ongoing exposure to the
activating stimulus. D) A library of memory-linked bacterial biosensors can be rapidly screened for activated sensors by
growth in spectinomycin selective media followed by sequencing of recovered gDNA for identification.

Results:

Construction of bacterial biosensor libraries encoding diverse native and heterologous sensing machinery:

Most HKs are encoded within 200bp of their partner RR [16]. Where a HK-RR pair sit next to a diverging gene, we term this a 'grouped' TCS (Figure 2A). Many grouped TCSs regulate their adjacent and divergent genes. Of a total of 30 known TCS pairs in *E. coli* MG1655, 13 lie in this 'grouped' formation, and of these, 10/13 regulate the divergent, adjacent gene based on Ecocyc annotations [17]. We, therefore, focused on these 'grouped' TCSs for biosensor library expansion due to the ability to replicate complete sensing machinery (HK, RR and putatively regulated promoter sequence) in a single PCR for transfer to the heterologous *E. coli*.

To enable rapid library design, we developed a computational pipeline to identify grouped TCSs from available genomic sequencing data (see methods). Using this pipeline directed against 17 bacterial species for which we had access to both full genome sequences and gDNA of exact or closely related strains, we identified 153 'grouped TCSs', 146 of which were compatible with our downstream cloning strategy (Table 1). Identified TCSs were cloned so that the divergent promoter would drive cI^{DN} expression (Figure 1B). Pooled golden gate assembly tagged each sensor with a 106bp randomised nucleotide hypervariable barcode flanked by sequencing adaptor sites for unique identification. The plasmid library was then transformed, and genome integrated into *E. coli* NGF-1 encoding the high-throughput memory system (PAS811) [11] (Supplementary Figure 1A).

Table 1: Compatible TCSs computationally identified and cloned from diverse gut bacteria.

Strain	Total TCSs	'Grouped'	SapI compatible	BsaI compatible (not SapI)	Successfully amplified	Assigned Library 1	Assigned Library 2
Bacteroides caccae	9	5	5	0	4	1	1
Bacteroides dorei	14	7	3	4	2	0	2
Bacteroides fragilis	13	8	6	0	5	2	0
Bacteroides thetaiotaomicron	12	8	3	3	1	1	0
Blautia producta	90	26	19	6	14	5	5
Citrobacter rodentium	22	14	11	2	13	11	2
Clostridium difficile	43	8	8	1	3	0	1
Edwardsiella tarda	20	11	8	1	5	5	0
Enterococcus faecalis	13	4	3	0	3	2	0
Klebsiella oxytoca	25	12	8	5	2	1	0
Klebsiella pneumoniae	25	12	10	0	8	7	0
Lactobacillus gasseri	6	1	1	0	1	1	0
Lactobacillus plantarum	13	2	2	1	2	1	0
Ruminococccus gnavus	36	13	8	4	6	2	3
Salmonella Typhimurium	22	11	6	2	5	3	0
Vibrio cholerae	24	13	8	3	5	3	2
Yersinia enterocolitica	20	8	7	1	5	4	0
Total	407	163	116	33	84	49	16

Total TCS 65

Barcodes were identified and associated with their corresponding sensing components by a combination of massive parallel long- and short-read sequencing (Supplementary Figure 2A). Sequencing confirmed successful barcode assignment for 49 unique SapI compatible TCSs in the first instance. We supplemented these strains with 9 additional individually cloned 'curated' sensors identified in our previous studies [6,11] to afford 'Library 1' (Table 1, Data File 1). Curated sensors included two controls: i) a *S.* Typhimurium *ttrSR*-P$_{ttrBCA}$ sensor, edited with a synthetic ribosome binding site, (ST TCS1*) that previously showed response to the inflammatory biomarker tetrathionate [6], and ii) the *E. coli* Nissle 1917 P$_{ynfEFGH}$ promoter edited with a synthetic 5' untranslated region and ribosome binding site, MCD15 (Ec ynfE15)[18] that previously showed switching under *in vitro* anaerobic growth conditions and in the murine gut [11]. Library 1 contained 504 assigned unique barcodes linked to these 58 sensors.

120
Figure 2: Barcoded biosensor screening of Library 1 identifies specific biosensors *in vitro*. A) 'Grouped' TCS
arrangements are ideal for straightforward cloning of libraries encoding heterologous sensing components together
with a probable regulated promoter to trigger memory formation. B) Normalised reads of a typical sample, with ON
and OFF control sensors highlighted. ON sensors will have equal growth in the presence (+SPEC) or absence (-SPEC) of
spectinomycin selective media, resulting in a fractional odds ratio (FOR) of ~1. OFF sensors will not grow in
spectinomycin selective media (+SPEC), resulting in a FOR of ~0. C) Average log10 transformed fractional odds ratio of
all sensors within the library in the presence and absence of oxygen and varying levels of tetrathionate. D) Ec ynfE15
sensors showed increased activation under anaerobic conditions. E) Sensor activation of barcodes from Et TCS7, ST
TCS1* under anaerobic conditions across all oxygen and tetrathionate combinations tested. For D) and E) each point
represents an individual barcode's FOR, with medians marked. F) Putative sensor regulation of both Et TCS7 and ST
TCS1* G) Et TCS7 was individually cloned (DTR302) and tested by exposure to anaerobic conditions in the presence and
absence of 100μM tetrathionate and indicator plating, confirming the sensor is responsive to tetrathionate under
anaerobic conditions. H) Response dynamics across various tetrathionate concentrations were similar to memory
driven by ST TCS1*(DTR277).

Building on the flexibility of the method to easily combine sensors, barcodes and libraries, we
subsequently cloned a set of additional triggers, targeting those responsive to gut and gut inflammation
related signals. These included *E. coli* promoter regions previously induced in mouse models, including
during inflammation [8]; 2) computationally identified TCSs that were not assigned in Library 1 construction,
including those with BsaI but not SapI compatibility; and 3) several additional curated sensors of interest
(Table 1, Data File 1). Library 2 contained 10,063 assigned unique barcodes linked to 17 additional TCSs and
72 *E. coli* promoter regions of interest.

The number of assigned barcodes per sensor ranged between 1 and 44 (median 5) for Library 1 and
1 and 1001 (median 52) for Library 2 (Supplementary Figure 2B). Each library demonstrated similar
abundance profiles (Supplementary Figure 2C). Between the two libraries we confirmed at least 1 barcode
for ~80% of successfully PCR-amplified TCS sensor regions with this method (Table 1).

In vitro validation confirms barcoded library biosensor screening capabilities:

To quantify the state of each sensor we compared barcode sequencing read counts for each
barcode from samples split and grown in the presence or absence of spectinomycin (Figure 2B). Only ON
sensors grow with spectinomycin due to *aadA* expression (Figure 1C-D). Degree of switching is represented
as a fractional odds ratio (FOR) by normalisation to reads from known positive and negative strains (see
methods) (Figure 2B). FOR ~1 corresponds to an ON sensor, and ~ 0 to an OFF sensor.

To validate barcoded library screening, we cultured pooled sensors from Library 1 *in vitro* with
varying tetrathionate concentrations and with or without oxygen (Figure 2C). Various sensors showed
differential activation between the conditions. As expected, around half of the sensors were consistently ON
in all conditions, suggesting a level of expression from these promoters during *in vitro* growth, resulting in
activation of the memory circuit under all conditions. Mirroring our previous results, Ec ynfE15 sensors had
elevated odds ratios in anaerobic conditions (Figure 2C-D) [11] and ST TCS1* sensors activated with
tetrathionate in the absence of oxygen (Figure 2C) [6]. Together, these results demonstrate the functionality
of the barcoding approach to combine sensors of diverse size and origins.

Barcode screening successfully identifies unannotated biosensor candidates

The 22 barcodes linked to *Edwardsiella tarda* TCS7 (Et TCS7) were also consistently induced at levels
comparable to ST TCS1* across the conditions tested (Figure 2C, E). While the available gene annotations
for the strain used for TCS extraction (*E. tarda* KC-Pc-HB1) did not predict this behaviour, BLAST searches
identified homology to a putative tetrathionate reductase promoter region with its associated TCS in *E.*
tarda strains Et54[19] and FL6-60 [20] (Figure 2F). Et TCS7 was therefore cloned as an individual strain (DTR302)
and its response to tetrathionate was confirmed by plating of induced cultures on X-gal indicator plates for
blue-white colony screening. When grown anaerobically, both DTR302 and an individual strain triggered by
ST TCS1* (DTR277) demonstrated strong induction in the presence of >1μM tetrathionate (Figure 2G-H).
This demonstrates the ability of our screening pipeline to identify unannotated biosensors with specific
sensing functions using our screening approach.

Barcode and strain diversity is maintained over short periods within the murine gut

We have previously demonstrated robust *E. coli* NGF-1 colonisation of the conventional mouse gut,
typically following a dose of streptomycin to reduce colonisation resistance, but in select cases also without
pre-treatment [5,6]. To test colonisation characteristics in our current facility, we administered sensor Library 1
by oral gavage (~10^{11} bacteria/mouse) to groups of 2 healthy, conventional mice 24 hours following
administration of streptomycin antibiotics (1mg or 5mg/mouse) or mock treatment (Supplementary Figure
3A). Faecal bacterial CFU counts reflected streptomycin provision, with engineered bacteria in untreated
animals dropping below the detection limit at day 3, and in mice administered 1mg streptomycin on day 4-5
(Supplementary Figure 3B). Engineered *E. coli* successfully colonised mice provided with 5mg streptomycin
throughout the full 53-day experiment (Supplementary Figure 3B).

Strain diversity, as estimated by percentage of barcodes identified via sequencing, was high in all
animals at day 1 post-administration but not measurable by day 4 in untreated and 1mg streptomycin-
treated mice as no engineered bacteria were recovered from these animals on these days (Supplementary
Figure 3C). Even in 5mg streptomycin-treated mice that were effectively colonised, barcode and sensor

diversity dropped quickly following administration (Supplementary Figure 3C and D). By day 4 only 3 – 4 %
of total barcoded strains remained, with a handful of strains dominating colonisation within each mouse
(Supplementary Figure 3E). Such colonisation bottlenecks are consistent with other work examining
barcoded isogenic strains in the mouse gut [21,22]. Consequently, all further library analyses focussed on short
(2-day) experimental timeframes to maintain barcode diversity.

Barcode screening successfully identifies biosensors in vivo:

To test sensor activation in the gut, we administered Library 1 sensors by oral gavage (~10^{12}
bacteria/mouse) to mice (n = 4) 24 hours following administration of 5mg streptomycin (Figure 3A). Nearly
all (>98%) barcodes and sensors (100%) were recovered on both days (Figure 3B-C). Various sensors showed
elevated switching in animals compared to gavage cultures (Figure 3D; full data set: Supplementary Figure
4A). Consistent with previous testing [11], Ec ynfE15 strains showed odds ratio increases most prominently by
day 2 (Figure 3E). The top-ranked activated sensor was *Citrobacter rodentium* TCS7 (Figure 3F), identified as
the *ygiW* gene promoter paired with the adjacent and opposing TCS, QseCB. Expression of *ygiW* is regulated
by the QseB homologue, PreA, in *S.* Typhimurium [23], and deletion of the HK QseC in K. pneumonia resulted
increase of *ygiW* expression, suggesting the gene is directly or indirectly regulated by the QseBC system in
this species also [24]. However, in *E. coli*, expression of *ygiW* has not been linked to QseB, but rather hydrogen
peroxide and cadmium stress [25], the gluconate utilisation response regulator, GlaR, and the leucine
responsive global transcriptional regulator, Lrp (Figure 3G) [17].

To validate the observed sensor response, we cloned Cr TCS7 as an individual strain (DTR307) and
delivered it to mice via oral gavage 24 hours following streptomycin treatment (5mg) (Figure 3H). DTR307
response to the gut was tested over the 48 hours following administration via plating of faecal samples on
indicator plates (Figure 3I). Similarly to our library-based screen, the sensor was off in the gavage sample,
and showed consistent switching in ~20% of bacteria collected from faecal pellets from all mice on both
days post gavage (Figure 3J). This validates the signal seen within the library-based screen and
demonstrates the ability for the screening pipeline to identify sensors of interest within the mouse gut.

Another biosensor of interest ranked as showing higher response within the murine gut than our
control Ec ynfE15 is Cr TCS2, identified as the *C. rodentium* intergenic region leading to *citC* with adjacent
TCS DpiAB (Figure 3D, G, Supplementary Figure 5A-C). We further observed Ye TCS1, the *Y. enterocolitica*
intergenic region leading to *macA* with adjacent TCS CpxAR (Supplementary Figure 4D-F)*,* showing response
to the gut, albeit below the threshold of the positive control Ec ynfE15. Homologous TCSs to these systems
in *E. coli* are well characterised, with known inducers. When cloned and tested *in vitro* as individual sensors
we confirmed the response of these heterologous sensors to known regulating signals for their cognate *E.*
coli homologues (Supplementary Figure 5A-B, D-F). For Cr TCS2 we additionally tested truncated variants of
the sensor, lacking the heterologous *C. rodentium dpiA* and *dpiB* genes, or DpiA binding sites
(Supplementary Figure 5A-C). We observed a response to citrate in the truncated mutant lacking *dpiA* and
dpiB, suggesting native *E. coli* host machinery is capable of regulation of the non-native intergenic promoter
region, but no response to citrate upon the removal of DpiA binding sites, confirming regulation by DpiA is
necessary for citrate response (Supplementary Figure 5C).

223
224

Figure 3: Barcoded memory screening of Library 1 successfully identifies biosensors for in vivo growth. A) Library 1
was administered to mice 1 day post-administration of 5 mg streptomycin (n=4). Faecal samples were collected for
colonisation and memory switching analyses the two days following. B) Colonisation levels and C) fractions of
recovered barcodes and sensors showed high retention in all mice. D) Sensor activation of top-ranked in vivo
responsive sensors, and control sensors in mice on days 1 and 2 post library administration. Full dataset is shown in
Supplementary Figure 4. E) The response of the control sensor, Ec ynfE15 and top-ranked in vivo responsive sensors F)
Cr TCS7 and G) Cr TCS2 to the gut environment. Panels show FOR of faecal pellets from each mouse & gavage samples
with mean response marked. H) Potential regulatory control of Cr TCS7 (QseBC-P$_{ygiW}$) based on regulation of C.
rodentium and E. coli homologues. I) Experiment timeline for testing the response of Cr TCS7 (DTR307) within the
mouse gut. J) Percentage of activated sensor colonies from plating of faecal contents on days 1 and 2 after sensor
administration, panel shows counts from plated individual mouse faecal pellets and the gavage sample.

Identification and validation of inflammation responsive biosensors:

To specifically target inflammation-responsive circuit development, we combined Library 1 with
Library 2 – the latter being predominantly built using *E. coli* promoters previously associated with response
in the murine gut including during inflammation [8]. We administered the combined libraries via oral gavage
to mice (n=4 per group; ~10^{11} bacteria/ mouse) pre-treated with streptomycin 24 hours prior (5mg/mouse)
and with or without 3% DSS in their drinking water for the preceding 4 days to induce intestinal
inflammation (Figure 4A). Colonisation levels were high in all animals and similar across both groups (Figure
4B). Reduction of colon length at endpoint and loss of body weight throughout the experiment confirmed
the expected impact of DSS in treated animals (Figure 4C-D).

248
Figure 4: Identification and validation of inflammation-specific biosensors through screening of Library 1 + 2. A)
Experimental timeline for biosensor library screening of combined Library 1 + 2 sensors in animals with or without
intestinal inflammation induced by DSS administration. B) Colonisation levels in all mice were comparable. C)
Fractional weight change of mice and D) colon lengths measured at the experimental endpoint on day 6 post DSS
administration/ day 2 post bacterial administration were typical of DSS induced inflammation. Graph shows mean ±
standard deviation and results from an unpaired T-test, p-value: 0.0075. E) Sensor activation of the top-ranked DSS
responsive, in vivo responsive, and control sensors as averaged FOR across all mice on day 2 post library
administration. The full dataset is shown in Supplementary Figure 6. F) individual sensor activation (FOR) from each
animal for top-ranked inflammation responsive sensors. Graphs also show mean. G) Predicted regulation of E. coli P_{spy}.
H) Response of DTR306 Ec spy sensor when exposed to different inducers in vitro. Graphs show mean. Statistics
calculated by one-way ANOVA between groups as shown, with Dunnet's multiple comparisons adjustment. Adjusted
p-values: ** = 0.001, **** = <0.0001, NS = not significant I) Experimental timeline to test DTR306 Ec spy sensor in mice
with or without intestinal inflammation induced by 3% DSS administration. J) Colonisation levels between groups and
animals remained high across the days following sensor bacteria administration. K) Fractional weight and L) colon

lengths on day 6 post DSS administration/ day 2 post bacterial administration were indicative of DSS-induced
inflammation (P value: 0.0988 by unpaired t-test). M) Response of DTR306 Ec spy sensor by plating of faecal contents
on days 1 and 2 post bacterial administration showed elevated response in DSS-treated animals. Graphs show mean.
Statistics calculated by one-way ANOVA between groups as shown, with Šídák's multiple comparison adjustment.
Adjusted p-values: * = 0.0195, *** = 0.0003. N) Plating of contents from different intestinal regions at experimental
endpoint on day 2 post bacterial administration confirms elevated sensor memory response in all tested regions within
the DSS-treated gut.

To account for the ~10-fold increase in barcode abundance in the combined library compared with Library 1
alone (Supplementary Figure 2B-C, Data File 1), increased volumes of faecal pellet supernatants
(corresponding to 30 – 40 mg worth of faecal pellet per mouse, and approximately 10^7 CFU of engineered
bacteria as estimated from colonisation levels) were inoculated into outgrowths before splitting into +/-
spectinomycin cultures. Following barcode sequencing, fractional odds ratios were then calculated at the
sensor level to account for the expected stochasticity of the lower abundance barcodes within the
recovered fractions.

Several sensors showed elevated FOR in response to either the mouse gut or the DSS-treated gut
specifically (Figure 4E, full dataset: Supplementary Figure 6A). The top 5 DSS responsive sensors included
two *E. coli torC* promoter variants (with wt or synthetic 5'UTR MCD10), likely activated by trimethylamine-
N-oxide [26]; *E. coli yeaR* promoter, potentially activated by nitrate, nitrite or nitric oxide [27]; *E. coli spy*
promoter, reported to be regulated by BaeR and CpxR [28,29] and previously identified as being upregulated in
response to DSS treatment [8]; and, ST TCS1* (TtrRS-P_{ttrBCA}) (see Figure 2), previously implicated in
tetrathionate sensing during inflammation [6] (Figure 4E-F). As expected, the control strain, Ec *ynfE15*,
showed activation in all animals, with stronger sensor activation in faecal samples from day 2 (Figure 4E,
Supplementary Figure 6A-B). Confirming our previous results (Figure 3), top-ranked sensors from Library 1
that activated in all animals included Cr TCS7 (QseCB-P_{ygiW}) and Cr TCS2 (DpiAB-P_{citC}). Additional gut-
responsive sensors of interest identified in this screen include the promoter region of *E. coli yhcN*, reported
to be induced by cytoplasmic acid response [30], Cr TCS12 (*C. rodentium* NarXL TCS and diverging promoter
region to the NarK homologue), and the promoter regions of *E. coli gatA* and *pspA* genes (Figure 4E,
Supplementary Figure 6A-B).

Of the top-ranked inflammation responsive sensors, Ec *spy*, showed particularly low response in
control animals and consistent response across DSS-treated animals (Figure 4F). To explore its induction
behaviour in the context of our memory circuit more extensively, we therefore cloned and tested the sensor
individually (DTR306). DTR306 cultures were grown for 4 hours in aerobic SOC broth in the presence of
previously reported inducers of the *spy* promoter: EtOH (5%), zinc (0.6mM) and copper (0.6mM) (Figure 4H)
[28,31]. Colony screening on indicator plates demonstrated clear induction of DTR306 by ethanol and zinc, but
not copper. Neither did we see *in vitro* induction of DTR306 in the presence of 3% DSS, indicating the
substance itself is not inducing sensor activation (Figure 4H).

To confirm *in vivo* sensor behaviour, DTR306 was administered by oral gavage as an individual
strain to mice. Animals (n = 4 per group) were treated with or without 3% DSS in drinking water for four
days (~10^{11} bacteria/ mouse) (Figure 4I), and streptomycin was provided (5mg/ mouse by oral gavage) 24
hours prior to DTR306 administration. Colonisation levels were high across the 2 days post administration
in both groups (Figure 4J). Weight loss throughout the experiment was indicative of the impact of DSS
treatment (Figure 4K). Average colon length was also reduced in DSS-treated mice, albeit without statistical
significance (Figure 4L). Analysis of DTR306 response via growth on indicator plates demonstrated
consistent increase in switching specifically in DSS-treated mice on both days (Figure 4M), consistent with
the library -based screening results. Growth of DTR306 from endpoint dissection of the gut also
demonstrated consistent switching in all regions of the gut (Figure 4N). Together, these results
demonstrate the potential for the library-based construction and screening approach to identify
compatible inducers for the development of memory biosensors responsive to a multitude of conditions.

Discussion:

Our work expands the use of a robust bacterial memory circuit to simultaneously evaluate hundreds of uniquely barcoded biosensor strains in the murine gut or *in vitro* culture. By incorporating a DNA barcoding strategy, using a single, hyper-variable oligonucleotide for barcode delivery, we generate large libraries of diversly sized sensors in a low-cost, single-pot reaction (Figure 1). Barcoding also facilitates iterative addition, combination and revision of libraries over time, as demonstrated throughout this current project. The successful identification and validation of several inducible circuits, both novel and previously identified, highlights the effectiveness of our pipeline in facilitating biotechnology tool development (Figure 2-4).

Novel sensor development is an area of need for synthetic biology in the quest to expand the toolbox of health- and disease- relevant inducible circuit components. Barcoded HTMS analysis is compatible with any transcriptional activation-based sensing circuits that function in the commensal *E. coli* host. This is a particular strength of our method, sourcing and testing diverse heterologous sensing components to drive memory circuit activity. By comparison, another powerful parallelised bacterial memory approach, RecordSeq [8,32], provides a transcriptome-wide view of chassis cell gene expression, akin to a recording of an RNAseq dataset over time. The flexibility of GGA for allowing simultaneous assembly of multiple fragments, facilitates future expansion of the approach to more complicated sensor designs, for example non-grouped TCSs, or those that regulate non-proximal or multiple promoters throughout the genome. Furthermore, use of alternative type IIS restriction enzymes can be used to expand cloning compatibility of sensors, as demonstrated here during Library 2 construction which used both SapI and BsaI enzymes.

The cloning strategy afforded libraries of thousands of uniquely barcoded strains, encoding hundreds of variant sensors. Not all targeted sensors were successfully cloned, with lack of PCR amplification the greatest source of loss within the pipeline. This is indicative of the challenges of undertaking PCR primer design and reactions in bulk using diverse bacterial genomes. Of the amplified sensors, >80% were successfully assigned to at least 1 barcode in the library. A fraction of the sensors were constitutively ON in all tests, which is expected in a memory system for any gene promoters that are routinely activated during *in vitro* culture conditions. In some cases, this may also result from a lack of native regulation and thus high basal expression of cI^{DN} in the heterologous host. TCSs derived from species more closely related to the *E. coli* NGF-1 host were, unsurprisingly, more likely to show signs of functionality, consistent with systematic assessment of porting non-native genetic systems into new hosts [33]. Many promoters are controlled by combinations of TCSs, and most TCSs regulate gene expression from a variety of targets [34], suggesting that cross-regulation between host and heterologous TCSs and gene expression is both likely and necessary. Tetrathionate sensing, driven by TtrRS regulation of the adjacent *ttrBCA* promoter from *S.* Typhimurium [6] or *E. tarda* (Figure 2F) requires cross-regulation by host *E. coli* FNR. Our experiments with truncated *Cr* TCS2 sensor variants also demonstrated cross-regulation by host *E. coli* DpiAB, NarL and cAMP:CRP (Supplementary Figure 5C). Future libraries may take this systems biology perspective into account by focussing on candidate TCSs from closely related species. Together, these challenges point to the power of library screening approaches for rapid sensor identification and validation within specific engineering biology contexts.

During *in vivo* library screening experiments, population bottlenecking caused barcode and strain diversity loss following administration to the gut, ultimately limiting experiment length (Supplementary Figure 3). Barcoded *C. rodentium* libraries have showed similar dynamics [21,22], indicating that bottlenecking is likely an inevitable physiological constraint. Nevertheless, our colonisation data suggests that library screening approaches are feasible and valuable over short experimental periods (eg. up to 2 days) to simultaneously test thousands of uniquely barcoded strains within the gut. Testing directly in the λ-memory system encoded in mouse commensal *E. coli* NGF-1, which has previously demonstrated low cellular burden, long-term stability, and function over many months in the murine gut [5,6,11] allows for rapid progression from screening to follow up tests as a single sensor in animals where these bottlenecking issues are no longer a concern (eg. Figure 2-4).

This pipeline not only enables the construction of biosensors tailored to the gut environment but
also offers the potential for screening biosensors in other microbial growth permissible and potentially
inaccessible environments. The ability to build and test new whole-cell biosensors at high throughput is a
powerful method for the identification of novel inducible synthetic circuit components and prototype
disease diagnostics.

Methods:

Media and culture conditions:

Bacterial cultures of individual strains were grown at 37°C in LB broth or on LB agar plates. Library
cultures were grown in LB peptone special (LBPS) containing 10 g/L peptone (Sigma product no. 68971), 10
g/L NaCl, and 5 g/L yeast extract in deionized water. LBPS was used because it does not contain lactose so
avoids the potential for biased outgrowth of ON sensors expressing *lacZ*. For anaerobic growth, cultures
were grown statically in pre-reduced media in a BD GasPak EZ container system with container system
sachets to generate the anaerobic environment (BD, product no. 260001) or using an InvivO$_2$ workstation
with I-CO$_2$N$_2$IC gas controller fitted for anoxic conditions (Baker Ruskinn). For memory response
quantification and blue-white screening, cultures were plated on LB agar plates containing 60 µg/mL 5-
bromo-4-chloro-3-indolyl-β-d-galactopyranoside (X-gal; Thermo Fisher Scientific catalogue no. R0402).
Antibiotics in media for bacterial growth were used at the following working concentrations; streptomycin
(Sigma-Aldrich, S650) 200 µg/mL, chloramphenicol (Sigma-Aldrich, C0378) 25 µg/mL, carbenicillin
(ThermoFisher Scientific, BP2648) 100 µg/mL, and spectinomycin (MP Biomedical, 158993) 50 µg/mL.

Individual biosensor inductions *in vitro* were conducted in SOC media (2% Tryptone, 0.5% yeast
extract, 10 mM NaCl, 2.5 mM KCl, 10 mM MgCl$_2$, 10 mM MgSO$_4$, 20 mM glucose) with the specified
concentration of inducer: potassium tetrathionate (Sigma-Aldrich, P2926), sodium citrate tribasic dihydrate
(Sigma-Aldrich, 71406), sodium nitrate (VWR, 27955), copper chloride dihydrate (Sigma-Aldrich, C6641), or
zinc sulphate (Sigma-Aldrich, Z0251). SOC media was used for individual sensor testing for comparability
with previous individual memory sensor testing (Naydich 2019, Riglar 2017). M9 (1x Difco M9 Minimal Salts
(Scientific Laboratory Supplies,: 248510), 0.1 mM CaCl$_2$, 1 mM MgSO$_4$, 0.4% filter sterilised glucose, 0.2%
casamino acids (Fisher Scientific Fisher,12747109) and 1µg/mL niacinamide) media was used for *in vitro*
library screening.

Computational pipeline for TCS sequence extraction:

A custom Python script was used to extract TCS DNA sequences from the Microbial Signal
Transduction Database (MiST 3.0) [35] and NCBI RefSeq databases. All HK and RR TCS signalling genes were
extracted from MistDB for a given bacterial strain and pairs of partner HK and RR were identified by
proximity (<200bp apart) and orientation (both genes must be on the same strand). Genes neighbouring
the paired TCS were considered likely regulated targets if they were encoded adjacent to, and on the
opposing strand of, the HK and RR pair. The strain's DNA sequence and annotations were automatically
downloaded from Refseq's FTP site. The TCS's gene IDs from MistDB were then matched to the RefSeq
annotations and the combined DNA sequence for the TCS and intergenic region between the TCS and its
putative target were extracted. Next, the combined TCS & Target sequences were screened for SapI or BsaI
sites, and, if absent, were deemed 'SapI or BsaI compatible'. Primers for compatible TCSs were designed
using Primer3 (in Geneious Prime software version 2020.1.1-2023.1.1; Biomatters Ltd) with SapI or BsaI
overhangs for Golden Gate Assembly (GGA). A full list of predicted grouped TCS amplicons (including HK, RR
and intergenic region) and primers used for TCS amplification is provided (Data File 1).

TCS Library construction:

Additional oligonucleotide and primer sequences used for library construction and sequencing
(Table 2) and bacterial strains used throughout the study (Supplementary Table 3) are provided.

Table 2: Primers and DNA fragments

Name	Sequence
Ultramer DNA Barcode cassette	ATGCTCTTCTAGATCGTCGGCAGCGTCAGATGTGTATAAGAGACAGNNNNNNNN NNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNN NNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNN NNNNNNNNCTGTCTCTTATACACATCTCCGAGCCCACGAGACGAATGAAGAGC GG
p070_Barcode_cassette_F_duplexing_primer	CCGCTCTTCATTCGTCTCGT
p075_Barcode_cassette_R_duplexing_primer	ATGCTCTTCTAGATCGTCGGC
p079_Barcode_cassette_F_duplexing_primer_BsaI	CAGGTCTCAGAGGTCGTCGGCAGCGTCAGAT
p100_Barcode_cassette_R_duplexing_primer_BsaI	ACGGTCTCATCCGTGTCTCGTGGGCTCGGAGAT
p145_p5_site	TCGTCGGCAGCGTCAG
p146_p7_site	GTCTCGTGGGCTCGGAG
p117_Nissle_Lib_seq_new_F	CTCACTATAGAGGGACAACC
p118_Nissle_Lib_seq_new_R	AATGGTTTCTTTTTTGTGCTCAT
DTR304_Fwd	ATGCTCTTCTGAATGCAATACCTTAGCGGGCTTTA
DTR304_DT305_Rev	TAGCTCTTCACATCGCAAAAGTATCCTGAGGC
DTR305_Fwd	ATGCTCTTCTGAACATCTAACTCTTTGTGAAATAAATCAAA

414 **Table 3:** Bacterial strains

	E. coli parent strain	Sensor	Source/reference
PAS811	E. coli NGF-1	None	Naydich 2019
DTR270-273	PAS811	*fabR* + barcode	This paper
DTR274-276	PAS811	*ynfE15* + barcode	This paper
DTR277-279	PAS811	*S.* Typhimurium ttrSR-pttrBCA (RBS) (ST TCS1*)	This paper
DTR280-283	PAS811	*hycAWT* + barcode	This paper
DTR284	PAS811	*torC23* + barcode	This paper
DTR285-288	PAS811	*torCWT* + barcode	This paper
DTR289-292	PAS811	*ynfE17* + barcode	This paper
DTR293	PAS811	*torC17* + barcode	This paper
DTR294-297	PAS811	*torC10* + barcode	This paper
DTR298	PAS811	*ST ttrSR-pttrBCA (wt)* + barcode	This paper
DTR299	PAS811	*Bp TCS1*+ barcode	This paper
DTR300	PAS811	*Bp TCS12* + barcode	This paper
DTR301	PAS811	*Ef TCS3* + barcode	This paper
DTR302	PAS811	*Et TCS7: E. tarda ttrSR-pttrBCA* + barcode	This paper
DTR303	PAS811	*Cr TCS2: C. rodentium (ICC168) dpiAB (WP_012904972.1 and RR: WP_012904973.1) - P$_{citC}$ (to gene locus tag ROD_RS03175)* + barcode	This paper
DTR304	PAS811	*Truncated Cr TCS2: ΔdpiAB* + barcode	This paper
DTR305	PAS811	*Truncated Cr TCS2: ΔdpiAB , ΔdpiA operator sites.* + barcode	This paper
DTR306	PAS811	*Ec spy* + barcode	This paper
DTR307	PAS811	*Cr TCS7: C. rodentium qseCB (WP_012907610 and WP_024132939) – P$_{ygiW}$ (to gene locus tag ROD_RS17570)* + barcode	This paper

Purified bacterial gDNA was sourced from Public Health England (NCTC 10396 *Edwardsiella tarda*
and NCTC 11829 *Blautia producta*), by donation from other laboratories, or, for *Citrobacter rodentium*,
purified using the Gentra Puregene Yeast/Bacteria gDNA extraction kit (Qiagen catalogue no. 158567). TCSs
were amplified by PCR using Q5 High-Fidelity DNA polymerase (New England Biolabs), and amplified PCR
fragments were purified by column purification using the Monarch PCR Cleanup Kit (New England Biolabs)
following the manufacturer's protocols.

DNA barcodes were synthesised as an Ultramer DNA Oligo (IDT) consisting of a 106bp variable
nucleotide region flanked by Illumina sequencing primer binding sites, allowing direct sequencing of the
barcode region, and SapI restriction sites, for GGA assembly (Table 2). The DNA barcode oligo was made
double stranded by Q5 PCR with 5 cycles with 8 pmol of starting oligo template and 32 pmol of each
duplexing primer (primers p070 and p075 for SapI based GGA, and p079 and p100 for BsaI based GGA, in
Table 2).

The destination vector was pCR06 (for SapI assembly), a modified Tn7 transposon backbone derived
from pGRG36 [36] via pDR07 [11], or pDR07 (for BsaI assembly). Amplified sensors were pooled and assembled
with the double stranded barcode oligo into the Tn7 transposon machinery containing backbone (pCR06 or
pDR07) by multiplexed GGA using SapI or BsaI. SapI GGA reactions were set up using: 3nM of each DNA
fragment, 3µL(15 units) of SapI, 0.25µL(500 units) of T4 DNA Ligase, 2µL of T4 DNA Ligase buffer and H20 to
a final volume of 20µL. BsaI GGA reactions were set up using: 3nM of each DNA fragment, 1.5µL (30 units)
of BsaI-HFv2, 0.5µL (1000 units) of T4 DNA Ligase, 2.5µL of T4 DNA Ligase buffer and H_2O to a final volume
of 25µL. Cycling conditions for all GGA were: (37°C, 5 min and 16°C, 5 min) x 30, followed by 60°C, 5 min,
then storage at 4°C. For each library, 4 µL of the GGA mix was transformed into 50 µL of ElectroMAX DH5α-E
competent cells (Thermo Fisher Scientific) by electroporation according to the supplier's protocol and
plated onto 5 carbenicillin selective LB-agar plates. An additional 1:100 dilution of the transformation
reaction was plated to estimate library size. All transformants were scraped from LB-agar transformant
plates using 1 mL of pre-warmed LB, vortexed to mix thoroughly, and frozen as a glycerol stock. A large
inoculum of the glycerol stock was grown in 5 mL of LB overnight, miniprepped and transformed into
electrocompetent E. coli NGF-1 encoding HTMS memory (PAS811). Transformant plates were scraped with
pre-warmed LB, pooled, diluted 1:1000 and grown for 6 hours at 30°C in LBPS-streptomycin-carbenicillin-
chloramphenicol with 0.1% L-arabinose to induce Tn7-based genome integration. Cells were then diluted
1:1000 and grown overnight at 42°C three times for plasmid curing. Libraries were frozen as 25% glycerol
stocks until use.

Individually cloned sensors (Ec yeaRWT, Ec yeaR23, Ec ynfE17, Ec torC10, Ec torC17, Ec torC23, Ec
torCWT, Ec hycAWT), control sensors (Ec ynfE15 and ST TCS1*), and fabR positive normalisation strains were
cloned using identical protocols to the library construction, with the exception of using individual sensor
PCRs for GGA reactions (Data File 1) and picking multiple separate (so separately barcoded) individual
colonies for plasmid integration and curing steps. Sensors and barcodes of individually cloned constructs
were verified and identified by sanger sequencing (Eurofins) (Data File 1). Correctly assembled individually
cloned sensors were combined with the pooled library at ~1:1000.

Truncation mutant cloning:

DpiA binding sites within the Cr TCS2 intergenic promoter region were identified by sequence
alignment to the corresponding genomic region in *E. coli* MG1655 within the Ecocyc database [17]. Plasmids
for truncated sensor mutants DTR304 and DTR305 were cloned by PCR amplifying appropriate regions
(using DTR304_Fwd and DTR304_5_Rev or DTR305_Fwd and DTR304_5_Rev respectively), assembled by
GGA using SapI along with unique barcodes, and transformed and genome integrated into PAS811 as above.

Library sequencing and barcode assignment:

For nanopore long read sequencing, the barcode and sensor regions of the biosensor libraries were
amplified using Q5 PCR (New England Biolabs) directly off 5 µL of glycerol stock using primers p117 and
p118 (Table 2). PCR products were purified using a Monarch PCR Cleanup Kit (New England Biolabs) and
prepared for nanopore long read sequencing using the Ligation Sequencing Kit (Oxford Nanopore
Technologies, SQK-LSK109). Library 1 was run on a Flongle flow cell (R9.4.1) and Library 2 was run on a

Minion flow cell (R10.4.1). Basecalling from Fast5 files was completed using MinKNOW software (version
22.12.5). Nanopore adapters were trimmed in Geneious (adapter sequence:
CCTGTACTTCGTTCAGTTACGTATTGCT) with 5bp allowed mismatches, minimum 10bp match to adapter and
0.1 error probability limit (regions with more than a 10% chance of error per base were trimmed).

Trimmed nanopore data was filtered for reads >400bp (a read length sufficient to at minimum
partially cover both the barcode and sensor regions), aligned to TCS reference sequences (excluding
barcode regions) of all successfully PCR amplified TCS using Minimap2 (version 2.17). Long read basepairs
that extend past the TCS reference sequence were trimmed using a custom python script and aligned to the
inferred barcodes from short read sequencing data (see below) using Bowtie2 [37]. Barcodes were assigned to
a specific sensor (Data File 1) if that sensor had both the highest number of trimmed long reads aligning to
the barcode, and highest fraction of aligning trimmed long reads normalised by total long reads for the
specific sensor, with a minimum of 5 long reads for assignment. Any barcodes with different assignments
between those values, or to which no trimmed long read data aligned were discarded for odds ratio
calculations.

For short read sequencing, genomic DNA (gDNA) was extracted from ± spectinomycin overnight
cultures manually using the Gentra Puregene Yeast/Bacteria gDNA extraction kit (Qiagen catalogue no.
158567) or on a FeliX liquid handler using the innuPREP DNA/RNA kit with an initial manual lysozyme step
for bacterial cell lysis. For the lysozyme bacterial cell lysis steps, 500μL of bacterial overnight culture was
pelleted, resuspended in 200μL of enzymatic buffer consisting of 20mM TrisCl pH 8, 2mM sodium EDTA,
1.2% Triton X-100, and 20mg/mL lysozyme and incubated at 37°C for 30 minutes. Barcodes were first Q5
PCR amplified from extracted gDNA using primers p145 and p146 (Table 2), then purified by AMPure XP
beads at a ratio of 1.8x beads to sample following the manufacturer's protocol (Beckman Coulter). Purified
barcodes were then Q5 PCR amplified (using a modified protocol with 12 cycles) using IDT UDIs and purified
again by AMPure XP beads, as above. Final fragments for short read sequencing were quantified using Qubit
dsDNA BR assay kit (Invitrogen) following the manufacturer's protocol and pooled at equimolar
concentrations. Sequencing was undertaken on an Illumina NovaSeq sequencer (150bp Paired-end)
(Novogene), with an average of 1.4 million reads per sample.

Short read sequence barcode analysis:

Short read sequencing of library screening experiments was analysed using Dada2 [38] with a custom
R script to generate inferred barcodes and barcode counts for each sample (settings: truncLen=106, max
expected errors maxEE = 1, truncQ=2). Inferred barcodes were filtered to the expected barcode length of
106bp and clustered on 95% sequence similarity using the seq_cluster function from bioseq [39]. The exact
barcode sequence with the highest read number in each cluster was kept as the cluster's reference barcode
and read counts from other barcode members of the cluster added to the reference barcode.

Fractional Odds ratio calculation and sample QC:

Sensor activation is calculated using a fractional odds ratios defined for each sensor. First, the odds
ratio for each barcode in a sample is calculated as:

$$OR_{sensor} = \frac{BC_{+SPECT}/mean(PNB_{+SPECT})}{BC_{-SPECT}/mean(PNB_{-SPECT})}$$

Where BC_{+SPECT} and BC_{-SPECT} are reads from an individual barcode from samples grown with and without
spectinomycin respectively, and PNB_{+SPECT} and PNB_{-SPECT} are combined read numbers from several positive
normalisation barcodes in samples grown with and without spectinomycin respectively. Odds ratios were
initially calculated using the averaged results from four barcoded strains triggered by our previously used
100% positive normalisation promoter from *E. coli* MG1655, pFabR [11]. However, in certain samples we
observed variability in the outgrowth of spiked-in strains compared to sensors contained within the library,
which appeared to grow more slowly (Supplementary Figure 7A). We hypothesised this may result from the
differential growth conditions of normalisation strains and library prior to mixing, leading to differential lag
phases prior to growth. Thus, we developed a more robust normalisation strategy using 14 barcodes linked
to 3 sensors contained within the library (Bp TCS1, Bp TCS12 and Ef TCS3) that consistently showed odds

ratios ~1 when normalised using fabR strains, and which were subsequently validated as constitutively switching ON by independent cloning and indicator plating (Supplementary Figure 7C). When samples were normalised using these barcodes instead of the fabR barcoded strains it corrected skewness that could lead to shifted odds ratio (Supplementary Figure 7B).

Because spectinomycin is bacteriostatic, reads from OFF sensors may remain in the culture at an abundance determined by the fold change of the population's outgrowth. This will vary based on the dilution factor used (typically 1:1000 for *in vitro* data, 1:100 for *in vivo* data) and *E. coli* cell density in the original sample (which is variable). Therefore, we further calculated a fractional OR (FOR) that takes into account observed differences in outgrowth, defined as:

$$FOR = \frac{OR_{sensor} - OR_{neg}}{OR_{pos} - OR_{neg}}$$

Where OR_{pos} is the average odds ratios of all positive control strains (Ef TCS3, Bp TCS12 and Bp TCS1), and OR_{neg} is the average odds ratio of an internally selected negative control (OFF) strain. Lg TCS1 was selected as an internal negative control, as it was the sensor with >5 assigned barcodes that consistently showed the lowest odds ratios across all analysed samples.

Finally, a set of QC parameters was developed to ensure any given sample would provide reliable sensor activation quantification. Replicate barcodes of individual sensors within the library allowed assessment of odds ratio variability caused by differences in bacterial starting concentration. Unsurprisingly, low concentration samples display higher variability in their outgrowth, resulting in higher deviation from the expected odds ratio of 1 for the 14 positive barcodes (Supplementary Figure 8G, H, I). Slope and R^2 of a linear fit of OR of positive control strains are calculated to exclude samples with high levels of observed outgrowth variation (thresholds set at an R^2 >0.6 and slope>0.5 and <2). We additionally set a conservative rationally calculated sensitivity threshold. The libraries contain sensors with abundances across ranges of orders of magnitude. We filtered barcodes to be above a set threshold of an abundance in the final sequenced -spectinomycin sample of >1/5000 of the fraction of reads. This is because any fractions below this threshold would indicate tens to a couple of hundred bacteria' cells being split between +spectinomycin and -spectinomycin cultures (from a stationary phase *E. coli* culture containing $10^8 - 10^9$ CFU/mL, a sensor at 1/5000 of the library is at a concentration of around $2*10^4 - 2*10^5$ CFU/mL, after a 1:1000 dilution into $\pm$ spectinomycin cultures would be at $20 - 200$ CFU/mL). To avoid any impacts from low abundance positive normalisation barcodes, barcodes with <100 reads in $\pm$ spectinomycin cultures from a given sample were excluded.

Due to the roughly 10-fold higher number of barcodes in Library 2, reads from all barcodes for a specific sensor in these samples were pooled before OR, FOR and QC calculations.

High throughput in vitro library screening with Tetrathionate:

Approximately 15μL of a glycerol stock of Library 1 was inoculated into a 4mL LBPS overnight culture with streptomycin, then back diluted 1:1000 into the relevant test condition in 0.5mL of LBPS in a 96-well deep-well plate and grown for 4 hours at 37°C aerobically or anaerobically. For aerobic growth plates were shaken at 1200 RPM. Liquid cultures of barcoded fabR strains for positive normalisation were spiked in at 1:100 and cultures from deep well plates were then split and back diluted 1:100 into 0.5mL cultures ± spectinomycin and grown overnight aerobically. Cells were pelleted and gDNA extracted using the FeliX liquid handling robot (as above).

In vivo library and individual strain screening:

All animal experiments were carried out under approval of the local Ethical Review Committee at Imperial College London according to UK Home Office guidelines. Experiments were conducted using 7-9 week old C57BL/6J female mice (Charles River UK). Upon arrival at the facility mice were given one week to acclimatise to housing conditions and diet. All animals were sacrificed humanely by cervical dislocation at the endpoint of the experiments. Mice were provided with Teklad 2019 Global Rodent Diet (Envigo). For all experiments, 24 hours prior to engineered bacterial administration, mice were administered 5mg, 1mg or 0mg of streptomycin sulphate as specified (VWR, 0382-EU-50G) by oral gavage in 100μL PBS and confirmed

free of streptomycin resistant bacteria by faecal plating on streptomycin selective LB agar plates 24 hours
post streptomycin oral gavage but prior to engineered bacterial delivery. Where specified, colitis was
induced via administration of 3% dextran sodium sulphate in drinking water for the specified number of
days before bacterial gavage.

For library screening experiments, libraries were grown overnight, washed in PBS and concentrated
10x (Library 1) or 5x (Library 1 + 2). 200μL of the washed library were then administered by oral gavage
(~10^{10-12} cells per mouse). For sensor activation and bacterial load quantification, fresh faecal pellets were
collected and stored immediately in 100μL of PBS, then resuspended to 100 mg/mL in PBS, vortexed for 2
mins, pulse centrifuged to remove large debris, before being diluted and plated to track bacterial load. The
remainder of the faecal supernatant (up to a limit of 400 μL for Library 1) was inoculated into 4 mL
streptomycin chloramphenicol LBPS and grown for 4 hours. For Library 1, positive normalisation fabR strains
were also diluted 1:1000 from overnight cultures and grown for 4 hours, before being diluted 1:100 into
5mL of the faecal pellet outgrowths. After thorough mixing, cultures were diluted 1:100 into 10mL fresh
LBPS, split into 2x 5mL culture, to which spectinomycin was added to one, and grown overnight. Overnight
cultures were pelleted, and gDNA extracted and amplified for short read sequencing.

For testing Ec spy, mice were administered 3% DSS for the specified number of days before bacterial
gavage. To test sensor activation, faecal pellets were collected in 100 μL of sterile PBS, then resuspended to
100 mg/mL, vortexed, pulse centrifuged to remove large debris and diluted and plated on indicator X-gal LB-
agar plates for blue-white screening. To test sensor activation within different regions of the gut, at the
endpoint of the experiment mice were dissected and the entire contents including mucus of the small
intestine, cecum, proximal colon or distal colon were scraped, collected, resuspended to 100 mg/mL,
vortexed, centrifuged, diluted and plated as for faecal pellets. The proximal colon was selected as the top
half of the colon (from the bottom of the cecum to halfway to the anus), and distal colon is defined as the
bottom half of this region.

Statistics and Sensor Rankings:

Statistical tests were performed in Graphpad Prism v9 or v10 software. For ranking responsive
sensors in the Library 1 *in vivo* screen (Figure 3D) and Library 2 *in vivo* screen (Figure 4E), sensors were first
filtered for those OFF in the gavage sample (FOR <0.25). To rank *in vivo* responsive For Library 1 screening
(Figure 3), sensors were ranked by greatest difference between average faecal FOR across all mouse
samples and gavage FOR. Sensors were then classified as 'top *in vivo* responders' if they had a response
higher than the control Ec ynfE15. To rank inflammation responsive sensors in the Library 1 + 2 screen
(Figure 4), sensors were ranked by difference in average faecal FOR in -treated animals (D2) and average
faecal FOR in control animals (D2). Sensors were classified as 'top DSS responders'.

Data availability:

595 TCS DNA sequences, including intergenic regions up to neighbouring genes and primer sequences used to
596 amplify the TCS, and library barcode sequences are available in Supplementary Data File 1.

Code availability:

598 All custom code used to analyse sequencing data or search relevant databases and extract TCS are publicly
599 available at https://github.com/ClareRobin/Robinson2023_BiosensorsLibrary.
600

References:
1   Robinson, C. M., Short, N. E. & Riglar, D. T. Achieving spatially precise diagnosis and therapy in the
mammalian gut using synthetic microbial gene circuits. *Frontiers in Bioengineering and
Biotechnology* **10** (2022).
2   Riglar, D. T. & Silver, P. A. Engineering bacteria for diagnostic and therapeutic applications. *Nat Rev
Microbiol* **16**, 214-225, doi:10.1038/nrmicro.2017.172 (2018).
3   Tanna, T., Ramachanderan, R. & Platt, R. J. Engineered bacteria to report gut function: technologies
and implementation. *Curr Opin Microbiol* **59**, 24-33, doi:10.1016/j.mib.2020.07.014 (2021).

4 Barra, M., Danino, T. & Garrido, D. Engineered Probiotics for Detection and Treatment of
Inflammatory Intestinal Diseases. *Frontiers in Bioengineering and Biotechnology* **8**, 265,
doi:10.3389/fbioe.2020.00265 (2020).
5 Kotula, J. W. *et al.* Programmable bacteria detect and record an environmental signal in the
mammalian gut. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* **111**, 4838-4843, doi:10.1073/pnas.1321321111 (2014).
6 Riglar, D. T. *et al.* Engineered bacteria can function in the mammalian gut long-term as live
diagnostics of inflammation. *Nat Biotechnol* **35**, 653-658, doi:10.1038/nbt.3879 (2017).
7 Mimee, M., Tucker, A. C., Voigt, C. A. & Lu, T. K. Programming a Human Commensal Bacterium,
Bacteroides thetaiotaomicron, to Sense and Respond to Stimuli in the Murine Gut Microbiota. *Cell*
Syst **1**, 62-71, doi:10.1016/j.cels.2015.06.001 (2015).
8 Schmidt, F. *et al.* Noninvasive assessment of gut function using transcriptional recording sentinel
cells. *Science* **376**, eabm6038, doi:10.1126/science.abm6038 (2022).
9 Inda-Webb, M. E. *et al.* Sub-1.4 cm(3) capsule for detecting labile inflammatory biomarkers in situ.
Nature **620**, 386-392, doi:10.1038/s41586-023-06369-x (2023).
10 Zou, Z. P., Du, Y., Fang, T. T., Zhou, Y. & Ye, B. C. Biomarker-responsive engineered probiotic
diagnoses, records, and ameliorates inflammatory bowel disease in mice. *Cell Host Microbe* **31**, 199-
212 e195, doi:10.1016/j.chom.2022.12.004 (2023).
11 Naydich, A. D. *et al.* Synthetic Gene Circuits Enable Systems-Level Biosensor Trigger Discovery at the
Host-Microbe Interface. *mSystems* **4**, e00125-00119, doi:10.1128/mSystems.00125-19 (2019).
12 Cooper, R. M. *et al.* Engineered bacteria detect tumor DNA. *Science* **381**, 682-686,
doi:10.1126/science.adf3974 (2023).
13 Ziesack, M. *et al.* Escherichia coli NGF-1, a Genetically Tractable, Efficiently Colonizing Murine Gut
Isolate. *Microbiol Resour Announc* **7**, doi:10.1128/MRA.01416-18 (2018).
14 Shaw, C., Hess, M. & Weimer, B. C. Two-component systems regulate bacterial virulence in response
to the host gastrointestinal environment and metabolic cues. *Virulence* **13**, 1666-1680,
doi:10.1080/21505594.2022.2127196 (2022).
15 Jacob-Dubuisson, F., Mechaly, A., Betton, J. M. & Antoine, R. Structural insights into the signalling
mechanisms of two-component systems. *Nat Rev Microbiol* **16**, 585-593, doi:10.1038/s41579-018-
0055-7 (2018).
16 Williams, R. H. N. & Whitworth, D. E. The genetic organisation of prokaryotic two-component
system signalling pathways. *BMC Genomics* **11**, 720, doi:10.1186/1471-2164-11-720 (2010).
17 Keseler, I. M. *et al.* The EcoCyc Database in 2021. *Front Microbiol* **12**, 711077,
doi:10.3389/fmicb.2021.711077 (2021).
18 Mutalik, V. K. *et al.* Precise and reliable gene expression via standard transcription and translation
initiation elements. *Nat Methods* **10**, 354-360, doi:10.1038/nmeth.2404 (2013).
19 Protein [Internet]. Bethesda (MD): National Library of Medicine (US), National Centre for
Biotechnology Information; [1988] - Accession No. BAE19899.1, Edwardsiella tarda tetrathionate
reductase complex response regulator [cited 2023 08 25] Available from:
https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/protein/BAE19899.1.
20 Daeffler, K. N. *et al.* Engineering bacterial thiosulfate and tetrathionate sensors for detecting gut
inflammation. *Mol Syst Biol* **13**, 923, doi:10.15252/msb.20167416 (2017).
21 Campbell, I. W., Hullahalli, K., Turner, J. R. & Waldor, M. K. Quantitative dose-response analysis
untangles host bottlenecks to enteric infection. *Nat Commun* **14**, 456, doi:10.1038/s41467-023-
36162-3 (2023).
22 Woodward, S. E. *et al.* Gastric acid and escape to systemic circulation represent major bottlenecks
to host infection by Citrobacter rodentium. *ISME J* **17**, 36-46, doi:10.1038/s41396-022-01321-9
(2023).
23 Merighi, M. *et al.* Genome-wide analysis of the PreA/PreB (QseB/QseC) regulon of Salmonella
enterica serovar Typhimurium. *BMC Microbiol* **9**, 42, doi:10.1186/1471-2180-9-42 (2009).
24 Lv, J. *et al.* The Role of the Two-Component QseBC Signaling System in Biofilm Formation and
Virulence of Hypervirulent Klebsiella pneumoniae ATCC43816. *Front Microbiol* **13**, 817494,
doi:10.3389/fmicb.2022.817494 (2022).

25   Lee, J., Hiibel, S. R., Reardon, K. F. & Wood, T. K. Identification of stress-related proteins in
Escherichia coli using the pollutant cis-dichloroethylene. *J Appl Microbiol* **108**, 2088-2102,
doi:10.1111/j.1365-2672.2009.04611.x (2010).
26   Baraquet, C. *et al.* TorT, a member of a new periplasmic binding protein family, triggers induction of
the Tor respiratory system upon trimethylamine N-oxide electron-acceptor binding in Escherichia
coli. *J Biol Chem* **281**, 38189-38199, doi:10.1074/jbc.M604321200 (2006).
27   Constantinidou, C. *et al.* A reassessment of the FNR regulon and transcriptomic analysis of the
effects of nitrate, nitrite, NarXL, and NarQP as Escherichia coli K12 adapts from aerobic to anaerobic
growth. *J Biol Chem* **281**, 4802-4815, doi:10.1074/jbc.M512312200 (2006).
28   Srivastava, S. K., Lambadi, P. R., Ghosh, T., Pathania, R. & Navani, N. K. Genetic regulation of spy
gene expression in Escherichia coli in the presence of protein unfolding agent ethanol. *Gene* **548**,
142-148, doi:10.1016/j.gene.2014.07.003 (2014).
29   Kwon, E., Kim, D. Y., Gross, C. A., Gross, J. D. & Kim, K. K. The crystal structure Escherichia coli Spy.
Protein Sci **19**, 2252-2259, doi:10.1002/pro.489 (2010).
30   Kannan, G. *et al.* Rapid acid treatment of Escherichia coli: transcriptomic response and recovery.
BMC Microbiol **8**, 37, doi:10.1186/1471-2180-8-37 (2008).
31   Bury-Mone, S. *et al.* Global analysis of extracytoplasmic stress signaling in Escherichia coli. *PLoS
Genet* **5**, e1000651, doi:10.1371/journal.pgen.1000651 (2009).
32   Schmidt, F., Cherepkova, M. Y. & Platt, R. J. Transcriptional recording by CRISPR spacer acquisition
from RNA. *Nature* **562**, 380-385, doi:10.1038/s41586-018-0569-1 (2018).
33   Wang, G. *et al.* CRAGE enables rapid activation of biosynthetic gene clusters in undomesticated
bacteria. *Nat Microbiol* **4**, 2498-2510, doi:10.1038/s41564-019-0573-8 (2019).
34   Rajeev, L., Garber, M. E. & Mukhopadhyay, A. Tools to map target genes of bacterial two-component
system response regulators. *Environmental Microbiology Reports* **12**, 267-276, doi:10.1111/1758-
2229.12838 (2020).
35   Gumerov, Vadim M., Ortega, Davi R., Adebali, O., Ulrich, Luke E. & Zhulin, Igor B. MiST 3.0: an
updated microbial signal transduction database with an emphasis on chemosensory systems.
Nucleic Acids Research **48**, D459-D464, doi:10.1093/nar/gkz988 (2020).
36   McKenzie, G. J. & Craig, N. L. Fast, easy and efficient: site-specific insertion of transgenes into
enterobacterial chromosomes using Tn7 without need for selection of the insertion event. *BMC
Microbiol* **6**, 39, doi:10.1186/1471-2180-6-39 (2006).
37   Langmead, B. & Salzberg, S. L. Fast gapped-read alignment with Bowtie 2. *Nat Methods* **9**, 357-359,
doi:10.1038/nmeth.1923 (2012).
38   Callahan, B. J. *et al.* DADA2: High-resolution sample inference from Illumina amplicon data. *Nat
Methods* **13**, 581-583, doi:10.1038/nmeth.3869 (2016).
39   Keck, F. Handling biological sequences in R with the bioseq package. *Methods in Ecology and
Evolution* **11**, 1728-1732, doi:https://doi.org/10.1111/2041-210X.13490 (2020).

Acknowledgements:

We would like to thank R Jackson, M Crone, N Matthews, and K Rekopoulou for assistance with sequencing
and sequencing analysis; M Tran and K Jensen for assistance with automation; G Frankel, J Marchesi, C
Mullineaux Sanders, L Roberts and D Chrystomou, for gifts of, and assistance with, genomic DNA. PAS811
was a gift from P Silver. This research was funded by a Sir Henry Dale Fellowship to D.T.R (211230/Z/18/Z).
C.M.R. was funded by a President's PhD Scholarship through Imperial College London.

Author contributions:

D.R., C.M.R and D. C. conceived of the study and experimental designs. D.R. and C.M.R. wrote the
manuscript. All authors contributed to the editing of the manuscript. T.W. and D.R. aided library
construction design, and C.M.R finalised and cloned all sensors. C.M.R. performed sequencing and
computational analyses. C.M.R and D.C. performed the animal experiments. Y.C. built and characterised the
C. rodentium DpiAB-p_{citc}C variants.

Competing interests:
The authors declare no competing interests.