Unraveling the start element and regulatory divergence of core promoters across the

domain Bacteria

Authors: Syue-Ting Kuo[1]†, Joshua Kevin Chang[1]†, Clara Chang[2]†‡, Wei-Yi Shen[1], Christine

Hsu[1]§, Sheng-Wen Lai[1], Hsin-Hung David Chou[1,2]*

Affiliations:

[1]Department of Life Science, National Taiwan University; Taipei, 106319, Taiwan.

[2]Genome and Systems Biology Degree Program, Academia Sinica and National Taiwan
University; Taipei, 106319, Taiwan.

†These authors contributed equally to this work.

‡Present address: Department of Biomedical Engineering, University of California Davis; Davis,
95616, USA.

§Present address: Department of Molecular and Cell Biology, University of California San
Diego; San Diego, 92122, USA.

*Corresponding author. Email: chouhh@ntu.edu.tw

Short Title: Dissecting core promoters across the domain Bacteria

Abstract: Core promoters comprise multiple elements whose interaction with RNA polymerase
initiates transcription. Despite decades of research, substantial sequence and length variation of
promoter elements has hindered efforts to elucidate their function and the evolutionary diversity
of transcriptional regulation. Combining massively parallel assays, biophysical modeling, and
functional validation, we systematically dissected the promoter architecture upstream of
experimentally determined transcription start sites in 49 phylogenetically diverse bacterial
genomes (GC content: 27.8–72.1%). We identified a conserved 3-bp promoter element, termed
'start,' that dictates transcription start site selection and enhances transcription. We uncovered a
four-region organization within the variable spacer element, whose sequence composition
modulates transcription by up to 600-fold. We showed that the discriminator element is
conserved in Terrabacteria but diverse in Gracilicutes, the two major bacterial clades. High
discriminator sequence diversity in Gracilicutes likely reflects diversifying evolution, enabling
promoter-encoded regulation to orchestrate global gene expression in response to growth rate
changes. Together, our findings reveal broad conservation of bacterial promoter organization
while highlighting regulatory divergence of promoter elements and RNA polymerase between
Terrabacteria and Gracilicutes. Sequence and functional similarities between bacterial promoter
elements and their archaeal and eukaryotic counterparts further suggest a shared evolutionary
origin of promoter architecture.

Introduction:

Genomes use just four nucleobases to encode myriads of genes and regulatory sequences. Deciphering this language of life is crucial — not only for understanding how organisms survive today but also for tracing the evolutionary history on Earth and projecting their future trajectories. Identifying genes' coding sequences is straightforward because they consist of codons, adhere to the reading frame, and show evident homology across species. In contrast, regulatory sequences, particularly core promoters, comprise multiple elements varying in length and sequence composition, making them difficult to recognize, especially in non-model organisms[1].

In bacteria, core promoters contain UP, -35, spacer, extended -10 (Ex), -10, and discriminator (Dis) elements in the 5′-to-3′ order (Fig. 1a)[2]. Transcription begins with RNA polymerase (RNAP) binding to the -35 and -10 elements via the interchangeable σ subunit, followed by unwinding of DNA at the -10 element to synthesize RNA from the downstream transcription start site (TSS)[3]. The -35 and -10 elements are both hexamers showing consensus sequences TTGACA and TATAAT, respectively. The spacer element, ranging from 15 to 19 bp, exhibits variable sequence composition and limited RNAP contact, with 17 bp as the preferred length for transcription[4–7]. The Ex element refers to a TG motif (or TRTG, commonly seen in Firmicutes; R = purine), appearing 2 bp upstream of the -10 element within the spacer element[8,9]. The UP element, bound by the C-terminal domain of the RNAP α subunit, displays alternating A- and T-tracts and lacks a defined length[10,11]. The Dis element, lying downstream of the -10 element, interacts with RNAP σ, β, and β′ subunits and shows high sequence variation[12–15].

Promoter evolution is shaped by multiple factors, including the corresponding σ subunit, genomic GC content, selection for gene expression, interaction with transcription factors, and functional complementation among promoter elements[2,16,17]. Decoding the regulatory syntax across diverse bacterial species is fundamental to advancing our understanding of transcriptional regulation and its evolution. Such knowledge forms the basis for developing predictive models that identify native promoters in genomes and guide the design of regulatory elements for synthetic biology applications. Earlier studies applied probabilistic models, like position weight matrices, and machine learning algorithms to reveal sequence features within individual promoter elements and across entire promoter regions[4,9,18–20]. More recently, researchers have applied massively parallel assays to explore the promoter sequence–function landscape by synthesizing and characterizing tens of thousands of promoter variants[21–25]. These efforts have enabled accurate identification of native promoters in model species (e.g., *Escherichia coli* and *Bacillus subtilis*) and yielded models that predict promoter strength in *E. coli* with impressive precision. To shed light on the diversity of promoters and gene regulation, future studies must look beyond model organisms[26–31]. However, progress has been hindered by limited empirical data, a wide range of genomic GC content, and substantial sequence and length variability among bacterial promoters—despite their being more compact and architecturally better defined than eukaryotic promoters[32]. Challenges in recognizing diverse bacterial promoters and their constituent elements have prompted researchers to reconsider the adequacy of the current promoter concept[16,2].

Changes in gene expression are critical to adaptive evolution[33], but limited knowledge of regulatory syntax has impeded our endeavor to unravel the underlying mechanisms. We reason that the field of gene regulation can be advanced through precise segmentation and alignment of promoter elements for experimental characterization and model development. Since the -35 and -10 elements are relatively conserved and separate variable elements in bacterial promoters, we

propose building an accurate -35 and -10 prediction model as the solution. We consider this
approach feasible because residues on the primary σ subunit ($σ^{70}$) that contact the -35 and -10
elements are highly conserved, even though the overall $σ^{70}$ subunit has diverged significantly
(Fig. 1a,b and Extended Data Fig. 1). To do so, we built a biophysical model trained on
comprehensive sequence–function mapping of the -35 and -10 elements in *E. coli* (Fig. 2). The
model was then applied to dissect core promoter organization upstream of experimentally
determined TSS in 49 diverse bacterial genomes spanning the domain Bacteria (genome GC%:
27.8-72.1; Figs.1c, 3, 4a and Table 1). Subsequently, we performed experiments and analyses to
validate the functional significance of the observed clade-specific and domain-wide promoter
sequence conservation.

Results:

Determining the -35 and -10 sequence–function relationship for model construction

We applied sort-seq to determine the sequence–function relationship of the -35 and -10 elements,
using green fluorescent protein (GFP) expression of *E. coli* cells to report promoter strength[34]. A
promoter library (PL) comprising all possible -35 and -10 sequence variants (4^{12} = 16,777,216)
was synthesized in the *E. coli* P$_{purR}$ promoter context (Fig. 2a). Through fluorescence-activated
cell sorting (FACS) and deep sequencing, two sort-seq replicates collectively detected
11,670,734 promoter variants (69.6%; Fig. 2b). Among these, we retained 1,022,018 variants
that passed a data quality filter ($\geq$ 20 reads and present in at least two sort-seq ranks) for
downstream analysis and model fitting. Measurements from the two replicates were highly
correlated (Pearson's r = 0.904; Fig. 2c), and promoter strength ranged from 2 to 1,115 relative
fluorescence units (RFU; Fig. 2d), with 90% of variants $\leq$ 5.8 RFU.

We constructed a model based on an established statistical thermodynamics framework[21,35,36]. It
assumes that a promoter exists in either the unbound or RNAP-bound state, with promoter
strength proportional to the RNAP-bound probability (Fig. 2e). The relative probability of each
state is determined by the Boltzmann factor $e^{-\beta\Delta\varepsilon_{RNAP}}$, where β is a system constant and $-\Delta\varepsilon_{RNAP}$
denotes the free energy difference between the RNAP-bound and unbound states. The $-\Delta\varepsilon_{RNAP}$ is
the sum of the free energy contributed by the -35 and -10 sequences and the spacer length.
Fitting the model to sort-seq determined promoter strength estimated these free energy
parameters with the mean absolute error as 0.414 (Fig. 2f,g). Results indicate that the consensus -
35 and -10 sequences and the 17-bp spacer length conferred the strongest RNAP–promoter
binding, consistent with the current knowledge (see Methods for details).

Model predicts promoter architecture across diverse bacteria

We applied our model trained on the synthetic PL library to identify the -35 and -10 elements in
native promoters across 49 species. Under a 15–19 bp spacer length constraint, our model
scanned for potential -35 and -10 elements that maximized $-\Delta\varepsilon_{RNAP}$ within the promoter region
preceding each experimentally mapped TSS (Fig. 1c). To evaluate model performance in
discerning promoter architecture in each species, we applied it to random genomic sequences and
promoter-shuffled sequences, the latter retaining base frequencies but not order. Differences
between the $-\Delta\varepsilon_{RNAP}$ distributions of these sequences and native promoters were quantified by

Kolmogorov-Smirnov statistics, with examples shown in Fig. 3a. Overall, the model
distinguished native promoters from random genomic sequences (D_g) better than from promoter-
shuffled sequences (D_s, Fig. 3b and Extended Data Fig. 2a). A cutoff of D_g, $D_s < 0.2$ was applied
to exclude *Phytoplasma sp.* (Ph.sp), *Pseudomonas putida* (Ps.pu), and *Shigella flexneri* (Sh.fl)
from further analysis (marked red in Figs. 3, 4, and 6; species acronyms listed in Table 1). Poor
model prediction for these species likely stemmed from the data quality of the original TSS
mapping experiments: (1) their TSS did not exhibit the purine bias observed in most bacteria[38],
as indicated by the *P*-values of the NRN motif in Fig. 4a; (2) the 5′ untranslated regions of their
mRNA tended to be longer, whereas most bacteria had the length distribution peaked at 20−49
bp (Extended Data Fig. 2e); and (3) their RNAP, both at the promoter-contacting residues and at
the whole-protein level, closely resembled those of their sister species (Figs. 1b and 7a and
Extended Data Figs. 1 and 5a).

Trained on empirical data from *E. coli*, model predictions across species revealed that native
promoters predominantly feature 17-bp spacer elements and -35 and -10 sequences resembling
the consensus (Extended Data Figs. 2b and 3b). In addition, three properties—unique to native
promoters yet not targeted by the model—support its translatability for mapping promoter
architecture in phylogenetically diverse bacteria: (1) higher frequencies of TG and TRTG motifs
at the Ex location (Fig. 3c and Extended Data Fig. 2c); (2) TSS was centered 7 bp downstream of
model-predicted -10 elements (Fig. 3d and Extended Data Fig. 2d), consistent with empirical
findings in *E. coli*[37]; (3) $-\Delta\varepsilon_{RNAP}$ increased when the model predicted -10 elements to be 7 bp
upstream of TSS (Fig. 3e and Extended Data Fig. 2d). Notably, the distance between TSS and
model-predicted -10 elements was more variable in *Nanosynbacter lyticus* (Na.ly), *Mycoplasma*
pneumoniae (My.pn), and *Lachnoclostridium phytofermentans* (La.ph) (standard deviations > 3.6
bp; marked in blue in Figs. 3, 4, and 6). Such variation may reflect either species-specific
characteristics or reduced TSS-mapping accuracy owing to less common technologies (Table 1).

Identifying a broadly conserved promoter element—start

Model mapping of the -35 and -10 elements in native promoters separated the length-variable
UP, spacer, and discriminator elements. Based on these boundaries, we aligned each promoter
element according to its length to reveal sequence enrichment, defined as the log-odds ratios of
base frequencies relative to genomic backgrounds (Fig. 4b, Extended Data Fig. 3, and
Supplementary Data 1). We chose this measure over the information content because it enhanced
signal contrast by offsetting genomic composition bias (Methods).

Intriguingly, while aligning experimentally mapped TSS present in each species, we unveiled a
conserved 3-bp motif, pyrimidine-purine-pyrimidine ($Y^{-1}R^{+1}Y^{+2}$), centered on TSS (position +1).
Among all 64 triplet bases, YRY was more frequent than the others in most bacteria examined
(observations $30.6 \pm 12.3\% >$ null expectation 12.5%; Fig. 4a). Taking the genomic composition
and purine bias of bacterial TSS into account[38], YRY enrichment remained statistically
significant (one-tailed binominal test: $P < 0.05$). Besides YRY, we noted the second abundant
pyrimidine-purine-purine ($Y^{-1}R^{+1}R^{+2}$) motif overrepresented in clade Terrabacteria (observations
$28.7 \pm 9.7\% >$ null expectation 12.5%), particularly *Thermotoga maritima* (Th.ma; observation
$56.0\% >$ null expectation 12.5%), indicating lineage-specific divergence. In contrast, three
species, *Geobacter sulfurreducens* (Ge.su), *Agrobacterium tumefaciens* (Ag.tu), and *Neisseria*
gonorrhoeae (Ne.go), were enriched for the TTT motif (observations vs. null expectations as
4.9% vs. 0.7%, 10.5% vs. 0.8%, and 5.6% vs. 1.4%, respectively) and lacked TSS purine bias.

Among these 3-bp motifs, only YRY has been sporadically observed before in four species:
Acinetobacter baumannii (Ac.ba), *Salmonella enterica Typhimurium* (Sa.ty), *Streptomyces*
coelicolor (St.co)*, and Mycobacterium tuberculosis* (My.tu)[39–42].

Co-localization of the YRY motif with TSS suggests it role in TSS selection. To test the
hypothesis and examine the effect of this motif on promoter strength, we analyzed data from
another study that performed saturation mutagenesis to assess how *E. coli* RNAP positioned TSS
in response to sequence variation 4–10 bp downstream of the -10 element (Fig. 5a)[37]. The
authors observed the $Y^{-1}R^{+1}$ motif. By grouping all TSS based on their distance from the -10
element, we confirmed YRY enrichment and co-localization with TSS (Fig. 5b). Notably, co-
localization occurred at 93.1% and 79.0% when the YRY motif was centered 7 or 8 bp
downstream of the -10 element, respectively (Fig. 5c). Relative to YRY, the YRR motif had a
similar but less prominent effect on TSS selection (86.2% and 67.4%, respectively). Apart from
TSS selection, promoter strength increased significantly when TSS occurred 7 or 8 bp
downstream of the -10 element, increasing further when YRY or YRR motifs co-localized (two-
tailed Mann-Whitney U test: $P < 10^{-190}$; Fig. 5d). In view of its functional significance in TSS
selection and promoting transcription, broad conservation across the domain Bacteria, and
divergence between the two major bacterial clades, Terrabacteria and Gracilicutes, we
designated the 3-bp region centered on TSS as a new promoter element, 'start.'

Variable promoter elements show broad conservation

Beyond the start element, we inspected enriched features in the other promoter elements. The -35
and -10 elements in most species were enriched for the consensus sequences (Fig. 4b and
Extended Data Fig. 3b). In contrast, Alphaproteobacteria, including *Novosphingobium*
aromaticivorans (No.ar), showed reduced -10 sequence conservation at its 3' end. The -10
element of *Bacteroides thetaiotaomicron* (Ba.th) diverged even further, exhibiting a TATCTT
hexamer followed by a TGC trimer extending into the Dis element. Both findings are consistent
with previous reports[29,43]. The -35 element of *B. thetaiotaomicron* also evolved distinctly
(TTGCTA), reflecting the significant divergence of its primary σ subunit (Fig. 1b and Extended
Data Fig. 1)[44]. Recapitulating these deviations underscores the robustness of our model
predictions.

In most species, the UP element exhibited alternating A- and T-tracts with a periodicity of
roughly 10 bp (Fig. 4b). The wave-like pattern typically spanned 40 bp but extended up to 100
bp in Gammaproteobacteria (e.g., *E. coli* (Es.co) in Extended Data Fig. 3a). Additionally, the 3'
end of the UP element was often enriched for cytosine, suggesting its contact with R554 and
R586 of $σ^{70}$ is functionally important (Extended Data Fig. 1a)[45]. Regarding the spacer element,
our model predicted its length to range mostly 16-18 bp, with 17 bp predominant across species
(Extended Data Fig. 2b). Despite considerable sequence variation, the spacer element can be
subdivided into four distinct regions in the 5′-to-3′ direction: an AT-tract (mainly thymine), a
low-signal region with slight GC enrichment (e.g., *N. aromaticivorans*, *S. coelicolor*, and
Rhodobacter sphaeroides (Rh.sp)), another AT-tract, and a G-rich region including the Ex
element (Fig. 4b and Extended Data Fig. 3c). Among them, the AT-tract and the G-rich region
proximal to the -10 element have been demonstrated to promote transcription in *E. coli* and
Mycolicibacterium smegmatis (My.sm), respectively[4,5,46–48]. In contrast, the AT-tract proximal to
the -35 element has been noted in *E. coli*[4]*,* while the adjacent 3′ GC-enriched region has not been
reported in prior studies.

Similar to the start element, the Dis element and initial transcribed region (ITR) of mRNA
(defined as the regions directly upstream and downstream of the start element, respectively, to
avoid overlap) displayed lineage specificity. The Dis element was AG- or AT-rich in
Terrabacteria but highly variable in Gracilicutes (Fig. 4b and Extended Data Fig. 3d). ITR was
AG-rich in Firmicutes (e.g., *Bacillus subtilis* (Ba.su)) and *T. maritima*, AT-rich in
Actinobacteriota (e.g., *S. coelicolor*), and frequently contained a 5′ T-tract in Gracilicutes (e.g.,
Helicobacter pylori (He.py); Fig. 4b and Extended Data Fig. 3e). To systematically assess the
sequence conservation of each element within and between species, we applied two quantitative
measures.

Intra-species conservation was estimated using Kullback-Leibler (KL) divergence, which gauged
the information contrast between an element and its genomic background (Methods). As
expected, the -10 and -35 elements ranked as the top two conserved elements across species (Fig.
6a). Notably, the start element ranked third, reaffirming its functional and evolutionary
significance. Inter-species conservation was quantified as the sequence enrichment similarity of
an element between two species, defined by the Spearman's correlation of enrichment scores
(e.g., the -10 element has 24 enrichment scores corresponding to four bases at six positions; Fig.
6b and Extended Data Fig. 4). Consistent with aforementioned observations, the -35 and -10
elements were highly conserved across species, except *B. thetaiotaomicron*. The UP, spacer, and
Ex elements were moderately conserved, except *Synechocystis* sp. (Sy.sp), *R. sphaeroides,*
Leptospira interrogans (Le.in)*, Mycoplasma pneumoniae* (My.pn), and *B. thetaiotaomicron*.

Overall, promoter elements and ITR were more conserved within Firmicutes and
Actinobacteriota than the other lineages (Fig. 6b). Relative to the -10 element and those further
upstream, the Dis and start elements and ITR showed greater differentiation between the two
major bacterial clades. In particular, the Dis and start elements were more conserved within
Terrabacteria than within Gracilicutes. Despite these between-clade differences, residues in the
σ^{70}, β, and β′ subunits that contact the Dis and start elements and ITR remain broadly conserved
(Figs. 1a and 7b, Extended Data Figs. 1a and 5a). Given that these subunits show between-clade
divergence at the whole-protein level (Figs. 1b and 7a), RNAP residues beyond the promoter-
contacting sites may contribute to the observed clade distinction in promoter elements and ITR.

Positive selection shapes broad spacer sequence conservation

To investigate the importance of sequence conservation in the spacer element, we performed
sort-seq to map its sequence–function landscapes in *E. coli*. We synthesized saturation
mutagenesis libraries, SL16, SL17, and SL18, for 16-, 17-, and 18-bp spacer elements,
respectively, paired with distinct -35 and -10 elements to reduce potential context dependence
(Fig. 8a). There, the -35 and -10 elements were designed to differ 1–3 bp from the consensus
sequences to mitigate their dominant influence on transcription initiation, as revealed by prior
studies[49,50]. From 3,855,981, 6,984,696, and 12,242,605 detected variants, we retained reliable
measurements, divided each library into five groups based on promoter strength, and computed
each group's sequence enrichment relative to the whole library (Fig. 8b and Extended Data Fig.
6). Despite differences in spacer length and promoter context, the three libraries revealed parallel
characteristics from low to high promoter strength (Groups 1 to 5 in Fig. 8c): (1) the spacer
element contained four distinct regions, mirroring those observed across species (Fig. 4b); (2)
enriched sequences in Group 5 resembled those in natural spacer elements, except for an
apparent lack of the signature TG motif of the Ex element. Notably, the TG motif frequency

increased steeply with promoter strength (Fig. 8d), indicating its positive contribution to
transcription. Underrepresentation of the TG motif was therefore an artifact of enrichment
analysis, masked by the positive enrichment of guanine (Fig. 8c,d).

To verify the context independence of the above findings, we characterized synthetic promoters
in which the enriched spacer sequences of Groups 1 and 5 (denoted as G1 and G5, respectively)
from each spacer library were paired with either consensus or the three library -35/-10 sequences
(denoted as 16, 17, 18, and C, respectively in Fig. 8e). Across SL16, SL17, SL18, G5 spacers
conferred significantly higher promoter strength than G1 spacers when paired with the four sets
of -35/-10 sequences ($P < 0.003$, paired t-test). The only exception was observed in SL17—its
G1 and G5 spacers conferred similar promoter strength when paired with the consensus -35/-10
sequence ($P > 0.05$, t-test), suggesting that the consensus -35/-10 sequence, under the optimal
17-bp spacer length, dominates and saturates RNAP–promoter binding potency. Remarkably, the
G1 and G5 spacers from SL16 exhibited a > 600-fold promoter strength difference when paired
with the SL16 -35/-10 sequences, underscoring the transcriptional impact of the spacer sequence
composition. These findings, validated by both GFP and mRNA expression (Fig. 8f), confirm the
functional importance of the four-region organization of the spacer element and suggest that
positive selection shapes its broad conservation in nature.

Diversifying evolution of the Dis element driven by growth rate regulation

To probe the function of variable Dis elements in Gracilicutes, we performed saturation
mutagenesis and sort-seq to characterize the 8-bp region directly downstream of the -10 element
in *E. coli* (Fig. 9a). Promoter strength in this DL library spanned a 240-fold range. Based on
promoter strength, we divided the DL variants into five groups to examine their sequence
enrichment (Fig. 9c). From low to high promoter strength (Groups 1 to 5), enriched features
shifted from GC-rich to C-poor sequences, with the 5` 3-bp region showing stronger enrichment
(Fig. 9d). The GC-rich pattern mirrored the 8-bp Dis element in the ribosomal promoter *rrnB* P1
(P1$_{rrnB}$; Fig. 9b)[15]. Paradoxically, the exact sequence was among the lowest-expression variants
in the DL library (24th in 58,065; Fig. 9c), while P1$_{rrnB}$ was among the strongest promoters in *E.*
coli[51].

Why would a strong promoter bear a strength-compromising component? A prior study
demonstrated that the GC-rich Dis element made P1$_{rrnB}$ transcription scale positively with
growth rate[15]. This growth rate-dependent regulation results from increasing production of the
stringent response signal ppGpp under slow growth, which allosterically regulates RNAP to
reduce P1$_{rrnB}$ transcription[52–54]. Another study further reported changes in 35.4% of the *E. coli*
transcriptome due to exogenous ppGpp overproduction (Fig. 9e)[12]. Among these changes, genes
within the same functional class showed correlated responses, for example: transcription of
translation- and nucleotide metabolism-related genes decreased significantly, whereas
transcription of amino acid metabolism- and signal response-related genes increased strongly.
Coincidentally, Dis sequences in native *E. coli* promoters whose transcription responded
negatively and positively to ppGpp (Groups 1 to 5 in Fig. 9f) resembled the low- and high-
expression variants in the DL library (Groups 1 to 5 in Fig. 9d), respectively, despite the DL
library being assayed in a nutrient-rich and ppGpp-poor condition. Examining the base
composition of DL variants and native Dis elements across groups further highlighted their
similar design principles (Fig. 9g,h).

Based on above findings, we hypothesized that high Dis variation within Gracilicutes arose in
part from diversifying evolution, enabling cells to fine-tune individual promoters to coordinate
the gene expression of each functional class across growth rates. If so, we would expect: (1)
growth rate dependency conferred by Dis elements to be modular; (2) ppGpp-contacting residues
on RNAP to be conserved; and (3) genes within the same functional class to share similar Dis
sequence features. To test modularity, we selected eight DL variants from low- to high-
expression and examined their effects on promoter strength in the P1$_{rrnB}$ and DL promoter
contexts (P$_{DL}$) in *E. coli* across growth rates (0.3-1.7 hr^{-1}; Fig. 9i). Despite the distinct expression
ranges of P$_{DL}$ and P1$_{rrnB}$, seven of eight DL variants exerted similar effects on expression and
growth rate dependency in both promoter contexts. Moreover, low- and high-expression DL
variants consistently led to positive and negative correlations, respectively, between promoter
strength and growth rate. Next, we examined ppGpp-contacting residues on the β', and ω
subunits of RNAP and found higher conservation in Gracilicutes than Terrabacteria (Fig 7c and
Extended Data Fig. 5b)[53].

Finally, we examined native Dis sequences of *E. coli* genes classified under translation,
nucleotide metabolism, amino acid metabolism, and signal response, according to KEGG
Orthology[55]. Compared with genome-wide Dis sequences, those of the four gene function classes
shifted from being overall C-rich to diverse and C-reduced in Gracilicutes (Fig. 9j), echoing *E.*
coli Dis design principles (Fig. 6g,h). In contrast, Dis sequences in Terrabacteria were AG- or
AT-rich regardless of gene function classes (Fig. 9k and Extended Data Fig. 7a-e). Examining
the similarity of Dis sequences across the four gene function classes, defined by the Spearman's
correlation of enrichment scores (i.e., 32 scores corresponding to four bases at eight positions),
further revealed the higher Dis sequence conservation among translation-related genes and the
contrasting Dis features between translation- and signal response-related genes in Gracilicutes
(Fig. 9l and Extended Data Fig. 7f,g). Together, these findings support an evolutionary
scenario—growth rate-dependent regulation in Gracilicutes has imposed functional constraints
on RNAP and diversifying selection on the Dis element, resulting in regulatory divergence of
RNAP and core promoters between the two major bacterial clades.

Discussion:

Variation in the sequence and length of promoter elements makes computational identification
and functional characterization of promoters challenging. To address this, we developed a simple
model capable of mapping core promoter organization across phylogenetically diverse bacteria
using only the -35 and -10 sequences and spacer length. Though the model-predicted $-\Delta\varepsilon_{RNAP}$
values of native promoters were generally higher than those of random sequences in most
species, their distributions overlapped substantially (Fig. 3a and Extended Data Fig. 2a). In
addition, model prediction currently requires experimentally mapped TSS to define promoter
regions. While the results highlight the potential of our model for genome-wide and cross-
domain promoter mapping, its limitations point to the need for further refinement. To this end,
future model improvement can incorporate the conserved features of the other promoter
elements, as revealed in Fig. 4b. In addition to advancing native promoter identification, our
experimentally determined sequence–function relationships for the -35, spacer, -10, and Dis
elements provide invaluable data for training models aimed at designing promoter sequences
with precise expression levels for synthetic biology applications. Among these, the spacer
element alone can modulate promoter strength by up to 600-fold (Fig. 8e), underscoring its
significance in regulating transcriptional initiation. Lineage- and gene function-specific traits,

such as Dis sequence divergence (Fig. 9), offer further guidance for engineering promoters
beyond model organisms and crafting promoters with the growth rate-tunable property.

In parallel to bioinformatic and bioengineering applications, this study yields critical insights
into the evolution of transcription mechanisms. Our findings emphasize the marked differences
in RNAP subunits and core promoter elements (Dis and start) between Terrabacteria and
Gracilicutes (Figs. 1b, 4a, 6b, 7a, 7c, 9j-l), underscoring the divergence of transcriptional
regulation between the two major bacterial clades beyond their distinct cell wall
organization[56,57]. Among these divergent features, gene function-dependent Dis similarity (Fig.
9j,l), together with systems-level modulation of cellular RNA polymerase and ribosome
concentrations[58,59], illustrate multilayered gene regulation through which Gracilicutes orchestrate
global gene expression in response to changing growth rates. Future molecular and biochemical
studies could use synthetic DNA fragments bearing these clade-specific features, together with
RNAP from diverse species or reconstructed through phylogenetic resurrection, to elucidate the
molecular mechanisms underlying evolutionary transition and functional differentiation in
RNAP–promoter interactions. Extending to the cross-domain context, identification of sequence
and functional similarities between bacterial promoter elements, start (YRY) and -10
(TATAAT), and their archaeal and eukaryotic counterparts, initiator (YR) and TATA box
(TATAAAA), strongly suggests a shared evolutionary origin of promoter architecture across the
three domains of life. This core promoter organization is retained, despite significant structural
divergence of core RNAP and recruitment of non-homologous subunits that recognize the -10
element (σ) in bacteria and the TATA box (TATA-binding protein) in the archaea/eukaryote
lineage[32,60].
376

Fig. 1 | Dissecting the function, diversity, and evolution of bacterial promoter elements.
a, σ[70]–promoter interaction. Promoter architecture highlights the broadly conserved start element, named in this study. Only σ[70] residues that physically contact the promoter are shown[13,45,61,62]. Residue positions and their domain associations correspond to *E. coli* σ[70]. Sequence conservation among the 49 examined bacterial species is quantified by information content (sequence alignment shown in Extended Data Fig. 1a). ITR, initial transcribed region. **b**, Pairwise protein sequence similarity of the σ[70] subunit among 49 species representing the two major bacterial clades. Species are ordered and lineages are distinguished by colors, as in Fig. 4a. Protein information and the maximum likelihood tree are shown in Extended Data Fig. 1. **c**, Research workflow, including model construction, collection of experimentally determined TSS, promoter element prediction, and functional validation.

Fig. 2 | Determining the -35 and -10 sequence–function relationship for model construction.
a, Promoter-reporter construct of the PL library. Two 6-bp randomized regions are marked in red.
RiboJ[63], self-cleaving ribozyme to make mRNA with a uniform 5′ end; RBS, ribosome binding
site; GFP, green fluorescent protein. **b**, Quality of fluorescence-activated cell sorting in two sort-
seq replicate experiments. The fluorescence distributions of eight sorting ranks (R1-R8) are
distinguished by colors. The black curve indicates the whole-library distribution. RFU, relative
fluorescence unit. **c**, Correlation (Pearson's r, t-test) between promoter strength measured in two
sort-seq replicates. **d**, Library distribution of promoter strength. **e**, Biophysical model of
transcription. $-\Delta\varepsilon_{RNAP}$, RANP–promoter binding energy; r_{max}, transcription rate constant; r_{min},
basal measurement noise; $\beta = 1/RT$. **f**, Model fitting performance. The curve and dots represent
model predictions and experimental data, respectively. MAE, mean absolute error. **g**, Model-
estimated free energy ($-\Delta\varepsilon$) contributions of each nucleobase in the -35 and -10 elements and of
each spacer length. Bases representing the consensus sequences are outlined for emphasis.

Fig. 3 | Model prediction and intrinsic properties of bacterial promoters.

a, Model-predicted RNAP binding energy ($-\Delta\varepsilon_{RNAP}$) for N random genomic, promoter-shuffled, and native promoter sequences in distinguishable (e.g., *T. maritima*, Th.ma) and indistinguishable (e.g., *P. putida*, Ps.pu) cases. Differences between the $-\Delta\varepsilon_{RNAP}$ distributions of native promoters and those of random genomic (D_g) and promoter-shuffled (D_s) sequences are quantified as Kolmogorov-Smirnov statistics. **b**, Summary of D_g and D_s values across the 49 species. The dashed line indicates a cutoff magnitude of 0.2. **c**, Sliding window analysis showing the frequency and the 3′ end location of the TG motif relative to the -10 element. **d**, Distribution of TSS relative to the -10 element. **e**, Correspondence between $-\Delta\varepsilon_{RNAP}$ and the TSS position relative to the -10 element. In **a-e**, species with D_g, $D_s < 0.2$ or with greater variation in -10-to-TSS distance (standard deviation > 3.6 bp) are marked in red and blue, respectively. In **c-e**, individual species are represented by curves, while histograms show the mean distributions across the 49 species.

Fig. 4 | Characteristics of TSS, promoter elements, ITR, and GC content.
a, Top to bottom: genomic GC content (gGC), proportions of all 64 triplets in the start element, statistical significances (*P*-value) of the TSS purine bias (i.e., NRN motif) and YRY and YRR motif frequencies conditioned upon TSS being purine, and the phylogenetic relationship of 49 bacteria[56]. Color bars in the top right indicate heatmap scales. Triplets belonging to YRY, YRR, or TTT motifs are indicated by red, blue, and green dots, respectively. Species with D_g, $D_s < 0.2$ or greater -10-to-TSS distance variation are marked in red and blue, respectively. T: Thermotogota, Cy: Cyanobacteria, C: Candidate Phyla Radiation, Actino: Actinobacteriota, My: Mycoplasmatota, S: Spirochaetota, B: Bacteroidota, Ch: Chlamydiota, Ca: Campylobacterota, D: Desulfobacterota, α-Proteo: Alphaproteobacteria, β: Betaproteobacteria, γ-Proteo: Gammaproteobacteria. **b**, Sequence enrichment in representative species. TSS is marked by a bended arrow. Graphic representation of positive and negative enrichment is rescaled for uniform visualization. Full enrichment analysis is presented in Extended Data Fig. 3. In **a,b**, species are shown as acronyms (full names listed in Table 1).

432

Fig. 5 | The start element influences TSS selection and promoter strength in *E. coli*.
a, Promoter bearing a 7-bp randomized region (red) in a prior TSS mapping study[37]. **b,** Sequence
enrichment in the 7-bp region for TSS occurring downstream of the -10 element. The 3-bp region
centered on TSS is highlighted. Graphic representation for positive and negative enrichment is
rescaled for uniformity. **c,** Influence of the location of YRY and YRR motifs (red bar) on TSS
selection (black curve). The TSS distribution of the whole library (N = 16,212) is shown as the
gray histogram. **d,** Library distribution of promoter strength with respect to the TSS location.
Promoter strength is calculated as RNA reads divided by DNA reads (transcripts per promoter).
The library subset, variants having YRY or YRR motifs co-localized with TSS = 7 or 8, are
shown for comparison. Boxes, whiskers, blue dots, red lines, and empty circles indicate the
interquartile range, 1.5-fold interquartile range, mean, median, and outliers, respectively, of the
distribution.

Fig. 6 | Conservation of promoter elements and ITR within and between species.
a, Intra-species conservation quantified by KL divergence per bp. **b**, Inter-species conservation measured as the Spearman's correlation of enriched sequence features. Species having D_g, D_s < 0.2 (i.e., Sh.fl, Ps,pu, Ph.sp) are excluded. Lineages are distinguished by colors shown in **a**. In **a,b**, analyses consider the dominant length type of the Dis (5-bp) and spacer elements (17-bp, excluding the 2-bp Ex region), the 40-bp UP element region upstream of the -35 element, and the 40-bp ITR region downstream of the start element. The abbreviations of species and lineage names follow Fig. 4 and Table 1.

Fig. 7 | Sequence conservation of the RNAP α, β, β', and ω subunits.

a, Pairwise protein sequence similarity of the α, β, β', and ω subunits among the 49 species.

Species are ordered and lineages are distinguished by colors, as in Fig. 4a. The ω subunit could

not be identified in *N. lyticus*, *M. pneumoniae*, *C. pneumoniae*, and *C. trachomatis* based on

genome annotation or BLAST searches, and is hence left blank. **b**, Conservation of promoter-

contacting residues quantified by information content[13,45,61,62]. Residue positions correspond to *E.*

coli homologues, with positions contacting the Dis and start elements and ITR marked in blue. **c**,

Conservation of ppGpp-contacting residues in the β' and ω subunits in Terrabacteria and

Gracilicutes. Sequence alignments for **b**,**c** are shown in Extended Data Fig. 5.

Fig. 8 | Determining the spacer sequence–function relationship.
a, Promoter backgrounds of the SL16, SL17, and SL18 libraries. **b**, Library distribution of
promoter strength in *E. coli*. RFU, relative fluorescence unit. **c**, Enriched sequences in the spacer
element with respect to promoter strength. Spacer variants are grouped based on the binning in **b**.
Graphic representation for positive and negative enrichment is rescaled for uniformity. **d**, Fold-
changes in the frequencies of the 16 2-bp motifs in the Ex region relative to the library (dashed
line) across groups. The trends of 'TG,' 'GG,' and the remaining G-bearing motifs are marked in
red, deep blue, and light blue, respectively. **e**, Transcriptional impact of the spacer element across
promoter contexts. Promoters consist of the consensus or library -35 and -10 sequences shown in
a (denoted as C, 16, 17, 18), paired with positively enriched spacer sequences from Groups 1 or
5 (denoted as G1, G5) of each spacer library shown in **c**. Results are shown as the means and
standard deviations of three independent measurements. **f,** Linear regression of mRNA fold-
changes against GFP levels (i.e., promoter strength) for the 24 promoter variants shown in **e**. The
lowest-expressing variant (SL17 -35/-10 sequences paired with its G1 spacer) serves as the
reference for calculating mRNA fold-changes. Dots and error bars represent means and standard
deviations from at least three independent measurements.

Fig. 9 | Determining the Dis sequence–function relationship.
a,b, DL library promoter background (**a**) and P1$_{rrnB}$ promoter (**b**), with the 8-bp Dis marked in red. **c**, DL library distribution of promoter strength in *E. coli*. Dis$_{rrnB}$, variant bearing the P1$_{rrnB}$ Dis in **b**. **d,g**, Sequence enrichment (**d**) and base composition (**g**) of DL variants with respect to promoter strength. Variants are divided into five groups based on the binning in (**c**). **e**, Distribution of the mRNA fold-changes of *E. coli* genes in response to ppGpp elevation[12]. **f,h**, Sequence enrichment (**f**) and base composition (**h**) of *E. coli* native Dis with respect to ppGpp-induced transcriptional changes[12]. Native Dis is grouped based on the binning in (**e**). **i**, Promoter strength of DL variants (top) in the library (P$_{DL}$) or P1$_{rrnB}$ promoter contexts across growth rates in *E. coil*. Dots and lines represent data and linear regression curves, respectively. All slopes are statistically significant ($R^2 > 0.75$, $P < 0.03$), except DL$_1$ variant in the P$_{DL}$ context. **j,k**, Base composition of Dis sequences associated with genes involved in translation (TL), nucleotide metabolism (NM), amino acid metabolism (AM), and signal response (SR) in Gracilicutes (**j**) and Terrabacteria (**k**). **l**, Similarity (Spearman's correlation) of Dis sequence enrichment across TL, NM, AM, and SR genes. Shown here are the mean similarities within and between gene function classes across species, based on Extended Data Fig. 7g. Species are excluded if they have D_g, $D_s < 0.2$ or < 10 Dis sequences in a given class. In **d,f**, graphic representation for positive and negative enrichment is rescaled for uniformity.

Table 1. Bacterial genomes and TSS.

Species	Acronym	Lineage	Genome accession no.	Experimentally mapped TSS		
				Technology	Number	PMID
Thermotoga maritima	Th.ma	Thermotogota	CP004077.1	dRNA-seq	550	23637642
Anabaena sp.	An.sp	Cyanobacteria	NC_003272.1	dRNA-seq	3955	22135468
Synechococcus elongatus	Sy.el	Cyanobacteria	CP006471.1	dRNA-seq	2429	30127850
Synechocystis sp.	Sy.sp	Cyanobacteria	NC_000911.1	dRNA-seq	170	21245330
Nanosynbacter lyticus	Na.ly	CPR‡	NZ_CP007496.1	RNA-seq*	188	35975994
Streptomyces coelicolor	St.co	Actinobacteriota	NC_003888.3	dRNA-seq	1016	27251447
Corynebacterium diphtheriae	Co.di	Actinobacteriota	NC_002935.2	dRNA-seq	1202	29370758
Corynebacterium glutamicum	Co.gl	Actinobacteriota	BX927147.1	dRNA-seq	2147	24341750
Mycolicibacterium smegmatis	My.sm	Actinobacteriota	NC_008596.1	dRNA-seq	3043	30984135
Mycobacterium tuberculosis	My.tu	Actinobacteriota	AL123456.3	dRNA-seq	1778	24268774
Phytoplasma sp.	Ph.sp	Mycoplasmatota	AP006628.2	dRNA-seq	82	29039971
Mycoplasma pneumoniae	My.pn	Mycoplasmatota	NC_000912.1	RNA-seq*	718	22617959
Clostridioides difficile	Cl.di	Firmicutes	NC_009089.1	dRNA-seq	1288	32903654
Lachnoclostridium phytofermentans	La.ph	Firmicutes	NC_010001.1	Capp-Switch	2057	27982035
Paenibacillus riograndensis	Pa.ri	Firmicutes	NZ_LN831776.1	dRNA-seq	1269	29100491
Bacillus subtilis	Ba.su	Firmicutes	NC_000964.3	dRNA-seq	600	20525796
Staphylococcus epidermidis	St.ep	Firmicutes	NC_004461.1	dRNA-seq	1206	27806702
Staphylococcus aureus	St.au	Firmicutes	NC_003923.1	dRNA-seq	1800	27806702
Listeria innocua	Li.in	Firmicutes	NC_003212.1	dRNA-seq	911	22617957
Listeria monocytogenes	Li.mo	Firmicutes	NC_003210.1	dRNA-seq	1079	22617957
Streptococcus pyogenes	St.py	Firmicutes	LR031521.1	dRNA-seq	683	30902048
Streptococcus agalactiae	St.ag	Firmicutes	NC_004368.1	dRNA-seq	885	26024923
Leptospira interrogans	Le.in	Spirochaetota	NZ_LT962963.1	dRNA-seq	2864	28154810
Bacteroides thetaiotaomicron	Ba.th	Bacteroidota	NC_004663.1	dRNA-seq	1616	32678091
Chlamydia pneumoniae	Ch.pn	Chlamydiota	NC_000922.1	dRNA-seq	382	21989159
Chlamydia trachomatis	Ch.tr	Chlamydiota	NC_010280.1	dRNA-seq	349	19923228
Campylobacter jejuni	Ca.je	Campylobacterota	NC_002163.1	dRNA-seq	675	23696746
Helicobacter pylori	He.py	Campylobacterota	NC_000915.1	dRNA-seq	716	26091613
Geobacter sulfurreducens	Ge.su	Desulfobacterota	NC_002939.5	dRNA-seq	875	27488344
Zymomonas mobilis	Zy.mo	Alphaproteobacteria	NZ_CP023715.1	dRNA-seq	3205	32694125
Novosphingobium aromaticivorans	No.ar	Alphaproteobacteria	NC_007794.1	dRNA-seq	944	34254822
Rhodobacter sphaeroides	Rh.sp	Alphaproteobacteria	NC_007493.2	dRNA-seq	1087	34254822
Caulobacter crescentus	Ca.cr	Alphaproteobacteria	NC_011916.1	dRNA-seq	1443	25569173
Agrobacterium tumefaciens	Ag.tu	Alphaproteobacteria	NC_003062.2	dRNA-seq	468	23950988
Methylorubrum extorquens	Me.ex	Alphaproteobacteria	NC_012988.1	dRNA-seq	2030	35889020
Bradyrhizobium japonicum	Br.ja	Alphaproteobacteria	NC_004463.1	dRNA-seq	4451	27107716
Neisseria gonorrhoeae	Ne.go	Betaproteobacteria	NC_022240.1	dRNA-seq	919	25143534
Bordetella pertussis	Bo.pe	Betaproteobacteria	NC_002929.2	dRNA-seq	593	29683387
Burkholderia cenocepacia	Bu.ce	Betaproteobacteria	AM747720.1	dRNA-seq	1086	26462475
Xanthomonas campestris	Xa.ca	Gammaproteobacteria	AM920689.1	dRNA-seq	1545	26975844
Acinetobacter baumannii	Ac.ba	Gammaproteobacteria	CP000521.1	dRNA-seq	864	27806702
Pseudomonas aeruginosa	Ps.ae	Gammaproteobacteria	NC_008463.1	dRNA-seq	2117	23028334
Pseudomonas putida	Ps.pu	Gammaproteobacteria	NC_002947.3	dRNA-seq	1142	27111755
Shewanella oneidensis	Sh.on	Gammaproteobacteria	NC_004347.2	Multiple†	1802	24987095
Vibrio cholerae	Vi.ch	Gammaproteobacteria	NC_002505.1	dRNA-Seq	1283	25646441
Klebsiella aerogenes	Kl.ae	Gammaproteobacteria	NC_015663.1	dRNA-seq	468	27806702
Salmonella enterica Typhimurium	Sa.ty	Gammaproteobacteria	FQ312003.1	dRNA-seq	1120	22538806
Shigella flexneri	Sh.fl	Gammaproteobacteria	CP037923.1	dRNA-seq	2051	32252626
Escherichia coli	Es.co	Gammaproteobacteria	NC_000913.2	dRNA-seq	1865	25266388

*TSS inferred based on the RNA-seq read coverage

†Tiling microarray and 5′-end RNA sequencing

‡Candidate phyla radiation

Methods:

Development of a biophysical model

Our model assumes that promoters exist in either the unbound or RNAP-bound state, with promoter strength proportional to the RNAP-bound probability. The state's relative probability is determined by the Boltzmann factor $e^{-\beta\Delta\varepsilon}$, where $-\Delta\varepsilon$ denotes the free energy, $\beta = 1/RT$, gas constant $R = 1.98e\text{-}3$ kcal mol^{-1} K^{-1}, and $T = 310$ K. The unbound-state free energy is set to zero as the ground condition. The free energy of the RNAP-bound state ($-\Delta\varepsilon_{RNAP}$) is the sum of the free energies of the -35 element ($-\Delta\varepsilon_{-35}$), spacer element ($-\Delta\varepsilon_{Spacer}$), -10 element ($-\Delta\varepsilon_{-10}$), and the P$_{purR}$ promoter context ($-\Delta\varepsilon_0$). The model assumes each base (b) at each position (i) in the -35 and -10 elements contributes to free energies additively (i.e., $-\Sigma_i \Delta\varepsilon_i(b)$). It further assumes $-\Delta\varepsilon_{Spacer}(l)$ varies with the spacer length (l) regardless of sequence[64]. During model fitting, the model scanned through each PL variant sequence, identified all potential -35 and -10 element pairs with spacer length as 16-18 bp, and selected the configuration that maximized $-\Delta\varepsilon_{RNAP}$ as the promoter. The model assumes the transcription rate constant as r_{max} in the bound state, whereas there exists basal measurement noise r_{min} in the unbound state, with $r_{min} \ll r_{max}$. We estimated model parameters by minimizing the mean squared error using the Python SciPy and scikit-learn packages[65]. The PL library promoter strength distribution was divided into ten equal-sized bins, from which 1,000 promoter variants per bin were randomly sampled with replacement as the training datasets (Fig. 2d)[66]. Model fitting estimated $-\Delta\varepsilon_0 = -7.3$, $r_{min} = 3.13$, the free energies of the 16-bp ($-\Delta\varepsilon_{Spacer}(16)$) and 18-bp ($-\Delta\varepsilon_{Spacer}(18)$) spacer elements, and that of each base in the -35 and -10 elements (Fig. 2g). Due to the scarcity of high-expression variants, we set r_{max} to 1000 RFU (i.e., maximum observed in the PL library) to represent the plateau of the model-fitted sigmoidal curve for stable parameter estimation (Fig. 2f). We tested this assumption by performing model training 30 times with r_{max} as a free parameter, resulting in $r_{max}= 452$–774 RFU. Despite this variation, the inferred $-\Delta\varepsilon_i(b)$ and $-\Delta\varepsilon_{Spacer}(l)$ correlated strongly with the r_{max}-constrained estimates (Pearson's $r = 0.981$–0.985). Similarly, to resolve parameter degeneracy that would arise due to independent estimation of $-\Delta\varepsilon_i$, $-\Delta\varepsilon_{Spacer}$, and $-\Delta\varepsilon_0$, we followed a previous modeling procedure to set $-\Sigma_b \Delta\varepsilon_i(b)$, $-\Delta\varepsilon_{Spacer}(17) = 0$[24]. To evaluate parameter sensitivity to the reference point, we performed model training 30 times using the same dataset while varying $-\Delta\varepsilon_{Spacer}(17)$. The resulting $-\Delta\varepsilon_i(b)$ were highly correlated (Pearson's $r = 0.982$–0.983). To expand the model prediction range for spacer length, we adopted $-\Delta\varepsilon_{Spacer}(15)$ and $-\Delta\varepsilon_{Spacer}(19)$ estimated by another study[64]. The two parameters were rescaled to adjust for the numerical difference, reflected by the fold difference of $-\Delta\varepsilon_{Spacer}(16)$, $-\Delta\varepsilon_{Spacer}(17)$, and $-\Delta\varepsilon_{Spacer}(18)$ between the two studies.

Model prediction and sequence analysis of promoter elements

We applied the biophysical model to predict promoter elements across the domain Bacteria. We collected the experimentally determined TSS information of 49 diverse species from the literature (Table 1). Among them, 47 TSS datasets were obtained by dRNA-seq or other direct detection methods, while two (*N. lyticus* and *M. pneumoniae*) were indirectly inferred based on the abrupt increase of the RNA-seq read coverage upstream of genes. Only primary TSS, the dominant TSS in a TSS cluster upstream of genes[67], was chosen for model prediction. The model scanned the 46-bp region upstream of each TSS to predict the -35 and -10 elements based on the criteria that their hexamer composition and the spacer length (15-19 bp) maximized $-\Delta\varepsilon_{RNAP}$. To verify the model's ability to identify true promoters, we created two negative control datasets with the sample size identical to the TSS dataset: one containing 46-bp random genomic

sequences and the other containing promoter-shuffled sequences generated by permutating the
46-bp sequence upstream of each TSS. Model prediction of the -35 and -10 elements and
identification of the start element (i.e., the 3-bp region centered upon TSS) defined ITR and the
remaining promoter elements for each TSS (Supplementary Data 1). Sequence features in each
promoter element and ITR were revealed by Log_2 enrichment and KL divergence analysis. Let p_i
(b) and $q_i(b)$ denote the frequencies of base $b \in \{A, T, G, C\}$ at position i in a data subset and the
whole dataset, respectively, where $\Sigma_b p_i(b) = \Sigma_b q_i(b) = 1$. The Log_2 enrichment $E_i(b)$ was
computed as $E_i(b) = \log_2(p_i(b)/q_i(b))$. The KL divergence D_i of position i was calculated as $D_i =$
$\Sigma_b p_i(b) \cdot \ln(p_i(b)/q_i(b))$.
561
Sequence and phylogenetic analysis of RNAP subunits
We applied Biopython 1.81 to collect all coding sequences (CDS) of the 49 species from their
genome files (Table 1)[65]. We then used RpoA, RpoB, RpoC, and RpoD of *E. coli* as the query
sequences for BLAST, setting E-value =1e-5 as the cutoff to identify the homologous proteins of
α, β, and β` subunits and σ[70], respectively (Extended Data Figs. 1 and 5). BLAST with *E. coli*
RpoA identified exactly one α subunit homolog per species. BLAST with *E. coli* RpoB identified
one β subunit homolog per species, but the corresponding CDS in *H. pylori* additionally encoded
the β` subunit at the C-terminal. Based on multiple sequence alignment, we divided this CDS
into N- and C-terminal segments homologous to the β and β` subunits, respectively. We used the
MUSCLE package in Jalview 2.11.3.3 with default settings to generate multiple sequence
alignments, both here and subsequently[68,69]. BLAST with *E. coli* RpoC found two CDS in each
of *Anabaena* sp., *Synechococcus elongatus*, and *Synechocystis* sp. as the cyanobacterial β`
subunit has evolved into two smaller γ and β` subunits[70]. We identified their protein residues
homologous to the full-length β` subunit by performing multiple sequence alignments with the β`
subunits of the remaining 46 bacteria. Then, the homologous segments were concatenated to
create a chimeric full-length β` subunit sequence for each cyanobacterium. BLAST with *E. coli*
RpoD found 164 CDS showing significant sequence similarity in 49 bacteria. To distinguish the
σ[70] subunit from other paralogs in the same protein family, we constructed a maximum
likelihood (ML) tree using the smart model selection (SMS) and fast likelihood-based method of
PhyML 3.0[71,72]. Results revealed a 56-taxa clade that comprised single CDS from 40 species
(e.g., *E. coli* RpoD) and 2-4 CDS from species belonging to Actinobacteriota (*S. coelicolor*,
Corynebacterium diphtheriae, *Corynebacterium glutamicum*, *Mycolicibacterium smegmatis*,
Mycobacterium tuberculosis) and Firmicutes (*L. phytofermentans*, *Clostridioides difficile*). As
two species, *Phytoplasma* sp. and *Burkholderia cenocepacia*, had no CDS identified by BLAST
due to missing annotation in their genome files, we separately retrieved the corresponding CDS
(BAD04713.1 and CAR54775.1) from the NCBI GenBank and merged them with the 56-taxa
clade, making the σ[70] subunit collection. The σ[70] subunit collection was subjected to multiple
sequence alignment, followed by ML tree construction using SMS and the standard bootstrap
analysis (n=1,000) of PhyML 3.0 (Extended Data Fig. 1)[71,72]. The ML tree was visualized by
FigTree 1.4.4[73]. The pairwise sequence similarity of CDS was calculated using the
PairwiseAligner function in the Bio.Align package of Biopython 1.81 using BLOSUM62 as the
scoring matrix. Since the RNAP ω subunit is too short and variable to be reliably identified by
BLAST, we retrieved its CDS primarily through finding annotations that contain keywords
'omega' or 'rpoZ' in genome files. We obtained single CDS of the ω subunit in 46 of 49 bacteria.
We used *E. coli* RNAP ω subunit (RpoZ) as the BLAST query sequence but still could not find
CDS with E-value ≤ 1e-5 in *N. lyticus*, *Chlamydia pneumoniae*, and *Chlamydia trachomatis*. The

three species may lack the ω subunit since it is not essential. Multiple sequence alignment of the
ω subunit was performed to examine its sequence conservation.
600
Strain and growth medium
E. coli K-12 MG1655 was the host strain for experiments throughout this study. LB medium
comprised 10 g NaCl (BioShop), 10 g bacterial tryptone (BD Bacto), and 5 g yeast extract (BD
Bacto) in one liter of deionized water. LBK medium, LB medium supplemented with filter-
sterilized kanamycin sulfate (final concentration as 50 mg/L, Thermo Fisher Scientific), was
used for growing cells for plasmid extraction. LBKG medium, LBK medium supplemented with
filter-sterilized glucose (final concentration as 10 g/L, Bionovas) to enhance growth and GFP
expression, was used in growth assays or FACS experiments. One liter of M9 minimal medium
comprised 5.98 g Na_2HPO_4 (AppliChem), 3 g KH_2PO_4 (AppliChem), 0.5 g NaCl, 0.8 g NH_4Cl
(AppliChem), 976.7 mL of deionized water, and the following components that were filter-
sterilized separately and added immediately before use: 1 mL of 0.1 M $CaCl_2$ (Hayashi
Chemical), 2 mL of 1 M $MgSO_4$ (Sigma-Aldrich), 0.2 mL of 185 mM $FeCl_3$ (AppliChem), 0.3
mL of 1 mM thiamine hydrochloride (WS Simpson), 9.8 mL of M9 trace element solution, 1 mL
of kanamycin sulfate (50 mg/mL), and the intended amount of carbon source and amino acid
supplements. M9 trace element solution comprised 0.18 g $ZnSO_4 \cdot 7H_2O$ (J.T.Baker), 0.12 g
$CuCl_2 \cdot 2H_2O$ (Sigma-Aldrich), 0.12 g $MnSO_4 \cdot H_2O$ (J.T.Baker), and 0.18 g $CoCl_2 \cdot 6H_2O$ (Sigma-
Aldrich) in 980 mL of deionized water. The final concentrations of glucose and glycerol
(J.T.Baker) were 5 g/L and 2.2 g/L, respectively. The final concentrations of casamino acids
(Bioshop) were 2 or 10 g/L (denoted as 1×CA and 5×CA, respectively). Six kinds of growth
medium were applied to grow *E. coli*, resulting in slow to fast cellular growth: M9-glycerol, M9-
glucose, M9-glucose-1×CA, M9-glucose-5×CA, LBK, LBKG. SOB medium, consisting of 20 g
bacterial tryptone, 5 g yeast extract, 0.584 g NaCl, 0.186 g KCl (J. T. Baker), 2.033 g
$MgCl_2 \cdot 6H_2O$ (J. T. Baker), and 2.465 g $MgSO_4 \cdot 7H_2O$ (J. T. Baker) in one liter of deionized
water, was used in preparation of electrocompetent cells. SOC medium, SOB medium
supplemented with filter-sterilized glucose (180 g/L), was applied to restore cells after
electroporation. To achieve a higher transformation efficiency in promoter library construction,
we used Recovery Medium (LGC Biosearch Technologies) to revive electrocompetent cells
instead of SOC medium. Solid medium was made by supplementing one liter of liquid medium
with 20 g agar (BioShop).
630
Plasmid and library construction
All primers and oligonucleotides were synthesized by Integrated DNA Technologies and listed in
Supplementary Table 1. Most plasmids were constructed by inverse PCR, while some were made
by restriction digestion and ligation. Plasmid features and construction procedures are delineated
in Supplementary Table 2. Primers for inverse PCR were 5' phosphorylated using T4
polynucleotide kinase (NEB). Inverse PCR was conducted using Phusion DNA polymerase
(Thermo Fisher Scientific). DpnI restriction enzyme (NEB) was employed to remove template
plasmids. T4 DNA Ligase (NEB) was utilized to circularize plasmids. After purification by the
Zymo DNA Clean & Concentrator kit, the ligation product was transformed into *E. coli* using the
BIO-RAD MicroPulser electroporator. Electrocompetent cells were prepared following
established protocols[34]. The promoter backbone and the ribosome binding site on the template
plasmids for constructing the PL, SP16, SP17, SP18, and DL libraries were adjusted to prevent
growth inhibition by excessive GFP expression while providing a wide dynamic range of
fluorescence signals for FACS experiments[34]. Primers for library construction were pre-

phosphorylated and HPLC-purified. PL, SL16, SL17, SL18, and DL libraries were constructed
by inverse PCR of template plasmids, followed by ligation, and transformation into *E. coli*
(Supplementary Table 2). Q5 DNA polymerase (NEB) and two inverse primers, each containing
randomized nucleotides, were applied to amplify template plasmids. Following DpnI treatment,
T4 DNA Ligase was utilized to circularize plasmids. After DNA purification, ligation products
were mixed with 180 µL of freshly made electrocompetent cells and divided into six equal
aliquots for electroporation. All transformed cells were pooled and revived in 6 mL of Recovery
Medium at 37°C and 225 rpm for 1 hour, transferred to 30 mL of LBK medium, and incubated at
37°C and 225 rpm overnight. The transformation efficiency for library construction was $\geq 5\times10^7$
colony forming units. Cells in the overnight culture were collected by centrifugation,
resuspended in 1 mL of PBS containing 25% glycerol (v/v), aliquoted into 20 portions, and
stored at -80°C as the inoculum for sort-seq experiments.
657
Measurement of cell growth and GFP expression
Cellular GFP fluorescence was quantified by a BD FACSJazz cell sorter. Each experiment began
with inoculating 1 µL of *E. coli* frozen stocks into 2 mL of growth medium incubated at 37°C
and 225 rpm overnight. The next day, 5 µL of the pre-culture was transferred to 2 mL of growth
medium, incubated and monitored in a Tecan Spark 10M microplate reader. When OD_{600} reached
0.55-0.65, 100 µL of culture was mixed thoroughly with 900 µL of pre-chilled phosphate-
buffered saline (PBS) and stored on ice. For each strain, the cell sorter quantified GFP
fluorescence (excitation/emission: 488 nm/513 ± 8.5 nm) of 50,000 to 200,000 cells in three
replicates.
667
Sort-seq experiment
One aliquot of the promoter library frozen stock was revived in 20 mL LBKG medium.
Meanwhile, spike-in variants, promoters with known sequences and expression levels (
Supplementary Table 3), were revived in 1 mL LBKG medium. Promoter libraries and spike-in
variants were incubated overnight at 37°C and 225 rpm. Subsequently, 50 µL and 2.5 µL of the
library and spike-in precultures were transferred to 20 mL and 1 mL LBKG medium,
respectively. Both were grown at 37°C and 225 rpm until their OD_{600} reached 0.55-0.65. All
spike-in variants were evenly pooled and added to the library in a 1:2500 ratio (v/v). This
mixture was diluted ten times with PBS and stored on ice. FACS experiments were performed by
a BD FACSJazz cell sorter, and cells were maintained at 4°C throughout. The photomultiplier
tube of the cell sorter was calibrated based on spike-in variants pWS19, LP02v14, and LP03v4.
The fluorescence distribution of each library was divided into 7-8 ranks, numbered in ascending
order according to the GFP fluorescence intensity (Supplementary Table 4). A total of 1.5×10^7
cells were collected, with the number of cells collected for each rank proportional to its relative
abundance in the library. After FACS, cells in each rank were immediately grown in 10 mL LBK
medium at 37°C and 225 rpm overnight. Subsequently, the plasmids of each rank were extracted
using the Qiagen Plasmid Miniprep Kit. To inspect the FACS purity of each rank, 5 µL of
overnight cultures were inoculated into 2 mL LBKG medium incubated at 37°C and 225 rpm.
The fluorescence distribution was examined by the cell sorter when its OD_{600} reached 0.55-0.65
(Fig. 2b and Extended Data Fig. 6a). Promoter sequences in each sorting rank were determined
by the Illumina NovaSeq 6000 system. Sequencing library preparation followed the Illumina
two-step PCR procedure. A 0.3-kb fragment, including the promoter, 5′ untranslated region, and
partial *gfp* gene, was amplified by amplicon PCR using KAPA HiFi DNA polymerase (Roche),
along with equal-volume mixed forward primers ILp11, ILp11a, ILp11b, and ILp11c and the

reverse primer ILp12. Amplicon PCR products were purified by AMPure XP Beads (Beckman)
and then subjected to index PCR using KAPA HiFi DNA polymerase and a unique pair of index
primers from the Nextera XT Index Kit (Illumina). Index PCR products were purified by
AMPure XP Beads, whose DNA concentrations were measured by a Qubit fluorometer (Thermo
Fisher Scientific). Index PCR products were pooled based on the proportion of each rank in the
library. The multiplexed sample was subjected to 150-bp paired-end sequencing. We set FastQC
quality score $Q \geq 25$ to filter out poor sequencing results.

Using sort-seq data to estimate promoter strength
The occurrence of each promoter variant was counted in each sort-seq rank. Let $F_v(n)$ denote the
frequency of promoter variant v in rank n, where $\Sigma_n F_v(n) = 1$. The rank mean R_v of variant v was
calculated as $R_v = \Sigma_n n \cdot F_v(n)$. The rank means of spike-in variants were computed in the same
manner. Let E_v denote RFU on the Log_{10} scale and $E_v = a \cdot R_v + b$. Parameters a and b were
obtained by performing a linear regression of R_v and E_v of the spike-in variants (Supplementary
Table 5). The rank mean of a promoter variant was then converted into its promoter strength
using E_v. We set a minimal read count threshold for promoter variants (PL: 20, SL16: 8, SL17:
23, SL18: 31, DL: 9) such that the Pearson's correlation coefficients of two sort-seq experimental
replicates were ≥ 0.9 (Extended Data Fig. 6b,c). To select data with high reproducibility for
model training, we further required variants in the PL library to be detected in at least two sort-
seq ranks. (Fig. 2b). We combined data from two sets of sort-seq replicates, averaging promoter
strength for variants present in both replicates, for subsequent analysis.

RNA extraction and quantitative PCR
E. coli was grown in 10 mL of LBKG medium at 37°C and 225 rpm overnight. When OD_{600}
reached 0.55-0.65, cells were harvested by adding 1/10 the volume of a growth-stopping solution
(5% Tris-EDTA saturated phenol and 95% ethanol), followed by centrifugation at 9,000 × g for
10 minutes at 4°C. Total RNA was extracted using the QIAGEN RNeasy Mini Kit, followed by
removal of genomic DNA with the Turbo DNA-free Kit (Thermo Fisher Scientific). cDNA was
synthesized by the High-Capacity cDNA Reverse Transcription Kit (Thermo Fisher Scientific).
For each variant, mRNA extraction and cDNA synthesis were performed twice independently.
The primer pairs for detecting the *gfp* and *gapA* transcripts were YLEp5/YLEp6 and
YLEp7/YLEp8, respectively. Real-Time PCR of each cDNA sample was performed in two
replicates with the iQ SYBR Green Supermix (Bio-Rad) on a CFX Connect Real-Time PCR
System (Bio-Rad). Only measurements with the standard deviation of cycle threshold values $\leq$
0.2 were retained for analysis. The *gapA* housekeeping gene served as the reference for data
normalization. mRNA levels were calculated based on an establxished method[34,74].

Data availability. The raw sequence reads of the PL, SL16, SL17, SL18, and DL libraries are
deposited under National Center for Biotechnology Information BioProject ID PRJNA1049603,
PRJNA1049606, and PRJNA1138934.

Code availability. The code of the promoter prediction model 'Promoter Scanner' is available at
GitHub (https://github.com/AntonySTKuo/Promoter-scanner/tree/main).

Acknowledgments. We thank the National Taiwan University College of Life Science
Technology Commons for instrument support, Uwe Sauer, Chris Marx, Sheng-Hong Chen, Jun-
Yi Leu, and Sen-Lin Tang for insightful discussions. This research is supported by National
Taiwan University grants (104R104034, 111L7842, 112L7834, 113L4000-1) and Taiwan
National Science and Technology Council grants (110-2311-B-002-008, 111-2311-B-002-020,
112-2311-B-002-011, 113-2311-B-002-008).

Author contributions. H.H.D.C. conceived the idea, acquired funding, supervised the project,
and wrote the manuscript with input from all authors. S.T.K., J.K.C., C.C. and H.H.D.C.
developed experimental and analytical methods. S.T.K., J.K.C., C.C., W.Y.S., C.H., S.W.L. and
H.H.D.C. led the investigation. H.H.D.C. and S.T.K analyzed and visualized the data.

Competing interests. Authors declare that they have no competing interests.

Correspondence and requests for materials should be addressed to Hsin-Hung David Chou.
751

References:

1. Wasserman, W. W. & Sandelin, A. Applied bioinformatics for the identification of

regulatory elements. *Nat. Rev. Genet.* **5**, 276–287 (2004).

2. Mejía-Almonte, C. *et al.* Redefining fundamental concepts of transcription initiation in

bacteria. *Nat. Rev. Genet.* **21**, 699–714 (2020).

3. Chen, J. *et al.* Stepwise promoter melting by bacterial RNA polymerase. *Mol. Cell* **78**, 275-

288.e6 (2020).

4. Singh, S. S., Typas, A., Hengge, R. & Grainger, D. C. *Escherichia coli* σ^{70} senses sequence

and conformation of the promoter spacer region. *Nucleic Acids Res.* **39**, 5109–5118 (2011).

5. Yuzenkova, Y., Tadigotla, V. R., Severinov, K. & Zenkin, N. A new basal promoter element

recognized by RNA polymerase core enzyme. *EMBO J.* **30**, 3766–3775 (2011).

6. Aoyama, T. *et al.* Essential structure of *E. coli* promoter effect of spacer length between the

two consensus sequences on promoter function. *Nucleic Acids Res.* **11**, 5855–5864 (1983).

7. Hook-Barnard, I. G. & Hinton, D. M. The promoter spacer influences transcription initiation

via σ^{70} region 1.1 of Escherichia coli RNA polymerase. **106**, 737–742 (2009).

8. Voskuil, M. The -16 region of *Bacillus subtilis* and other gram-positive bacterial promoters.

Nucleic Acids Res. **26**, 3584–3590 (1998).

9. Shultzaberger, R. K., Chen, Z., Lewis, K. A. & Schneider, T. D. Anatomy of *Escherichia*

coli σ^{70} promoters. *Nucleic Acids Res.* **35**, 771–788 (2007).

10. Ross, W. *et al.* A third recognition element in bacterial promoters: DNA binding by the α

subunit of RNA polymerase. *Science* **262**, 1407–1413 (1993).

11. Estrem, S. T., Gaal, T., Ross, W. & Gourse, R. L. Identification of an UP element consensus

sequence for bacterial promoters. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **95**, 9761–9766 (1998).

12. Sanchez-Vazquez, P., Dewey, C. N., Kitten, N., Ross, W. & Gourse, R. L. Genome-wide

effects on *Escherichia coli* transcription from ppGpp binding to its two sites on RNA

polymerase. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **116**, 8310–8319 (2019).

13. Zhang, Y. *et al.* Structural basis of transcription initiation. *Science* **338**, 1076–1080 (2012).

14. Travers, A. A. Promoter sequence for stringent control of bacterial ribonucleic acid

synthesis. *J. Bacteriol.* **141**, 973–976 (1980).

15. Haugen, S. P. *et al.* rRNA promoter regulation by nonoptimal binding of σ region 1.2: an

additional recognition element for RNA polymerase. *Cell* **125**, 1069–1082 (2006).

16. Hook-Barnard, I. G. & Hinton, D. M. Transcription initiation by mix and match elements:

flexibility for polymerase binding to bacterial promoters. *Gene Regul. Syst. Biol.* **1**,

117762500700100 (2007).

17. Lee, D. J., Minchin, S. D. & Busby, S. J. W. Activating transcription in bacteria. *Annu. Rev.*

Microbiol. **66**, 125–152 (2012).

18. Rhodius, V. A., Mutalik, V. K. & Gross, C. A. Predicting the strength of UP-elements and

full-length *E. coli* σ^E promoters. *Nucleic Acids Res.* **40**, 2907–2924 (2012).

19. Cassiano, M. H. A. & Silva-Rocha, R. Benchmarking bacterial promoter prediction tools:

potentialities and limitations. *mSystems* **5**, e00439-20 (2020).

20. Wang, Y. *et al.* Synthetic promoter design in *Escherichia coli* based on a deep generative

network. *Nucleic Acids Res.* **48**, 6403–6412 (2020).

21. Kinney, J. B., Murugan, A., Callan, C. G. & Cox, E. C. Using deep sequencing to

characterize the biophysical mechanism of a transcriptional regulatory sequence. *Proc. Natl.*

Acad. Sci. **107**, 9158–9163 (2010).

22. Belliveau, N. M. *et al.* Systematic approach for dissecting the molecular mechanisms of

transcriptional regulation in bacteria. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **115**, (2018).

23. Urtecho, G. *et al.* Genome-wide functional characterization of *Escherichia coli* promoters

and sequence elements encoding their regulation. *eLife* **12**, (2023).

24. Lagator, M. *et al.* Predicting bacterial promoter function and evolution from random

sequences. *eLife* **11**, e64543 (2022).

25. LaFleur, T. L., Hossain, A. & Salis, H. M. Automated model-predictive design of synthetic

promoters to control transcriptional profiles in bacteria. *Nat. Commun.* **13**, 5159 (2022).

26. Farasat, I. *et al.* Efficient search, mapping, and optimization of multi-protein genetic systems

in diverse bacteria. *Mol. Syst. Biol.* **10**, 731 (2014).

27. Johns, N. I. *et al.* Metagenomic mining of regulatory elements enables programmable

species-selective gene expression. (2018).

28. Yim, S. S. *et al.* Multiplex transcriptional characterizations across diverse bacterial species

using cell-free systems. *Mol. Syst. Biol.* **15**, e8875 (2019).

29. Myers, K. S., Noguera, D. R. & Donohue, T. J. Promoter architecture differences among

Alphaproteobacteria and other bacterial taxa. *mSystems* **6**, e00526-21 (2021).

30. Chevez-Guardado, R. & Peña-Castillo, L. Promotech: a general tool for bacterial promoter

recognition. *Genome Biol.* **22**, 318 (2021).

31. Martinez, G. S. *et al.* CDBProm: The comprehensive directory of bacterial promoters. *NAR*

Genomics Bioinforma. **6**, lqae018 (2024).

32. Haberle, V. & Stark, A. Eukaryotic core promoters and the functional basis of transcription

initiation. *Nat. Rev. Mol. Cell Biol.* **19**, 621–637 (2018).

33. Wittkopp, P. J. & Kalay, G. Cis-regulatory elements: molecular mechanisms and

evolutionary processes underlying divergence. *Nat. Rev. Genet.* **13**, 59–69 (2012).

34. Kuo, S.-T. *et al.* Global fitness landscapes of the Shine-Dalgarno sequence. *Genome Res.* **30**,

711–723 (2020).

35. Bintu, L. *et al.* Transcriptional regulation by the numbers: models. *Curr. Opin. Genet. Dev.*

15, 116–124 (2005).

36. Shea, M. A. & Ackers, G. K. The OR control system of bacteriophage lambda. A physical-

chemical model for gene regulation. *J. Mol. Biol.* **181**, 211–230 (1985).

37. Vvedenskaya, I. O. *et al.* Massively Systematic Transcript End Readout, "MASTER":

Transcription Start Site Selection, Transcriptional Slippage, and Transcript Yields. *Mol. Cell*

60, 953–965 (2015).

38. Kim, D. *et al.* Comparative analysis of regulatory elements between *Escherichia coli* and

Klebsiella pneumoniae by genome-wide transcription start site profiling. *PLOS Genet.* **8**,

e1002867 (2012).

39. Kröger, C. *et al.* The transcriptional landscape and small RNAs of *Salmonella enterica*

serovar Typhimurium. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **109**, E1277-1286 (2012).

40. Cortes, T. *et al.* Genome-wide mapping of transcriptional start sites defines an extensive

leaderless transcriptome in *Mycobacterium tuberculosis*. *Cell Rep.* **5**, 1121–1131 (2013).

41. Jeong, Y. *et al.* The dynamic transcriptional and translational landscape of the model

antibiotic producer *Streptomyces coelicolor* A3(2). *Nat. Commun.* **7**, 11605 (2016).

42. Kröger, C. *et al.* The primary transcriptome, small RNAs and regulation of antimicrobial

resistance in *Acinetobacter baumannii* ATCC 17978. *Nucleic Acids Res.* **46**, 9684–9698

(2018).

43. Bayley, D. P., Rocha, E. R. & Smith, C. J. Analysis of *cepA* and other *Bacteroides fragilis*

genes reveals a unique promoter structure. *FEMS Microbiol. Lett.* **193**, 149–154 (2000).

44. Vingadassalom, D. *et al.* An unusual primary sigma factor in the Bacteroidetes phylum. *Mol.*

Microbiol. **56**, 888–902 (2005).

45. Campbell, E. A. *et al.* Structure of the bacterial RNA polymerase promoter specificity σ

subunit. *Mol. Cell* **9**, 527–539 (2002).

46. Liu, M., Tolstorukov, M., Zhurkin, V., Garges, S. & Adhya, S. A mutant spacer sequence

between -35 and -10 elements makes the P*lac* promoter hyperactive and cAMP receptor

protein-independent. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **101**, 6911–6916 (2004).

47. Warman, E. A., Singh, S. S., Gubieda, A. G. & Grainger, D. C. A non-canonical promoter

element drives spurious transcription of horizontally acquired bacterial genes. *Nucleic Acids*

Res. **48**, 4891–4901 (2020).

48. Zhu, Y. *et al.* Characterization of a minimal type of promoter containing the −10 element and

a guanine at the −14 or −13 position in Mycobacteria. *J. Bacteriol.* **199**, (2017).

49. Einav, T. & Phillips, R. How the avidity of polymerase binding to the –35/–10 promoter sites

affects gene expression. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **116**, 13340–13345 (2019).

50. Van Brempt, M. *et al.* Predictive design of sigma factor-specific promoters. *Nat. Commun.*

11, 5822 (2020).

51. Schneider, D. A., Ross, W. & Gourse, R. L. Control of rRNA expression in *Escherichia coli*.

Curr. Opin. Microbiol. **6**, 151–156 (2003).

52. Wu, C. *et al.* Cellular perception of growth rate and the mechanistic origin of bacterial

growth law. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **119**, e2201585119 (2022).

53. Ross, W., Vrentas, C. E., Sanchez-Vazquez, P., Gaal, T. & Gourse, R. L. The magic spot: a

ppGpp binding site on *E. coli* RNA polymerase responsible for regulation of transcription

initiation. *Mol. Cell* **50**, 420–429 (2013).

54. Irving, S. E., Choudhury, N. R. & Corrigan, R. M. The stringent response and physiological

roles of (pp)pGpp in bacteria. *Nat. Rev. Microbiol.* **19**, 256–271 (2021).

55. Kanehisa, M., Furumichi, M., Sato, Y., Kawashima, M. & Ishiguro-Watanabe, M. KEGG for

taxonomy-based analysis of pathways and genomes. *Nucleic Acids Res.* **51**, D587–D592

(2023).

56. Coleman, G. A. *et al.* A rooted phylogeny resolves early bacterial evolution. *Science* **372**,

eabe0511 (2021).

57. Hashimi, A. & Tocheva, E. I. Cell envelope diversity and evolution across the bacterial tree

of life. *Nat. Microbiol.* **9**, 2475–2487 (2024).

58. Klumpp, S., Zhang, Z. & Hwa, T. Growth rate-dependent global effects on gene expression

in bacteria. *Cell* **139**, 1366–1375 (2009).

59. Balakrishnan, R. *et al.* Principles of gene regulation quantitatively connect DNA to RNA and

proteins in bacteria. *Science* **378**, eabk2066 (2022).

60. Decker, K. B. & Hinton, D. M. Transcription regulation at the core: similarities among

bacterial, archaeal, and eukaryotic RNA polymerases. *Annu. Rev. Microbiol.* **67**, 113–139

(2013).

61. Feklistov, A. & Darst, S. A. Structural basis for promoter −10 element recognition by the

bacterial RNA polymerase σ subunit. *Cell* **147**, 1257–1269 (2011).

62. Bae, B., Feklistov, A., Lass-Napiorkowska, A., Landick, R. & Darst, S. A. Structure of a

bacterial RNA polymerase holoenzyme open promoter complex. *eLife* **4**, e08504 (2015).

63. Lou, C., Stanton, B., Chen, Y.-J., Munsky, B. & Voigt, C. A. Ribozyme-based insulator parts

buffer synthetic circuits from genetic context. *Nat. Biotechnol.* **30**, 1137–1142 (2012).

64. Lagator, M. *et al.* Predicting bacterial promoter function and evolution from random

sequences. *eLife* **11**, e64543 (2022).

65. Cock, P. J. A. *et al.* Biopython: freely available Python tools for computational molecular

biology and bioinformatics. *Bioinformatics* **25**, 1422–1423 (2009).

66. Botev, Z. & Ridder, A. Variance reduction. in *Wiley statsRef: statistics reference online* 1–6

(John Wiley & Sons, Ltd, 2017).

67. Thomason, M. K. *et al.* Global transcriptional start site mapping using differential RNA

sequencing reveals novel antisense RNAs in *Escherichia coli*. *J. Bacteriol.* **197**, 18–28

(2015).

68. Waterhouse, A. M., Procter, J. B., Martin, D. M. A., Clamp, M. & Barton, G. J. Jalview

Version 2—a multiple sequence alignment editor and analysis workbench. *Bioinformatics*

25, 1189–1191 (2009).

69. Troshin, P. V., Procter, J. B. & Barton, G. J. Java bioinformatics analysis web services for

multiple sequence alignment—JABAWS:MSA. *Bioinformatics* **27**, 2001–2002 (2011).

70. Shen, L. *et al.* An SI3-σ arch stabilizes cyanobacteria transcription initiation complex. *Proc.*

Natl. Acad. Sci. **120**, e2219290120 (2023).

71. Guindon, S. *et al.* New Algorithms and Methods to Estimate Maximum-Likelihood

Phylogenies: Assessing the Performance of PhyML 3.0. *Syst. Biol.* **59**, 307–321 (2010).

72. Lefort, V., Longueville, J.-E. & Gascuel, O. SMS: Smart Model Selection in PhyML. *Mol.*

Biol. Evol. **34**, 2422–2424 (2017).

73. Rambaut, A. Figtree ver 1.4.4. Institute of Evolutionary Biology, University of Edinburgh

(2018).

74. Livak, K. J. & Schmittgen, T. D. Analysis of relative gene expression data using real-time

quantitative PCR and the $2-\Delta\Delta CT$ method. *Methods* **25**, 402–408 (2001).

Additional files:

Supplementary Data 1

Supplementary Information

919   Extended Data Figs. 1-7

920   Supplementary Tables 1-5

921   References for Supplementary Information