A simplified and highly efficient cell-free protein synthesis system for prokaryotes

Xianshengjie Lang[1,#], Changbin Zhang[1,#], Jingxuan Lin[1], Zhe Zhang[1,*], Wenfei Li[1,2,*]

[1] School of Basic Medical Sciences, Cheeloo College of Medicine, Shandong University,
Jinan, Shandong, China.

[2] Children's Hospital Affiliated to Shandong University, Jinan, Shandong, China

[#] Equal contribution

[*] Correspondence to: Zhe Zhang zhezhang@sdu.edu.cn, Wenfei Li
wenfeili@sdu.edu.cn

Abstract

Cell-free protein synthesis (CFPS) systems are a powerful platform with immense

potential in fundamental research, biotechnology, and synthetic biology. Conventional

prokaryotic CFPS systems, particularly those derived from *Escherichia coli* (*E. coli*), often

rely on complex reaction buffers containing up to thirty-five components, limiting their

widespread adoption and systematic optimization. Here, we present an optimized *E. coli*

cell-free protein synthesis (*e*CFPS) system, significantly streamlined for high efficiency.

Through systematic screening, we successfully reduced the essential core reaction

components from 35 to 7. The thorough optimization of these seven key components

ensured that protein expression levels were not only maintained but even improved.

Furthermore, we developed a much simpler procedure for preparing the bacterial

cytosolic extracts, enhancing the overall accessibility and robustness of *e*CFPS. This

optimized and user-friendly *e*CFPS is poised to become a powerful tool, facilitating

diverse applications in basic life science research and beyond.

Introduction

Cell-free protein synthesis (CFPS) offers a powerful and flexible platform for biological research and biotechnological applications by reproducing the cellular protein synthesis process in an *in vitro* environment[1,2]. Compared to traditional cell-based expression systems, CFPS possesses several notable advantages, including rapid reaction kinetics, ease of operation, independence from cell culture, high tolerance to toxic proteins, and facile incorporation of non-canonical amino acids[3–5]. These characteristics position CFPS for broad applications in protein engineering, high-throughput screening, synthetic biology, and diagnostic reagent development[6,7].

Prokaryotic CFPS systems, especially those based on *E. coli* lysates, have garnered significant attention for their high protein synthesis yields and compatibility with genetic manipulations[8–12]. They have played a pivotal role in early molecular biology research and continue to be relevant in industrial protein production and biosensor development[1,13,14]. However, for a long time, most prokaryotic CFPS protocols have relied on complex buffer systems containing a large number of auxiliary components[15,16]. A comprehensive analysis of existing literature reveals that the composition of reaction buffers differs widely between protocols, both in the number of optional components and in the concentrations of individual components (**Table S1**). These complex systems, while effective, often lead to high costs, laborious preparation procedures, and potential interactions among components, posing significant challenges for further optimization and standardization, thereby limiting their widespread adoption in resource-constrained laboratories.

In recent years, the field of eukaryotic CFPS has seen remarkable progress in system optimization and simplification[17,18]. Highly optimized human *in vitro* translation systems have demonstrated that high-efficiency protein synthesis can be achieved with a minimal number of core components[17]. Recognizing the potential of such systematic optimization approaches, we hypothesized that similar strategies could be equally applicable and beneficial for *E. coli* CFPS systems by thoroughly analyzing the functions of existing components and integrating insights from previous reports on prokaryotic protein synthesis mechanisms. This study aimed to develop a highly simplified yet efficient *E. coli*

cell-free protein synthesis system (eCFPS). We conducted a systematic component reduction screening of traditional eCFPS systems, successfully streamlining the core components from thirty-five to just seven. The subsequent meticulous optimization of these seven key components not only maintained but even improved protein expression levels. Furthermore, we developed a much simpler procedure for preparing the bacterial cytosolic extracts, enhancing the overall accessibility and robustness of eCFPS. This optimized eCFPS is poised to become a powerful tool, facilitating diverse applications in basic life science research and beyond.

Results

Streamlining eCFPS: removal of dispensable components

To develop a more streamlined and efficient eCFPS system, we performed a systematic screening of auxiliary components commonly found in traditional prokaryotic CFPS protocols[15,19]. Our objective was to identify dispensable components while maintaining or enhancing protein synthesis efficiency, thereby simplifying system preparation and reducing costs. Starting with a comprehensive reaction mixture containing up to thirty-five components[15], we iteratively evaluated the contribution of individual constituents through luciferase reporter assays. Throughout this optimization, essential core components such as creatine phosphate (CrP), creatine kinase (CrK), ATP, GTP, magnesium, and potassium were maintained in the base reaction mixture[3,8,17]. Our systematic approach allowed us to precisely determine the impact of each component on overall protein synthesis yield, leading to the identification of both dispensable and critical factors.

Through this systematic screening, we first identified several components that could be entirely removed from the reaction mixture without compromising protein synthesis efficiency (**Figure 1**). Dithiothreitol (DTT), a reducing agent commonly included in both transcription and translation systems to maintain protein sulfhydryl groups in a reduced state and prevent aggregation, was found to be unnecessary within our specific system, as its removal did not affect the final protein expression levels (**Figure 1A**). Similarly, cyclic adenosine 3′,5′-monophosphate (cAMP), a regulator implicated in transcriptional regulation[20–22], was also found to be dispensable for efficient protein synthesis (**Figure**

1B). Furthermore, we systematically evaluated other auxiliary components, including the

molecular crowder polyethylene glycol 8000 (PEG8000), used to enhance

macromolecular crowding[24–28]; ammonium ions (NH_4^+), typically included as an osmolyte

and for its role in maintaining protein stability and solubility in *e*CFPS reactions[28–32]; and

folinic acid, which serves as a crucial cofactor for nucleotide synthesis[8,32]. Our results

consistently showed that removing these components had a negligible impact on overall

protein synthesis performance (**Figure 1C-E**). These findings collectively demonstrate

that a substantial portion of the auxiliary components in traditional *e*CFPS protocols can

be eliminated, paving the way for a more streamlined and cost-effective system.

An evaluation of various concentrations of amino acids and tRNA was conducted, as

these components are fundamental building blocks for protein synthesis[33–35]. Previous

studies on *e*CFPS have highlighted the rapid degradation of certain amino acids, such as

arginine, cysteine, and tryptophan, necessitating their replenishment for prolonged

synthesis[36,37]. Our results showed that while these components are critical for achieving

high yields, protein synthesis still occurs in their absence (**Figure 1F-G**). This suggests

that while they are optimizable, tRNA and amino acids are not strictly essential for the

reaction to proceed, likely due to residual amounts within the cell lysate (**Figure 1F-G**).

Furthermore, we evaluated the role of nucleoside triphosphates (NTPs) in our system,

which are essential for coupled transcription-translation. Interestingly, we found that

protein synthesis could proceed without the addition of CTP or UTP (**Figure 1H-I and**

Figure S1). While adding either ATP or GTP alone resulted in a very weak reaction, the

presence of both ATP and GTP together recovered the reaction to approximately 40% of

the complete NTPs mix (**Figure S1B-C**). This highlights the critical role for ATPase-

dependent chaperones (e.g., DnaK) and GTPase-dependent elongation factors (e.g., EF-

Tu and EF-G)[38], which are crucial for proper protein folding during synthesis[39].

Ultimately, this comprehensive screening allowed us to successfully reduce the core

reaction components from thirty-five to just seven (**Figure 1J**).

.

Figure 1 Optimization of *e*CFPS components. Protein expression levels from the *e*CFPS system were measured using an Nanoluciferase (NLuc) reporter DNA. Green area in the graphs indicate the common concentration range used in published protocols for *e*CFPS. Error bars represent the standard error (SE) of at least three independent reactions. (**A-E**) Protein expression levels of the *e*CFPS system supplemented with different concentration of DTT (**A**), cAMP (**B**), PEG8000 (**C**), NH_4^+ (**D**), and folinic acid (**E**). (**F-I**) Protein expression levels of *e*CFPS with various concentrations of tRNA (**F**), amino acids (**G**), CTP (H) and UTP (**I**). (**J**) A summary of the supplement components before and after optimization.

Optimization of essential eCFPS components

While a core set of seven components was found to be sufficient for protein synthesis,
we conducted further fine-tuning to maximize the system's performance. First, we
optimized the concentrations of key salts and energy components (**Figure 2**). Our findings
reveal that the final protein expression level is highly dependent on the concentrations of
both magnesium (Mg^{2+}) and potassium ions (K^+), which are fundamental for the structural
integrity and catalytic activity of ribosomes, and various enzymatic reactions critical to
eCFPS[40,41]. Through a detailed matrix-based optimization, we first identified the optimal
concentrations of Mg^{2+} and K^+ to achieve maximum protein expression (**Figure 2A**).
Similarly, we conducted a separate screen to optimize the concentrations of Mg^{2+} and
PEG8000 as previous reports have suggested a cooperative relationship between them[15]
(**Figure 2B**).

A comprehensive evaluation of the core energy components was also performed. We
specifically focused on co-optimizing the concentrations of ATP and GTP, which serve as
both energy sources and building blocks[42–44], to maximize the yield of protein synthesis
(**Figure 2C**). Additionally, the energy regeneration system, primarily composed of CrP
and CrK, is vital for maintaining sustained ATP levels[45,46]. We found that CrP is crucial,
with no reaction occurring in its absence (**Figure S2A**). Initial experiments showed while
CrK addition significantly boosted translation efficiency early on, reactions without
exogenous CrK could achieve a protein expression level approximately four times higher
at later time points (2 hours or more), suggesting the presence of an endogenous CrK-
like enzyme in the lysate (**Figure S2B**). A co-optimization screen for CrP and CrK
concentrations was also performed, and our results showed that optimizing the
concentrations of these components is critical for achieving and sustaining high protein
expression (**Figure 2D**). Furthermore, we optimized the pH and concentration of the
HEPES buffer, finding that a specific range was critical for maintaining stable and high
protein expression (**Figure 2E**). These multi-faceted optimizations ensured that each
component was present at its ideal concentration, leading to a synergistic effect that
significantly boosted the system's overall performance.

Figure 2 Optimization of essential components for *e*CFPS system. (**A**) Protein expression levels of the *e*CFPS system measured at varying concentrations of KGlu and MgGlu$_2$. (**B**) Protein expression levels of the *e*CFPS system measured at varying concentrations of MgGlu$_2$ and PEG8000. (**C**) Protein expression levels of the *e*CFPS system measured at varying concentrations of ATP and GTP. (**D**) Protein expression levels of the *e*CFPS system measured at varying concentrations of CrK and CrP. (**E**)

161   Protein expression levels of the eCFPS system measured at varying pH and buffer

162   concentrations. Data from all panels present mean ± SE, n = 3.

Performance characterization of the optimized eCFPS

To thoroughly evaluate the performance of our optimized eCFPS, we conducted a series

of experiments. We first investigated the kinetics of protein synthesis measuring the

expression over time at different temperatures (25°C, 30°C, and 37°C). Our results

demonstrate that the system exhibits robust protein synthesis across this range, with the

highest expression rates observed at the physiological temperature of 37°C (**Figure 3A**).

Next, we assessed the system's sensitivity to DNA concentration, finding that it could

efficiently utilize a wide range of reporter DNA templates to produce quantifiable protein

products, which were validated by both luminescence assays and western blot analysis

(**Figure 3B**). Furthermore, we investigated the impact of varying cell lysate volume ratios,

comparing our initial system with the newly optimized eCFPS. Our findings indicate that

the optimized system maintains superior protein expression even at different lysate-to-

buffer ratios (**Figure 3C**).

Figure 3 Characterization of the optimized eCFPS system. (**A**) Kinetics of protein

synthesis at 25℃, 30℃ and 37℃ over a 60-minute period. Data present mean ± SE, n =

3. (**B**) Protein expression levels of the eCFPS system measured at varying DNA

concentrations for a reporter encoding a FLAG-tagged NLuc. The protein product was

quantified via a luminescence assay and confirmed by western blotting. Data present

mean ± SE, n = 3. (**C**) Comparison of protein expression levels from the initial and

optimized eCFPS systems at various cell extract volume ratios. Data present mean ± SE,

n = 4.

Comparative analysis of energy regeneration systems

To validate the efficacy of our optimized *e*CFPS, we benchmarked its performance

against two widely used systems: the classical Phosphoenolpyruvate (PEP)-based

energy system, a common alternative for ATP regeneration [6,7], and an initial CrP/CrK-

based system (**Figure 4**). We utilized NLuc, representing a broadly applicable protein,

and super-folder green fluorescent protein (sfGFP), with codons optimized for *E. coli* as

reporter proteins and monitored their expression over time (**Figure 4A-B, Figure S3A**).

Our results show that the optimized *e*CFPS consistently outperforms both the classical

and initial systems, achieving significantly higher protein expression levels in a shorter

period (**Figure 4A-B**). The robust expression was further confirmed by western blot

analysis, which provided clear visual evidence of the superior protein yield from our

optimized system (**Figure 4C-D, Figure S3B-C**). Finally, we validated the function of our

system through antibiotic-mediated inhibition assays. Our results demonstrate that

protein expression in the optimized *e*CFPS can be effectively inhibited by standard

antibiotics, confirming its robust and native-like translation machinery (**Figure S3D**).

Figure 4 Benchmarking the optimized eCFPS system with different DNA templates.

(**A**) Protein expression over time using NLuc as DNA templates for different energy

regeneration systems. Data present mean ± SE, n = 4. (**B**) Protein expression over time

using sfGFP as DNA templates for different energy regeneration systems. Data present

mean ± SE, n = 3. (**C-D**) Western blot validation of protein expression for NLuc (**C**) and

sfGFP (**D**) from the different *e*CFPS system shown in (**A-B**). The asterisk (*) indicates a

non-specific band.

A simplified method for bacterial lysate preparation

In addition to optimizing the reaction buffer, we sought to simplify the entire *e*CFPS

procedure by developing an easy-to-use method for preparing the bacterial cell lysate.

During lysate making, traditional methods, which often rely on time consuming runoff and

dialysis procedures[19,8], were replaced with a high-pressure homogenizer for efficient cell

disruption, eliminating the need for additional dialysis. Compared to traditional

biochemical methods such as ultrasonication, lysozyme treatment, or freeze-thaw

cycles[47], this approach is faster and more convenient (**Figure 5A**). Additionally,

endogenous T7 RNA polymerase in the optimized *e*CFPS lysate obviates exogenous

addition, simplifying preparation and reducing costs while maintaining high translation

efficiency (**Figure 5A**).

We validated this new method by testing lysates prepared from cells harvested at various

optical densities at 600 nm (OD_{600}). While the density did not significantly impact protein

expression levels, a harvest optical density of $OD_{600}=2$ yielded the best performance

(**Figure 5B**). The quality of the ribosomes was further confirmed by sucrose gradient

centrifugation (**Figure S4A**) and negative-staining transmission electron microscopy

(TEM) images (**Figure S4B**).

To further simplify the protocol, we evaluated the necessity of the traditional runoff and

dialysis steps[8] (**Figure 5A**). Our results from sucrose gradient analysis and TEM imaging

confirmed that ribosomes remained intact, and the *e*CFPS expression signal was

significantly higher without them (**Figure 5C-D, Figure S4B**). These findings confirm that

both the runoff and dialysis steps are dispensable for our system, allowing for a

significantly simplified and faster preparation. Additionally, our reliance on endogenously

expressed T7 RNA polymerase yields a significantly higher expression signal,

outperforming previously reported eCFPS systems by up to four-fold (**Figure 5D**).

Our optimized lysate preparation method yielded highly active and stable extracts. It is
capable of sustaining protein synthesis for up to 120 minutes (**Figure S4C**) and maintains
the protein synthesis efficiency even after multiple freeze-thaw cycles, making it highly
suitable for routine laboratory use (**Figure 5E**).

Figure 5 Preparation of *e*CFPS from cultured *E. coli* Cells. (**A**) Flowchart of the *e*CFPS
preparation procedures. (**B**) Comparison of reaction efficiency in *e*CFPS using lysate with
bacteria cells harvested at different optical density. Data present mean ± SE, n = 3. (**C**)
Sucrose gradient sedimentation analysis of different lysates used for *e*CFPS, revealing
the presence of ribosome monomers. (**D**) Comparison of protein expression levels in
*e*CFPS system using lysates prepared by runoff, dialysis, and rapid endogenous T7 RNA
polymerase induction. Data present mean ± SE, n = 4. (**E**) Comparison of reaction
efficiency in *e*CFPS using lysates after different numbers of freeze-thaw cycles. Data
present mean ± SE, n = 3.

247
Discussion

In this study, we successfully developed a highly streamlined and efficient *e*CFPS system.
By systematically eliminating dispensable components from traditional protocols, we
reduced the complexity of the reaction mixture from thirty-five to a core set of just seven
components. This simplification represents a significant advancement over conventional
systems by not only drastically lowering the cost and effort of preparing the reaction buffer,

but also by minimizing potential inhibitory interactions between numerous auxiliary
components, thereby making the system more accessible for a wider range of
researchers and laboratories.

The thorough optimization of the seven core components was a critical step in achieving
high protein expression levels. Our detailed screening of key factors like salts, energy
components, and buffer conditions revealed that precise concentrations are essential for
optimal performance. The synergistic effect of these optimized components, particularly
the energy source and regeneration system, is based on CrK coupled with CrP[36]. A
notable finding from our optimization was the ability of our system to function effectively
without certain components traditionally considered essential. For example, the removal
of dithiothreitol (DTT) did not negatively impact protein expression, suggesting that our
lysate preparation procedure may maintain sufficient reducing conditions or that the high
expression levels are transient enough that protein aggregation is not a major issue.
Similarly, the ability to achieve high protein yields with minimal or even no added tRNA or
CTP/UTP highlights the remarkable robustness and inherent capacity of our lysate, likely
due to residual components retained during our simplified preparation method. We also
observed that the protein synthesis signal was significantly higher without traditional
runoff and dialysis steps, suggesting that these steps may remove essential components
that are beneficial for efficient protein synthesis. This led to a significant improvement in
protein synthesis yield compared to both classical and initial systems. The benchmarking
experiments clearly demonstrated that our optimized eCFPS system provides higher
protein expression levels compared to these traditional systems while offering faster
kinetics, which is a key advantage for high-throughput applications.

Our simplified lysate preparation method, which eliminates the time-consuming runoff and
dialysis steps, further distinguishes this work. We demonstrate that a highly active lysate
can be prepared rapidly using a high-pressure homogenizer, which enhances the overall
accessibility and robustness of our eCFPS system. The ability to use the lysate directly
after a single centrifugation step, coupled with the reliance on endogenous T7 RNA
polymerase, makes our protocol one of the most straightforward and rapid for producing
high-quality eCFPS lysates. This streamlined preparation procedure is a significant step

toward making CFPS a more routine and scalable tool for a variety of applications, from
educational settings to industrial-scale bioproduction.

In conclusion, our optimized and streamlined *e*CFPS system represents a significant
advancement in the field of prokaryotic cell-free protein synthesis. By drastically reducing
the number of reaction components and simplifying the lysate preparation procedure, we
have created a highly efficient, cost-effective, and user-friendly platform. This system is
poised to accelerate fundamental research and facilitate high-throughput protein
engineering, compound screening, and diagnostic development. However, we
acknowledge that our system, like all CFPS platforms, has limitations, such as the
synthesis of complex membrane proteins and glycosylation, which would require the
addition of specific accessory components. Future work will focus on further
characterizing the endogenous factors in the lysate that enable the high efficiency of our
system and exploring its use in novel synthetic biology applications.

Methods

Plasmid construction

All plasmids and primers used in this study are detailed in **Table S2**. The NLuc and sfGFP reporter genes, each fused with a FLAG-tag, were cloned into a T7-driven expression vector. The sfGFP gene was optimized for *E. coli* codon usage to ensure efficient translation. The vector backbone was constructed using standard molecular biology techniques.

E. coli cell culture and lysate preparation

E. coli S30 cell lysate for CFPS was prepared using a simplified protocol adapted from a previously reported method[8]. Briefly, *E. coli* BL21(DE3) was cultured in LB medium at 37°C with shaking. Once the OD_{600} reached 0.8, endogenous T7 RNA polymerase expression was induced with 1mM IPTG. The culture was then grown for an additional 2 hours before being harvested (when the OD_{600} reached 2-3). The cells were collected by centrifugation at 3500 *g* for 15 minutes at 4°C. The cell pellet was washed with 5 volumes of cold S30 buffer (10 mM HEPES-KOH pH7.5, 14 mM Mg(OAC)$_2$, 60 mM KOAc) and then resuspended in S30 buffer at a ratio of 1 mL per gram of wet cell paste. Cell disruption was performed using a high-pressure homogenizer at 800 *bar* for two passes. The lysate was then clarified by centrifugation at 20,000 *g* for 10 minutes at 4°C, and the resulting supernatant, designated as the fast lysate, was collected. Finally, the fast lysate was aliquoted and flash-frozen in liquid nitrogen before being stored at -80°C until use.

*e*CFPS reactions

The optimized *e*CFPS reaction was performed in a 10 μL total volume containing the components listed in **Table S3** and **Table S4**. Plasmid of NLuc reporter gene was used as the template.

Protein quantification and analysis

Protein expression levels were quantified using NLuc and sfGFP reporter systems. NLuc activity was measured with the Nano-Glo luciferase assay system (Promega). Reaction mixtures were diluted as specified in the source data to prevent signal saturation and then analyzed on a microplate luminometer (BERTHOLD, Centro XS3 LB 960) to obtain the

luminescence units as described priously[48,49]. SfGFP fluorescence was used to quantify

protein synthesis following the methods reported[50]. Briefly, 5 μL of the reaction mixture

was added to 195 μL of fluorescence assay buffer (20mM HEPES-KOH pH7.5, 100mM

NaCl, 5mM magnesium glutamate). Fluorescence was measured on a Cell Imaging

Multimode Reader (BioTek, Cytation 5) with an excitation wavelength of 485 nm and an

emission wavelength of 528 nm.

Western blotting analysis was performed to confirm protein synthesis of the *e*CFPS

reactions. Synthesized proteins were detected using a primary anti-FLAG (MBL Life

Sciences, Cat#: M185-3L). Chemiluminescence was detected using a Gel Imaging

System (Tanon).

Sucrose density gradient (SDG) analysis

A volume of 170–180 μL of lysate was loaded onto a 10%–40% (w/w) SDG. The gradient

buffer contained 10 mM HEPES-KOH (pH 7.5), 14 mM $Mg(OAc)_2$, 60 mM KOAc. The

gradient was prepared using a simple diffusion method (Biocomp) and centrifugation at

38,000 rpm for 2.5 hours at 4°C in a Beckman SW41Ti rotor. Following centrifugation, the

gradient was fractionated using a density gradient fractionation system (Biocomp), with

continuous monitoring of the absorbance at 260 nm.

Negative-staining transmission electron microscopy (TEM)

Samples from the SDG were prepared for TEM. Fresh, glow-discharged carbon-coated

grids were immersed in 3 μL of the corresponding sample for 2 minutes. Excess solvent

was removed, and the grids were stained with uranyl acetate for 1 minute and air dried.

Samples were observed using a Talos F200C transmission electron microscope at a

nominal magnification of 92,000.

Acknowledgements

We thank Arto Pulk and Alexey Amunts for helpful discussions. This work was supported

by grants from the National Natural Science Foundation of China (32171291 and

32371351), National Key Research and Development Program of China

(2022YFA0807100), Nature Science Foundation of Shandong Province (ZR2021QC002)

the Shandong Excellent Young Scientists Fund Program (2022HWYQ-025), Taishan
Scholars Program (tsqnz20221104), Cutting Edge Development Fund of Advanced
Medical Research Institute (GYY2023QY01) and the Cheeloo Youth Program of
Shandong University to W.L..

Contributions

X.L.,C.Z. and J.L. were responsible for obtaining experimental data and performing data processing. X.L. and C.Z. conducted biochemical experiments. X.L., C.Z., Z.Z. and W.L. analyzed the data and created charts. W.L. wrote the initial draft of the paper. All authors edited the paper.

References

1. Carlson, E. D., Gan, R., Hodgman, C. E. & Jewett, M. C. Cell-free protein synthesis: applications come of age. *Biotechnol. Adv.* **30**, 1185–1194 (2012).
2. Katzen, F., Chang, G. & Kudlicki, W. The past, present and future of cell-free protein synthesis. *Trends Biotechnol.* **23**, 150–156 (2005).
3. Martin, R. W. *et al.* Cell-free protein synthesis from genomically recoded bacteria enables multisite incorporation of noncanonical amino acids. *Nat. Commun.* **9**, 1203 (2018).
4. Liu, C. C. & Schultz, P. G. Adding new chemistries to the genetic code. *Annu. Rev. Biochem.* **79**, 413–444 (2010).
5. Dumas, A., Lercher, L., Spicer, C. D. & Davis, B. G. Designing logical codon reassignment - Expanding the chemistry in biology. *Chem. Sci.* **6**, 50–69 (2015).
6. Guzman-Chavez, F. *et al.* Constructing cell-free expression systems for low-cost access. *ACS Synth. Biol.* **11**, 1114–1128 (2022).
7. Gregorio, N. E., Levine, M. Z. & Oza, J. P. A user's guide to cell-free protein synthesis. *Methods Protoc.* **2**, 24 (2019).
8. Jiang, N., Ding, X. & Lu, Y. Development of a robust Escherichia coli-based cell-free protein synthesis application platform. *Biochem. Eng. J.* **165**, 107830 (2021).
9. Xu, H., Liu, W.-Q. & Li, J. Translation related factors improve the productivity of a Streptomyces-based cell-free protein synthesis system. *ACS Synth. Biol.* **9**, 1221–1224 (2020).
10. Zemella, A., Thoring, L., Hoffmeister, C. & Kubick, S. Cell-free protein synthesis: Pros and cons of prokaryotic and eukaryotic systems. *Chembiochem* **16**, 2420–2431 (2015).
11. Jiang, L., Zhao, J., Lian, J. & Xu, Z. Cell-free protein synthesis enabled rapid prototyping for metabolic engineering and synthetic biology. *Synth. Syst. Biotechnol.* **3**, 90–96 (2018).
12. Endoh, T. *et al.* Cell-free protein synthesis at high temperatures using the lysate of a hyperthermophile. *J. Biotechnol.* **126**, 186–195 (2006).
13. Gao W., Bu N. & Lu Y. Recent advances in cell-free unnatural protein synthesis. *Sheng Wu Gong Cheng Xue Bao* **34**, 1371–1385 (2018).

14. Lee, K.-H. & Kim, D.-M. Recent advances in development of cell-free protein
synthesis systems for fast and efficient production of recombinant proteins. *FEMS*
Microbiol. Lett. **365**, (2018).
15. Kigawa, T. *et al.* Cell-free production and stable-isotope labeling of milligram
quantities of proteins. *FEBS Lett.* **442**, 15–19 (1999).
16. Kim, J., Copeland, C. E., Seki, K., Vögeli, B. & Kwon, Y.-C. Tuning the cell-free
protein synthesis system for biomanufacturing of monomeric human filaggrin. *Front.*
Bioeng. Biotechnol. **8**, 590341 (2020).
17. Bothe, A. & Ban, N. A highly optimized human in vitro translation system. *Cell Rep.*
Methods **4**, 100755 (2024).
18. Aleksashin, N. A., Chang, S. T.-L. & Cate, J. H. D. A highly efficient human cell-free
translation system. *RNA* **29**, 1960–1972 (2023).
19. Levine, M. Z., Gregorio, N. E., Jewett, M. C., Watts, K. R. & Oza, J. P. Escherichia
coli-Based Cell-Free Protein Synthesis: Protocols for a robust, flexible, and
accessible platform technology. *J. Vis. Exp.* (2019) doi:10.3791/58882-v.
20. Sands, W. A. & Palmer, T. M. Regulating gene transcription in response to cyclic
AMP elevation. *Cell. Signal.* **20**, 460–466 (2008).
21. Daniel, P. B., Walker, W. H. & Habener, J. F. Cyclic AMP signaling and gene
regulation. *Annu. Rev. Nutr.* **18**, 353–383 (1998).
22. Boshart, M., Weih, F., Schmidt, A., Fournier, R. E. & Schütz, G. A cyclic AMP
response element mediates repression of tyrosine aminotransferase gene
transcription by the tissue-specific extinguisher locus Tse-1. *Cell* **61**, 905–916
(1990).
23. Anderson, M. J., Stark, J. C., Hodgman, C. E. & Jewett, M. C. Energizing
eukaryotic cell-free protein synthesis with glucose metabolism. *FEBS Lett.* **589**,
1723–1727 (2015).
24. Chu, I.-T., Hutcheson, B. O., Malsch, H. R. & Pielak, G. J. Macromolecular
crowding by polyethylene glycol reduces protein breathing. *J. Phys. Chem. Lett.* **14**,
2599–2605 (2023).
25. Ge, X., Luo, D. & Xu, J. Cell-free protein expression under macromolecular
crowding conditions. *PLoS One* **6**, e28707 (2011).
26. Liebau, J. *et al.* Polyethylene glycol impacts conformation and dynamics of
Escherichia coli prolyl-tRNA synthetase via crowding and confinement effects.
Biochemistry **63**, 1621–1635 (2024).
27. Paudel, B. P., Fiorini, E., Börner, R., Sigel, R. K. O. & Rueda, D. S. Optimal
molecular crowding accelerates group II intron folding and maximizes catalysis.
Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A. **115**, 11917–11922 (2018).
28. Zhang, L., Lin, X., Wang, T., Guo, W. & Lu, Y. Development and comparison of cell-
free protein synthesis systems derived from typical bacterial chassis. *Bioresour.*
Bioprocess. **8**, 58 (2021).
29. Auton, M., Rösgen, J., Sinev, M., Holthauzen, L. M. F. & Bolen, D. W. Osmolyte
effects on protein stability and solubility: a balancing act between backbone and
side-chains. *Biophys. Chem.* **159**, 90–99 (2011).
30. Mojtabavi, S., Samadi, N. & Faramarzi, M. A. Osmolyte-induced folding and stability
of proteins: Concepts and characterization. *Iran. J. Pharm. Res.* **18**, 13–30 (2019).

31. Hunt, A. C. *et al.* Cell-free gene expression: Methods and applications. *Chem. Rev.*
125, 91–149 (2025).
32. Cai, Q. *et al.* A simplified and robust protocol for immunoglobulin expression in
Escherichia coli cell-free protein synthesis systems. *Biotechnol. Prog.* **31**, 823–831
(2015).
33. Anderson, W. F. The effect of tRNA concentration on the rate of protein synthesis.
Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A. **62**, 566–573 (1969).
34. Deutscher, M. P. Processing of tRNA in prokaryotes and eukaryotes. *CRC Crit. Rev.*
Biochem. **17**, 45–71 (1984).
35. Rodnina, M. V. Translation in prokaryotes. *Cold Spring Harb. Perspect. Biol.* **10**,
(2018).
36. Kim, D. M. & Swartz, J. R. Prolonging cell-free protein synthesis by selective
reagent additions. *Biotechnol. Prog.* **16**, 385–390 (2000).
37. Kim, D. M. & Swartz, J. R. Prolonging cell-free protein synthesis with a novel ATP
regeneration system. *Biotechnol. Bioeng.* **66**, 180–188 (1999).
38. Agirrezabala, X. & Frank, J. Elongation in translation as a dynamic interaction
among the ribosome, tRNA, and elongation factors EF-G and EF-Tu. *Q. Rev.*
Biophys. **42**, 159–200 (2009).
39. Mayer, M. P. The Hsp70-chaperone machines in bacteria. *Front. Mol. Biosci.* **8**,
694012 (2021).
40. Nierhaus, K. H. Mg2+, K+, and the ribosome. *Journal of bacteriology* vol. 196
3817–3819 (2014).
41. Gesteland, R. F. Unfolding of Escherichia coli ribosomes by removal of magnesium.
J. Mol. Biol. **18**, 356–371 (1966).
42. Espinasse, A., Lembke, H. K., Cao, A. A. & Carlson, E. E. Modified nucleoside
triphosphates in bacterial research for in vitro and live-cell applications. *RSC Chem.*
Biol. **1**, 333–351 (2020).
43. Calhoun, K. A. & Swartz, J. R. An economical method for cell-free protein synthesis
using glucose and nucleoside monophosphates. *Biotechnol. Prog.* **21**, 1146–1153
(2005).
44. Sitaraman, K. *et al.* A novel cell-free protein synthesis system. *J. Biotechnol.* **110**,
257–263 (2004).
45. Gaddi, A. V., Galuppo, P. & Yang, J. Creatine phosphate administration in cell
energy impairment conditions: A summary of past and present research. *Heart*
Lung Circ. **26**, 1026–1035 (2017).
46. Wallimann, T., Tokarska-Schlattner, M. & Schlattner, U. The creatine kinase system
and pleiotropic effects of creatine. *Amino Acids* **40**, 1271–1296 (2011).
47. Fujiwara, K. & Doi, N. Biochemical preparation of cell extract for cell-free protein
synthesis without physical disruption. *PLoS One* **11**, e0154614 (2016).
48. Li, W. *et al.* Structural basis for selective stalling of human ribosome nascent chain
complexes by a drug-like molecule. *Nat. Struct. Mol. Biol.* **26**, 501–509 (2019).
49. Wu, M. *et al.* Human ribosome interactions reframe neomycin toxicity. *bioRxiv*
(2025) doi:10.1101/2025.07.22.666027.
50. Wang, Y., Wang, T., Chen, X. & Lu, Y. IRES-mediated Pichia pastoris cell-free
protein synthesis. *Bioresour. Bioprocess.* **10**, 35 (2023).
486