Flux modelling analysis reveals the metabolic impact of cryptic plasmids and

environmental conditions in probiotic *Escherichia coli* Nissle 1917

Paola Corbín-Agustí[1*], Alba Arévalo-Lalanne[1], Patricia Álvarez[1], Maria Enrique[2], Daniel

Ramón[3], Juli Peretó[1,4], Marta Tortajada[5*]

[1]Institute for Integrative Systems Biology, I[2]SysBio (CSIC-Universitat de València), Paterna, Spain.

[2]Archer Daniels Midland, R&D Center-Valencia, ADM Health & Wellness, Parc Científic Universitat de

València, C/Catedrático Agustín Escardino Benlloch, 9, 46980 Paterna, Spain.

[3]Department of Animal Production and Health, Faculty of Veterinary Sciences, Universidad Cardenal

Herrera, Centro de Estudios Universitarios, UCH-CEU, Alfara del Patriarca, Spain.

[4]Department of Biochemistry and Molecular Biology, Universitat de València, Burjassot, Spain.

[5]Department of Biomedical Sciences, Faculty of Health Sciences, Universidad Cardenal Herrera, Centro

de Estudios Universitarios, UCH-CEU, Alfara del Patriarca, Spain

*Corresponding authors: Marta Tortajada marta.tortajadaserra@uchceu.es, Paola Corbín Agustí

paola.corbin@uv.es

Abstract

Escherichia coli Nissle 1917 (EcN) is a well-characterized Gram-negative probiotic distinguished

by its unique, strain-specific physiology. Genome-scale metabolic models (GEMs) are powerful

tools for elucidating metabolic traits and predicting genotype–phenotype relationships. Although

several EcN GEMs have been published, none have explicitly represented its probiotic

physiology. Here, we present a manually curated GEM of EcN that, for the first time, incorporates

the energetic costs associated with its cryptic plasmids. Inclusion of a plasmid-specific module

improved biomass yield predictions and overall model accuracy, providing a more physiologically

realistic representation of EcN metabolism. Using COBRA methodologies and possibilistic

metabolic flux analysis, this model and previous EcN reconstructions were systematically

compared to evaluate the trade-off between model complexity and predictive performance. The

analysis revealed that increased structural detail does not necessarily enhance quantitative

accuracy and that predictive reliability depends on both computational methodology and model

context. Metabolomic profiling under gut-like anaerobic conditions further showed that EcN

exhibits a distinctive metabolic phenotype, characterized by elevated amino acid consumption

and enhanced short-chain fatty acid production. These findings highlight the unique probiotic

physiology of EcN and demonstrate the utility of metabolic modeling for reproducing and exploring

such traits. Overall, this study provides a quantitatively reliable and physiologically relevant

framework for modeling *E. coli* Nissle 1917 and related commensal bacteria, supporting advances

in probiotic engineering, synthetic biology, and bioprocess design.

Keywords: *Escherichia coli* Nissle 1917, genome-scale metabolic modeling, possibilistic

metabolic flux analysis, probiotics, plasmid burden

Graphical Abstract Summary

This study presents a manually curated genome-scale model of *Escherichia coli* Nissle 1917 that

accounts for the metabolic cost of its cryptic plasmids. Through systematic comparison with

previous reconstructions and validation against fluxomics datasets, the models improved

accuracy in predicting growth and fluxes. Simulations and experiments under gut-like conditions

provide new insights into EcN's unique probiotic traits.

1. Introduction

Escherichia coli Nissle 1917 (EcN) is a well-characterized probiotic strain originally isolated by Alfred Nissle in 1917 from the faeces of a First World War soldier who appeared resistant to dysentery (Beimfohr, 2016). Since its discovery, EcN has been extensively used to treat gastrointestinal disorders such as infectious diarrhea, inflammatory bowel diseases (IBD), ulcerative colitis or Crohn's disease (Petersen *et al.*, 2011; Olier *et al.*, 2012; Maltby *et al.*, 2013). Remarkably, EcN remains the only Gram-negative strain in routine probiotic use, despite belonging to a species typically associated with pathogenic lineages.

EcN exhibits several unique, strain-specific features that underpin its probiotic efficacy. These include (i) high fitness in the intestinal environment and stable colonization through strong adhesion to the epithelium, biofilm formation, and antimicrobial resistance; (ii) competitive exclusion of enteric pathogens via production of antimicrobials such as microcins, interference with virulence mechanisms, and sequestration of key nutrients such as iron; and (iii) reinforcement of host mucosal immunity by activating TLR and NF-κB signaling, enhancing epithelial barrier function, and stimulating antimicrobial peptide production (Deriu *et al.*, 2013; Schumann *et al.*, 2014; Hare *et al.*, 2022). EcN also lacks typical virulence factors such as α-hemolysin and fimbriae and displays a semi-rough lipopolysaccharide, which may contribute to immune evasion, attenuated inflammatory response, and improved mucosal adhesion (Deriu *et al.*, 2013; Schumann *et al.*, 2014; Hare *et al.*, 2022).

Genome-scale metabolic models (GEMs) represent the metabolic capabilities of an organism through the stoichiometric formulation of its biochemical reactions. Over the past two decades, GEMs have become indispensable powerful and robust computational tools in systems biology for elucidating microbial metabolism, predicting genotype–phenotype relationships, functional characteristics, and optimizing industrial bioprocesses (Monk *et al.*, 2013, 2016, 2017; Pearcy *et al.*, 2021; Bernstein *et al.*, 2023). Due to the large number of reactions and metabolic

uncertainties, GEMs are inherently underdetermined and require constraint-based approaches—

collectively known as COBRA (Constraint-Based Reconstruction and Analysis)—to predict

metabolic flux distributions. Among the most widely applied methods are metabolic flux analysis

(MFA), which integrates experimental flux measurements to estimate flux rates, and flux balance

analysis (FBA), which uses stoichiometric constraints and optimization principles to infer

metabolic states under an assumed cellular objective (Orth *et al.,* 2010; Antoniewicz, 2021).

Complementary to these approaches, possibilistic MFA provides a framework for handling

uncertainty by combining constraint-based models with measurement error distributions

represented as possibility functions. This method enables robust flux estimation even when

experimental data are incomplete, using linear programming to identify feasible flux ranges

(Llaneras *et al.*, 2009; Llaneras, 2011).

Recent GEM-based studies have explored the metabolic capabilities of EcN. These models have

been used to benchmark EcN against laboratory or pathogenic *E. coli* strains, identify distinctive

metabolic features and explore its potential as a chassis for biosynthetic applications (Kim *et al.*,

2021; Moutinho *et al.*, 2022; van't Hof *et al.*, 2022).

EcN harbors two cryptic plasmids, pMUT1 (3.2 kb) and pMUT2 (5.5 kb), both possessing ColE1-

type replication origins and maintained at high copy numbers (more than 100 copies per cell)

(Zainuddin *et al.*, 2019). These plasmids are stably inherited and commonly used for strain typing

(Blum-Oehler *et al.*, 2003). Although historically considered phenotypically neutral, recent

transcriptomic evidence indicates that deletion of pMUT1 and pMUT2 substantially alters the

expression of genes involved in cell aggregation and amino acid metabolism, suggesting possible

contributions to EcN's probiotic function (Lin *et al.*, 2024). Additionally, their stable maintenance

and replication machinery have been exploited as antibiotic-free expression systems for targeted

intestinal delivery of heterologous proteins (Zhou *et al.*, 2024).

However, plasmid carriage often imposes a significant metabolic burden on host cells due to the

energetic costs of replication and gene expression. This phenomenon is well documented in *E.*

coli, particularly in recombinant protein production systems (Rozkov *et al.*, 2004; Zeng and Yang,

2019). The additional biosynthetic demand typically leads to reduced growth rate and yield

compared with plasmid-free strains and is frequently accompanied by metabolic overflow, such

as acetate accumulation. Even strains harboring empty, high-copy-number ColE1-derived

plasmids exhibit globally altered physiological states and increased non-growth-associated

maintenance energy (Ow *et al.*, 2009; Oftadeh and Hatzimanikatis, 2024). Several modeling

studies have successfully incorporated plasmid-related metabolic costs into constraint-based

metabolic models, including GEMs, improving their ability to reproduce experimental data (Özkan

et al., 2005; Ow *et al*., 2009; Zeng and Yang, 2019; Oftadeh and Hatzimanikatis, 2024).

Nevertheless, the explicit consideration of plasmid burden in probiotic EcN models remains

limited.

This study presents a manually curated genome-scale metabolic model (GEM) of EcN that

explicitly accounts for the energetic costs of its cryptic plasmids. Using COBRA methods and

possibilistic MFA, this model and previously published EcN GEMs were systematically compared

and evaluated, including prediction of biomass formation and by-product external rates, as well

as their consistency with experimental metabolomics and ^{13}C-fluxomics datasets. This

comparative framework enabled the assessment of how different models predict metabolic

behavior under specific experimental and methodological contexts. Importantly, the experimental

metabolomics data used were obtained under conditions that mimic those of the probiotic's native

environment, an approach that, to our knowledge, has not been previously applied to this strain.

The results provide a mechanistic framework for better understanding the metabolic determinants

of EcN's probiotic properties, and a more accurate characterization of its probiotic capacity and

model predictions within that physiological context.

2. Materials and Methods

Bacterial strains and culture conditions

Two strains of *Escherichia coli* were used in this work: *E. coli* Nissle 1917 (DSM 6601) and *E. coli* K12-HB101 (DSM 1607). EcN strain was isolated from Mutaflor commercial product (Ardeypharm) and grown in Lysogeny Broth (LB) at 37ºC unless stated otherwise. EcN strain was routinely identified by PCR amplification in cryptic plasmid pMUT2, as described in (Blum-Oehler *et al.*, 2003). *E. coli* K12-HB101 strain was purchased from Promega (Madison, WI, USA). Growth media used throughout experiments include M9 minimal medium, with glucose (Monk *et al.*, 2016a) and supplemented with casamino acids to fulfill the auxotrophic requirements of K12-HB101 strain, and rich-gut microbiota medium (GMM), prepared according to Goodman *et al.* (2011) and Średnicka *et al.* (2023) without agar. Composition details are provided in the Supplementary Methods.

Draft model construction and refinement

The genome sequence of EcN strain was retrieved from NCBI (RefSeq accession number: NZ_CP007799.1; annotated Feb 23, 2017) and used to compare with other reference *E. coli* strains. For that, the protein sequences of K-12 MG1655 (NC_000913) and CFT073 (NC_004431.1) were used to identify the ortholog genes between EcN and these strains by a reciprocal blast best hit method, with an e-value $> 1 \times 10^6$ and a percentage of homology greater than 85%. In parallel, the curated models of E. coli K-12 MG1655 (iAF1260, iJO1366 and iML1515) and E. coli CFT073 (ic_1306) were downloaded from the BIGG database (King *et al.*, 2016) in JSON format. A first EcN draft model was reconstructed incorporating all shared reactions and metabolites from iAF1260 and ic_1306 metabolic models, dependent on EcN homologous genes. Subsequently, the non-homologous genes of *E. coli* EcN were reviewed and

the associated reactions, retrieved from BiGG when possible, were added to the draft model.

MetaCyc (Caspi *et al.*, 2020), KEGG (Kanehisa *et al.*, 2021) and BRENDA (Schomburg *et al.*,

2013) databases were also consulted for the manual model curation. The biomass reaction used

in this EcN model corresponds to that of the iJO1366 model. Consistency analysis of the

topological network was conducted to identify gap metabolites and blocked reactions (Ponce-de-

Leon *et al.*, 2015). Finally, gaps, reaction directionality and redundancies were manually curated.

Reactions, metabolites, genes, and subsystems were annotated using the KEGG, BioCyc,

MetaNetX, SEED, Rhea, ChEBI, and NCBI databases. SBOannotator (Leonidou *et al.*, 2023) was

used to assign SBO terms. The quality of the model was evaluated using the MEMOTE tool

(v.0.13.0) (Lieven *et al.*, 2020). For the manipulation, study and development of the model Python

3 and the COBRApy library were used (Ebrahim *et al.*, 2013). The final GEM is provided in json,

mat and sbml format (Supplemental Material S1).

Metabolic models comparison

The EcN model reconstructed here was compared to the remaining available models (iDK1463

(Kim *et al.*, 2021) and iHM1533 (van't Hof *et al.*, 2022) in terms of structure, Memote scores, and

predictive analysis.

Plasmid integration in the EcN model

To incorporate the biosynthesis of the two cryptic plasmids, present in EcN into the model, two

reactions were introduced: one representing the consumption of deoxyribonucleotides (dNTPs)

and the production of the plasmids (Eq. 1), and a demand reaction (Eq. 2) to enable simulations.

The stoichiometric coefficients of dNTPs and pyrophosphate were calculated using the BOFdat

algorithm (Lachance *et al.*, 2019), based on each plasmid's nucleotide composition and its

estimated copy numbers (Zainuddin *et al.*, 2019). The contribution of the plasmids to the cellular

dry weight was computed as the DNA fraction, considering the product of plasmids size and copy

number relative to the chromosome genome size (Eq. 3).

0.0133 datp_c + 0.0125 dctp_c + 0.011 dgtp_c + 0.0137 dttp_c --> plasmid_c + 0.0504 ppi_c (Eq. 1)

178　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　plasmid_c --> (Eq. 2)

((plasmid bp × copy number) / (chromosome bp + plasmid bp × copy number)) × 0.031 (Eq. 3)

To simulate plasmid replication and its associated metabolic burden, we imposed a fixed lower

bound on the plasmid, while keeping biomass maximization as the objective function. To select

this fixed value, the strategy was evaluated across a range of NGAM lower bound values,

considering which would best reproduce the experimental conditions (see belowe *In silico growth*

conditions and *Experimental datasets*) and to assess sensitivity to NGAM. Further details and

simulations are provided in the Supplementary Methods.

ATP expenditure parameters

Growth associated ATP maintenance (GAM) and non-growth associated ATP maintenance

(NGAM) are critical parameters for GEMs to accurately represent physiological responses. GAM

and NGAM values for wild-type and plasmid-bearing *E. coli* were retrieved from literature. A

consensus value of 59.8 mmol·gDW^{-1}·h^{-1} for GAM was used (Kim *et al*., 2021). The occurrence

of plasmids has been referred to increase NGAM energy due to the metabolic burden associated

with their maintenance, replication, and expression (Rozkov *et al.*, 2004; Ow *et al.*, 2009; Zeng

and Yang, 2019). The median of previously reported NGAM values was used to set the lower

bound of the ATPM reaction in aerobic (25 mmol·gDW^{-1}·h^{-1}) and anaerobic conditions (3.5

mmol·gDW^{-1}·h^{-1}). Further details can be found in Supplementary Methods.

Experimental datasets employed for model validation

Experimental data were compiled from literature on the growth of EcN on various carbon sources

(Revelles *et al.*, 2013; Millard *et al.*, 2021) and used for model validation. Each dataset contains

experimental measurements of several external fluxes, including specific growth rate, carbon

source uptake rate, and secretion rates of byproducts. These experimental measurements are

provided in Supplementary Methods.

In silico constraints and growth conditions

For reversible reactions, upper and lower bounds of 1000 and -1000 mmol·gDW^{-1}·h^{-1}, were

respectively applied. For irreversible reactions, the lower bound –or in specific cases, the upper

bound– was fixed at 0 mmol·gDW^{-1}·h^{-1}. Maximization of growth rate was set as the objective

function. Anaerobic conditions were imposed by constraining the lower bound of the O$_2$ exchange

reaction to 0 mmol·gDW^{-1}·h^{-1}; whereas aerobic conditions were simulated by setting this bound

to -20 mmol·gDW^{-1}·h^{-1} (Nogales, 2017; Blázquez *et al.*, 2023).

To prevent unrealistic behaviors under some conditions, certain reactions were deactivated and

constrained to 0 mmol·gDW^{-1}·h^{-1} as stated in reference *E. coli* models. Under all conditions, the

following reactions were blocked: CAT, DHPTDNR, DHPTDNRN, SPODM, SPODMpp,

SUCASPtpp, SUCFUMtpp, SUCMALtpp, and SUCTARTtpp, as well as PTRCORNt7pp,

GALCTNLt2pp, GALCTLO, EX_chitob_e, URCN, CHITPH and CHITOBpts. The following

reactions were kept active only in anaerobiosis: DTARTD, LCARS, SUCTARTtpp, TARTD,

TARTRt7pp, ARGAGMt7pp, FHL and CELBpts (Monk *et al.*, 2016). Although FHL is active

anaerobically, it was also blocked here to allow quantification of formate production that would

otherwise be fully consumed by the return reaction.

NGAM and GAM energy requirements were constrained according to the values specified in the

previous *ATP expenditure parameters* section. For the simulation of each growth media, the lower

bounds of exchange reactions were set to zero except for the metabolites present in the defined

medium (M9 minimal media or gut microbiota media, GMM). Detailed specific exchange

restrictions of each media are provided in Supplementary Methods. M9 minimal media was

employed when simulating the experimental datasets, subject to additional condition-specific

adjustments. A detailed summary of the constrained reactions and fluxes applied to in *silico*

simulations of these datasets is provided in Supplementary Methods.

Flux Balance and Flux Variability Analyses

Flux Balance Analysis (FBA) and Flux Variability Analysis (FVA) were performed using the

COBRApy software (Ebrahim *et al*., 2013) All optimization problems were solved with CPLEX and

the GNU Linear Programming Kit (GLPK). FBA was used to compute the maximum value of the

objective function and the corresponding flux distribution (Thiele and Palsson, 2010; Orth *et al*.,

2011). Maximization of the growth rate was set as the default cellular objective function. For

modelling and simulating growth specific conditions, bounds of some reactions were modified as

previously specified in *in silico constraints and growth conditions* section. Subsequently, FVA was

carried out to determine the minimum and maximum feasible fluxes for each reaction on the

constrained metabolic model while maintaining at least 90% of the optimal FBA objective value.

Possibilistic Metabolic Flux and Consistency Analysis

Possibilistic Metabolic Flux Analysis (MFA) was applied as previously described in (Tortajada *et*

al., 2010; Llaneras, 2011; Morales *et al*., 2014), using the PFAToolbox implemented in MATLAB

R2020b. Briefly, this methodology accounts for data uncertainty, allowing experimental

measurements to deviate from actual flux values, and can be represented as: $w_m = v_m + e_m$,

where e_m is a vector containing the measurement errors. Each candidate solution fulfilling the

model and experimental constraints is denoted as δ. A possibility value [0, 1] is assigned to each

solution based on a linear cost index $J(\delta) = \alpha \cdot \varepsilon_1 + \beta \cdot \mu_1$, where the possibility of each solution will

be $\pi(\delta) = \exp(-J(\delta)\delta \subset \Delta$. Thus, a situation where $v_m = w$ is considered fully possible, and the

greater the deviation between v_m and w_m, the lower the associated possibility.

In order to assess consistency, the agreement between experimental datasets and the metabolic

network was evaluated as described in (Tortajada *et al.*, 2010; Llaneras, 2011). Briefly, this

method assigns a possibility value π^{mp} = [0, 1] to consistency between the most possible flux

distribution with the model constraints and the experimental data under the model constraints. A

value of 1 indicates full consistency, whereas lower values indicate discrepancies between

measurements and model. For each dataset, measurement uncertainty was defined so that fluxes

were considered fully possible (π = 1) within 5% of their reported standard deviations, while

deviations exceeding the larger of either 20% of the experimental mean value or two standard

deviations from experimental standard deviations corresponded to a possibility of $\pi \leq 0.1$.

Flux-associated error estimation

To quantify the agreement between experimental measurements and model-predicted fluxes, the

Relative Squared Error (RSE) was computed. For each condition and model, individual flux RSE

values were calculated and then summarized to obtain the median error estimate. These values

were used to compare the predictive performance of the different EcN GEMs across experimental

datasets.

Metabolomic assays and data analysis

Starting from a 10 mL overnight culture in LB medium for each strain, the cells were washed twice

with saline solution and inoculated into the corresponding medium at OD 0.05. Cultures were

incubated overnight at 37°C under anaerobic conditions (BD GasPak™ system). After incubation,

the cultures were collected and centrifuged for 15 minutes at 4500g. The supernatants were

filtered through a 0.22 μm membrane filter and stored at -80°C until HPLC analysis. For each

growth medium (GMM and M9), three replicates of both strains were performed, across two

independent experimental setups. Blanks were conducted as medium samples, non-inoculated,

independently.

The determinations of the metabolites listed in Supplementary Methods were carried out by high-

performance liquid chromatography according to the analytical methods described below. For

short-chain fatty acids (SCFAs) and fermentation-related metabolites, an Arc-HPLC system

coupled with a refractive index detector (RID 2414) (Waters Corp., Milford, MA, USA) was used.

The separation was carried out on an ion-moderated partition chromatography column (Aminex

HPX-87H, 300 x 7.8mm, 9 µm) from Bio-Rad Laboratories (Hercules, CA, USA), kept at 60ºC,

and eluted with 5mM H_2SO_4, at 0,6 ml min^{-1} flow rate (Huda-Faujan, *et al.*, 2010).

Amino acid quantification (arginine, ornithine, and glutamate) was carried out on a Waters Acquity

Arc HPLC system equipped with a fluorescence detector (FLD 2475) using a Nova-Pak C18

column (3.9 × 150 mm, 4 µm). Analyses were performed at 37 °C with a 1 mL min^{-1} flow rate

following an AccQ-Tag gradient program. Detection was achieved at excitation and emission

wavelengths of 250 nm and 395 nm, respectively. Standards and samples were derivatized

according to the manufacturer's instructions. Peak identification and quantification were carried

out using analytical standards and their corresponding calibration curves (Jaworska *et al.,* 2012).

Tryptophan and γ-aminobutyric acid (GABA) were quantified by UHPLC coupled to a single

quadrupole mass detector (LC-QDa-MS) using a Waters Acquity Arc system with a Kinetex C18

column (100 × 4.6 mm, 2.6 µm) (Phenomenex, Torrance, CA, USA). Tryptophan was analyzed

using water and methanol mobile phases containing 0.1% formic acid under a gradient elution at

0.5 mL min^{-1}, while GABA was measured under similar conditions with ammonium formate-formic

acid buffers at 0.6 mL min^{-1}. Compounds were detected in positive electrospray mode in Single

Ion Recording, and quantified using external calibration standards (Zhu, *et al.*, 2011, de Bie, *et*

al., 2021).

For data analysis and comparison, blanks measurements were extracted for each metabolite

value, depending on medium. Metabolite concentrations (in mg/L) were normalized to cell growth

in terms of OD. This processed data was used in the subsequent analysis. For visualization of

each metabolite profiling, ggplot2 (v3.4.4; Wickham, 2009) was employed. Statistical analysis was

performed in python (v3.11.5) using a bootstrap resampling with 10000 iterations and a

significance level of 0.05 to evaluate differences between control and condition samples. A

threshold of 10^{-3} mg/L was applied to filter out low-abundance metabolites. For each metabolite

and condition, 95% bootstrap-based confidence intervals were computed to assess the

significance of differences in metabolite concentrations relative to control values.

Code availability

The code and data for reproducing this analysis are available in the GitHub repository:

https://github.com/paocorbin/EcN-GEM

313   3. Results

314   3.1 Reconstruction of the EcN and structural comparison with other EcN
315   GEMs

316   3.1.1 Previously published GEMs of EcN

Several researchers have developed genome-scale metabolic models (GEMs) specific to EcN.

The initial step in this research involved comparing the available reconstructions (Table 1) to

evaluate how their structural features influence predictive accuracy and performance in practical

experimental scenarios.

The first GEM of EcN (iDK1463; Kim *et al.*, 2021) was derived from earlier reconstructions of *E.*

coli K-12 MG1655 and two uropathogenic strains, CFT073 and ABU83972. This model was

qualitatively validated using Biolog phenotypic assays, covering a broad range of carbon and

nitrogen sources, and other substrates under aerobic conditions. The analysis identified gene

clusters unique to EcN relative to the K-12 strain and used the metabolic model to simulate

anaerobic growth in intestinal environments with various carbon sources. These simulations

revealed distinct metabolic behaviors between EcN and K-12 strains.

Subsequently, Moutinho and coworkers (2022) reconstructed a smaller, more streamlined

network to demonstrate their proposed reconstruction workflow, called Constraint-based Analysis

Yielding reaction Usage across metabolic Networks (CANYUN). This model was validated against

experimental growth data under both aerobic and anaerobic conditions.

Finally, van't Hof and coworkers (2022) developed an additional model (iHM1533), built on a high-

quality genomic sequence and related to 55 other *E. coli* strains with available GEMs. This model

was validated through phenome analysis and ^{13}C-fluxomics data, which provided insights into

internal fluxes under aerobic conditions (Revelles *et al.*, 2013). They also refined the pathways

involved in secondary metabolism to create a framework for using EcN as a synthetic biology

chassis, particularly for enhancing secondary metabolite production, such as antimicrobial

compounds. For this, a mutant EcN strain curated from the cryptic plasmids was used for further

validation during Biolog phenotypic assays.

An analysis of the main features of these EcN models shows an average of approximately 3,064

reactions (excluding the Canyun model) and around 1,471 unique metabolites. The Canyun

model differs from the others because its primary goal was to simulate qualitative growth

phenotypes and validate the reconstruction workflow. As a result, it omits over 1,200 reactions

that are not essential for growth. Overall, the published EcN GEMs vary in complexity and the

level of manual curation, which depends on the reconstruction strategy—whether based on

extensive reference GEMs or utilizing new reconstruction methods—and the degree of refinement

performed. The models listed in Table 1 are ranked from least to most complex based on these

criteria. Nevertheless, all reconstructions have been validated using similar experimental

datasets.

3.1.2 Development of the EcN model presented in this study

In this study, we present an updated GEM of EcN, designated iPC1373 (Supplementary Material

S1; Alvarez *et al.*, 2019). The model was developed to accurately represent the core physiology

and metabolic capabilities of this probiotic strain. Reconstruction was based on the annotated

genome of EcN, available GEMs of closely related *E. coli* strains, and manual curation.

Initially, a draft reconstruction was generated by incorporating all shared reactions and

metabolites from the *E. coli* K-12 MG1655 and the uropathogenic *E. coli* CFT073 models, based

on the presence of homologous genes. Manual curation was subsequently performed to refine

the model, addressing non-homologous genes, filling metabolic gaps, verifying reaction

directionality, and removing redundant reactions based on literature evidence. The final step

involved the annotation of reactions, metabolites, and genes using multiple databases, including

KEGG, BioCyc, MetaNetX, SEED, Rhea, ChEBI, and NCBI. Systems Biology Ontology (SBO)

terms were assigned using SBOannotator (Leonidou *et al.*, 2023).

Unlike previously published models, which do not include the EcN cryptic plasmids pMUT1 and

pMUT2, iPC1373 explicitly incorporates these genetic elements. The concept of plasmid-

associated metabolic burden is well established, and several studies have addressed its

representation in metabolic models of various scales, including GEMs (Ow *et al.*, 2009; Zeng and

Yang, 2019; Oftadeh and Hatzimanikatis, 2024). Notably, simulations of wild-type EcN growth on

glucose using previously published models overestimated the experimental biomass growth rate

by approximately 20% (van't Hof *et al.*, 2022), suggesting an unaccounted burden or metabolic

cost. To capture this effect, iPC1373 includes the maintenance and expression of both cryptic

plasmids, implemented as two additional reactions (Eq. 1 and Eq. 2) representing their associated

biosynthetic and energetic demands. Plasmid maintenance costs were parameterized using

literature-derived estimates for plasmid-bearing *E. coli* (Weber *et al.*, 2002; Orth *et al.*, 2011; Zeng

and Yang, 2019). Accordingly, the NGAM parameter was adjusted by constraining the lower

bound of the ATPM reaction to the median of reported values: 25 mmol·gDW^{-1}·h^{-1} under aerobic

conditions and 3.5 mmol·gDW^{-1}·h^{-1} under anaerobic conditions. For additional validation, the

effect of ATP parameters on reaction fluxes, particularly biomass estimation, was evaluated (see

Supplementary Methods). A good correspondence was found between the values selected from

literature, and the resulting predictions using biomass as the objective function.

The finalized model comprises 2,716 reactions, 1,943 metabolites (corresponding to 1,217 unique

metabolites), and 1,373 genes. Model quality and consistency evaluated using the Memote

testing suite (Lieven *et al*., 2020), yielded a total score of 91% and a consistency score of 98%

(Supplementary Material 2). Annotation completeness scores were 78% for metabolites, 79% for

reactions, and 60% for genes; the latter reflecting incomplete database coverage. The coverage

of SBO terms reached 93%, indicating a high level of semantic and structural annotation.

3.1.3 Structural analysis and comparison of available EcN metabolic models

Once the iPC1373 model had been established, we evaluated its structural correspondence with

previously published reconstructions. The EcN CANYUN model was excluded from the

comparison and subsequent analyses owing to its deliberately reduced size. In terms of reactions

(Fig. 1A, Supplementary Material 3), the models shared 2,654 reactions, 83% of the total. Notably,

the published models iDK1463 and iHM1533 contain substantially more reactions; over half of

their surplus (154 of 284; 58%) comprises extracellular exchange and transport reactions,

followed by 39 reactions involved in alternative carbon metabolism (Fig. S1). The iPC1373 model

exhibits a smaller set of 17 unique reactions, comprising: i) two biomass formulations—wt and

core, corresponding respectively to the full, experimentally measured macromolecular

composition of the wild-type strain and a simplified precursor-based biomass reaction—, ii) the

two reactions related to plasmid representation, iii) seven transport reactions, and iv) six reactions

representing the O-antigen biosynthesis module (Wzx/Wzy/WaaL pathway), responsible for

semirough LPS production in EcN (Grozdanov *et al.*, 2002). In iDK1463, apart from the biomass

reaction, the other 19 unique reactions were removed during the curation of iPC1373 as

duplicates or redundancies—changes consistent with the updated *E. coli* K-12 model iML1515

(e.g., ALAt2pp, ALAt2pp_copy1, ALAt2pp_copy2). Finally, iHM1533 includes 188 unique

reactions (Fig. S2), primarily in secondary-metabolite biosynthesis (102), transport and exchange

(43), and aromatic compounds breakdown (15).

For metabolites (Fig. 1B, Supplementary Material 4), the main differences occur in iHM1533 and

reflect the subsystem expansions aimed at optimizing specialized metabolism (Fig. S3),

consistent with the reaction-level disparities among the models. In terms of MEMOTE (Fig. S4),

the three EcN models show high consistency (97–98%). Annotation coverage is strong for

metabolites and reactions (78–84%), with gene annotation being the main weakness (60–68%).

iPC1373 has the highest SBO term coverage (93%). Overall scores are high and comparable

(89–91%), with iPC1373 slightly leading by two points, indicating all three reconstructions are

robust with minor annotation differences.

3.2 Model validation with experimental flux datasets

The next step was to validate the phenotypic consistency of the EcN metabolic models against

independent experimental data, beyond their mathematical accuracy as calculated with

MEMOTE. Equations reflecting plasmid replication were incorporated into all EcN models

available for validation, comparison and predictive analyses. Unless otherwise specified, models

including these plasmid-associated reactions were employed.

A quantitative approach was adopted to rigorously evaluate model performance of the different

EcN metabolic models, examining whether increased model complexity improves quantitative

predictive accuracy (O'Brien *et al.*, 2015; Blázquez *et al.*, 2023). Since completeness and

mathematical consistency do not necessarily ensure accurate physiological predictions, this

validation aimed to test the models' ability to reproduce experimental biomass formation,

substrate uptake, and by-product secretion rates—key parameters for bioprocess control and

understanding EcN physiology. For that, several datasets from the literature were compiled (see

above *Experimental datasets* in Methods).

3.2.1 Experimental growth scenarios and model consistency analysis

First, the experimental datasets were used to evaluate consistency—that is, the compatibility

between the experimental data and the model—by applying possibilistic MFA and computing the

possibility (π) of the most possible flux state. As shown in Table 2, the consistency analysis

yielded possibility values of 1 for the Revelles and coworkers (2013) dataset, indicating full

agreement between the data and the models. For both fucose and rhamnose conditions,

consistency was marginally higher in the iHM1533 model, increasing with model complexity.

Conversely, randomly generated scenarios yielded possibilities lower than 0.1 on over 98% of

occasions.

3.2.2. Prediction of biomass growth rate

Then, we evaluated whether the incorporation of the plasmid module and the adjustment of

energy maintenance rates improved the prediction of biomass growth rates across the

experimental datasets. Introducing the plasmid module partially corrected the overestimation of

in vivo growth observed in all simulated carbon sources (Table 3). Model predictions including the

plasmid representation showed better agreement with experimental data, clearly decreasing the

relative squared error (RSE) across all scenarios and models, resulting in an average reduction

from 16% to 4% (Table S1). There were no wide differences in performance between the different

models, with the iDK1463-based reconstruction achieving the best biomass prediction, with a

prediction error of 3.6%, compared to 4.0% and 4.6% for iHM1533 and iPC1373, respectively.

3.2.3 Prediction of remaining external rates

Once plasmid incorporation was shown to improve biomass growth prediction, external production

rates were estimated using the plasmid-bearing models by constraining only the carbon source

uptake rate to the experimental values of each dataset. This approach reflects typical fermentation

conditions, where substrate uptake is measured and controlled, while other exchange fluxes are

rarely monitored. Predictions for all datasets were obtained using FBA, FVA, and possibilistic

MFA (Figure 2; Supplementary Material S5).

Overall, a good directional agreement was observed between experimental and *in silico* FBA-

predicted values (Table S2), though quantitative deviations were larger than those found for

biomass estimation, with an overall average RSE of 32% (Table S3). Among the models, iPC1373

provided in this case the most accurate predictions, achieving an RSE of 27%, compared to 35%

for both iDK1463 and iHM1533.

Additionally, the three models produced comparable external flux predictions across all

methodologies, with only minor variations. Noticeable discrepancies appeared for 1,2-propanediol

production (Fig. 2E, Fig. 2F), pyruvate production under gluconate conditions (Fig. 2C, Fig. 2D),

and glycogen formation (Fig. 2B). Range-based approaches (possibilistic MFA and FVA)

generally encompass both the FBA predictions and the experimental values within their bounds.

In some cases—such as 1,2-propanediol production—these range-based methods captured the

experimental results more accurately.

3.2.4 Prediction of internal flux reactions rates

Finally, since the complete flux distribution can be estimated, we compared the model predictions

with the experimental ^{13}C fluxomics data reported for the EcN wild-type strain by Revelles and

coworkers (2013), using glucose (Fig. 3A) and gluconate (Fig. 3B) as sole carbon sources. Both

FBA and possibilistic MFA were applied to analyze central metabolic pathways and reactions (Fig.

3, Supplementary Material S6), allowing for a comparison of the methodologies. Overall, model

predictions qualitatively followed the experimental intracellular flux trends, except for the TCA

cycle, which showed underestimated fluxes under both carbon sources–except for the iHM1533

model in glucose using possibilistic MFA–and reaction 7 of glycolysis (the conversion of

phosphoenolpyruvate to pyruvate) under glucose. Quantitative discrepancies depended on both

the model and the methodology, although FBA predictions were generally accurate across

reaction groups. However, notable deviations were observed in reactions 4 (glucose) and 14

(gluconate), where the iPC1373 and iHM1533 models demonstrated greater consistency with the

experimental findings. Overall, attending to median RSE, all models performed similarly across

the different scenarios with relative errors ranging 29-33% (Table S4).

When possibilistic MFA was applied to estimate the most probable flux value for each reaction,

larger differences emerged depending on the underlying model. In this case, the model iPC1373

achieved the highest overall accuracy, better capturing the fluxes through the TCA cycle reactions

and exhibiting the lowest median RSE across the 23-24 reactions analyzed, 32% (Table S4).

3.3 EcN exhibits a distinct metabolomic profile in GMM medium, both

experimentally and *in silico*

Once the models were validated and compared against experimental flux datasets, we examined

whether they could reproduce EcN's metabolic behavior under different environmental conditions.

To this end, EcN and the reference *E. coli* K-12 strain were cultured anaerobically in minimal M9

media and Gut Microbiota Medium (GMM), which promotes the growth of beneficial gut bacteria

and enhance short-chain fatty acids (SCFAs) production (Park *et al*., 2024). This setup aimed to

determine if GMM elicits distinct metabolic behavior in the probiotic strain, as it mimics the nutrient

composition of the gut environment. Although previous GEM studies (Kim *et al.,* 2021) suggested

that EcN behaves differently under anaerobic environments, this physiologically relevant aspect

has not yet been experimentally confirmed best of our knowledge.

To explore global metabolic differences, representative metabolites–including organic acids,

SCFAs, and amino acids–were quantified. Samples were grouped by strain and medium,

revealing largely similar profiles overall, except for EcN grown in GMM, which clearly separated

from the rest (Fig. 4A). This separation was mainly driven by PC1, which explained 82% of the

total variance, followed by PC2 (10.5%). The metabolites contributing most to this separation

were lactate, acetate, formate, and succinate.

When analyzing specific patterns in the different extracellular compounds, some metabolites

showed no detectable production or consumption or did so only in insignificant changes in several

compounds, including propionate, isobutyrate, and isovalerate (Supplementary Material S7). In

contrast, clear differences were observed in the production of organic acids—particularly

SCFAs—and in amino acid consumption when EcN was grown in GMM medium (Fig. 4B-I).

Indeed, an overall increase in fermentation-related metabolites and SCFAs was found in EcN

cultures under GMM conditions (Fig. 4B-F). EcN produced acetic, butyric, formic, lactic, and

succinic acids at net concentrations of 1.19, 0.16, 0.49, 1.01, and 0.49 g/L, respectively

(Supplementary Material S7). In addition, small amounts of valeric acid (≈20 mg/L) were detected

exclusively in EcN cultures (Fig. 4F). Compared to the K-12 strain, EcN showed markedly higher

production of acetic, butyric, lactic, and succinic acids (0.08, 0.08, 0.33, and 0.35 g/L in K-12,

respectively). Moreover, EcN demonstrated distinct amino acid utilization patterns within GMM

(Fig. 4G-I), exhibiting elevated uptake of arginine and tryptophan compared to the K-12 strain or

EcN in M9 medium. Interestingly, ornithine consumption showed opposite behavior for the strains.

These observed variations seem independent of growth, as EcN achieved a lower optical density

under these conditions (Supplementary Material S7).

Finally, the models were used to simulate EcN metabolism under M9 and GMM media (Fig. 5,

Supplementary Material S8). As previously evaluated, all three models successfully captured the

overflow metabolism characteristic of EcN growth in M9 medium with glucose (Fig. 5A), including

the production of acetate, ethanol and formate, although they failed to reproduce lactate

formation. Under simulated GMM conditions (Fig. 5B), all three models accurately reproduced the

distinctive overproduction of succinate and acetate observed experimentally. Model iPC1373 also

captured the increased butyrate production, while iHM1533 predicted higher lactate formation. In

contrast, ethanol production was not predicted by any model—which aligns with its low

experimental levels when compared to M9 medium (Supplementary Material S7). Enhanced

consumption of key amino acids, including glutamate, arginine, and tryptophan, was also correctly

represented. However, none of the models reproduced ornithine uptake, with iHM1533 instead

predicting its secretion. Some discrepancies, such as the absence of isovaleric, valeric, and

GABA predictions were probably due to missing reactions or metabolites in the reconstructions.

4. Discussion

The main objective of this study was to develop a GEM of EcN capable of accurately reproducing

its physiological behavior, with particular focus on its characteristic probiotic traits. Although EcN

is a well-characterized and commercially available probiotic strain, systems biology studies have

paradoxically emphasized its potential as a biosynthetic chassis rather than its probiotic

physiology. Owing to its strong adherence, resistance, and persistence in the gastrointestinal

tract, EcN represents an attractive platform for targeted drug delivery and live biotherapeutic

applications (Kan *et al.,* 2021; Kim *et al.,* 2021). Previous research has typically relied on specific

experimental constraints, media compositions, or genetically modified variants—such as the

plasmid-cured strain reported by van't Hof *et al.* (2022)—to characterize EcN's performance as a

recombinant host.

In constructing our model, we explicitly incorporated the presence and energetic cost of EcN's

cryptic plasmids. The metabolic burden associated with plasmid maintenance is well established

in *E. coli* (Ow *et al*., 2009; Oftadeh and Hatzimanikatis, 2024), and previous EcN GEMs have

tended to overestimate biomass growth rates (van't Hof *et al*., 2022). Van't Hof and colleagues

attributed these discrepancies to incomplete biomass formulations, underestimated maintenance

energy requirements, or missing by-product pathways. By introducing a plasmid-specific module

representing the additional energetic demands of plasmid maintenance, our model achieved more

realistic biomass yield estimates and accurately reproduced acetate overflow metabolism. This

adjustment reduced the overestimation of *in silico* growth rates to within 5% of experimental

measurements. Beyond improving model fidelity, this refinement is also relevant to synthetic

biology applications, where EcN's cryptic plasmids are often retained and exploited as stable

endogenous expression vectors. The systematic inclusion of endogenous plasmids could also

have broader implications for GEM development in other microorganisms. Many industrially and

clinically important bacteria—whether probiotic, pathogenic, or commensal—naturally harbor

plasmids (Fogarty *et al*., 2024; Garcillán-Barcia *et al.,* 2025), yet these elements are rarely

represented in their respective GEMs. Incorporating plasmid-associated metabolic costs and

interactions thus represents a promising strategy to enhance both model realism and predictive

power.

To further assess model performance, we compared several EcN GEMs after integrating the

plasmid module, evaluating the trade-offs between model complexity and accuracy in reproducing

experimental physiological behavior. Interestingly, models with differing levels of curation and

structural detail yielded distinct quantitative outcomes when validated against experimental flux

data. Notably, greater model complexity did not necessarily improve predictive accuracy—

particularly for external fluxes such as acetate or ethanol secretion—and similar inconsistencies

were observed for intracellular flux predictions. Some recurring discrepancies, including those

related to 1,2-propanediol, pyruvate, or glycogen production, likely reflect inherent limitations of

FBA, which assumes growth optimization and neglects non-essential or suboptimal fluxes. These

by-products are often regulated through mechanisms such as CsrA-dependent glycogen

accumulation, underscoring the need to integrate regulatory constraints or multi-objective

formulations to more faithfully reproduce EcN's observed metabolism.

Our analyses further demonstrated that intracellular flux prediction accuracy does not scale

linearly with model complexity. Predictive performance depended on both the computational

method and the reaction–model pairing, indicating that specific models may better capture

particular pathway dynamics. Under certain environmental simulations, some metabolites—such

as valerate, isovalerate, and GABA—were not predicted by all models, likely due to missing

exchange reactions or incomplete pathway representations. Other deviations, such as the

absence of lactate production in IDK1463 and iPC1373 or misrepresented ornithine flux in

iHM1533, may result from alternative flux distributions that divert carbon flow from these

pathways.

While qualitative predictions aid in interpreting general physiological trends, quantitative precision

is crucial for industrial applications. In probiotic manufacturing, accurate control of fermentation

parameters is essential to maintain cell viability and product stability. GEMs are valuable tools for

optimizing such processes, especially when it is difficult the direct measurement of key

parameters such as growth, substrate uptake, or by-product secretion. Reliable model predictions

can thus improve fermentation efficiency and product consistency. Accordingly, the present study

establishes a framework for developing and validating strain-specific GEMs with quantitative data

and industrial relevance.

From a methodological perspective, this work also illustrates how distinct metabolic flux analysis

approaches provide complementary insights into cellular metabolism. Possibilistic MFA proved

particularly valuable for incorporating measurement uncertainty and generating robust flux

estimates in underdetermined systems, where conventional MFA or FBA may produce less stable

solutions. Comparative analyses of FBA, FVA, and possibilistic MFA revealed that each method

captures unique aspects of metabolic behavior and uncertainty. Furthermore, as shown in this

study, different metabolic reconstructions—regardless of their origin or level of curation—can be

effectively prioritized depending on the specific biological or experimental context.

Finally, this study enhances our understanding of EcN's unique probiotic features. Metabolomic

analyses confirmed that EcN displays a distinctive metabolic profile under anaerobic conditions

in GMM, supporting previous *in silico* observations that it expresses unique metabolic traits under

gut-like environments (Kim *et al*., 2021; van't Hof *et al*., 2022). This phenotype is characterized

by selective consumption and secretion of key metabolites that distinguish EcN from other *E. coli*

strains. Compared to *E. coli* K-12, EcN consumes several amino acids at higher rates, potentially

conferring a competitive advantage in the intestinal niche by depleting local nutrient pools and

limiting resources available to competing microorganisms. Simultaneously, EcN produces

elevated levels of organic acids—such as lactic and acetic acid—that inhibit pathogens, as well

as SCFAs like butyrate and valerate, which promote the growth of beneficial anaerobes. Together,

these findings reinforce EcN's physiological distinctiveness and provide ecological insight into its

probiotic mechanisms of action. They also confirm that EcN's phenotype is strongly context-

dependent, particularly on growth medium composition and oxygen availability. Thus,

physiologically relevant conditions are essential when validating and applying GEMs to

commensal, probiotic, or pathogenic microorganisms.

Future work could extend this framework to simulate microbial interactions within the gut

ecosystem. Integrating EcN into community-scale metabolic models—similar to prior approaches

for *Bacillus* and *Lactobacillus* species (Devika *et al*., 2021)—would allow exploration of its

interactions with both commensal and pathogenic bacteria, offering deeper insights into its

ecological role and therapeutic potential.

5. Conclusions

In summary, this study presents a refined genome-scale metabolic model of EcN that explicitly

accounts for the energetic cost of its cryptic plasmids and achieves improved quantitative

agreement with experimental data. Comparative analyses with previous models revealed that

increased structural complexity does not necessarily enhance predictive accuracy, underscoring

the importance of contextual and condition-specific validation. Metabolomic analyses further

demonstrated that EcN exhibits a distinctive metabolic phenotype under gut-like conditions,

characterized by enhanced amino acid consumption and short-chain fatty acid production,

reinforcing its probiotic identity. Overall, this work provides a robust framework for the quantitative

and physiologically relevant modeling of EcN and related commensal bacteria, with implications

for probiotic research, industrial fermentation, and synthetic biology applications.

Author Contributions

Paola Corbín Agustí: Conceptualization, Methodology, Formal analysis, Visualization,

Investigation, Software, Data curation, Writing– Original draft, Reviewing and Editing. **Alba**

Arévalo-Lalanne: Methodology, Investigation, Writing– Reviewing and editing. **Patricia Álvarez**:

Methodology, Formal analysis, Investigation, Software, Data curation, Writing– Reviewing and

editing. **María Enrique:** Methodology, Investigation, Writing– Reviewing and editing. **Daniel**

Ramón: Conceptualization, Formal analysis, Writing– Reviewing and editing. **Juli Peretó**:

Conceptualization, Formal analysis, Funding acquisition, Writing– Original draft, Reviewing and

Editing. **Marta Tortajada:** Conceptualization, Formal analysis, Supervision, Writing– Original

draft, Reviewing and Editing.

Funding

Conflicts of Interest

D. Ramón and M. Tortajada are former employees of Biopolis–Archer Daniels Midland and

contributed to this study in their personal capacity. M. Enrique is an employee of Archer Daniels

Midland, Nutrition, Health & Wellness, Biopolis S.L.

Data Availability Statement

The code and data for reproducing this analysis are available in the GitHub repository:

https://github.com/paocorbin/EcN-GEM

6. References

Álvarez, P., Corbín, P., Ruiz, M., Peretó, J., and Tortajada, M. (2019) Reconstruction and analysis of genome-scale metabolic models of industrial *Escherichia coli* strains. In: *Proceedings 8th International Conference on Foundations of Systems Biology in Engineering*. Valencia: FOSBE, pp. 275–276.

Antoniewicz, M.R. (2021) A guide to metabolic flux analysis in metabolic engineering: Methods, tools and applications. *Metabolic Engineering* 63: 2–12.

Beimfohr, C. (2016) A review of research conducted with probiotic *E. coli* marketed as Symbioflor. International *Journal of Bacteriology* 2016: 1–10.

Bernstein, D.B., Akkas, B., Price, M.N., and Arkin, A.P. (2023) Evaluating *E. coli* genome-scale metabolic model accuracy with high-throughput mutant fitness data. *Molecular Systems Biology* 19: e11566.

Blázquez, B., San León, D., Rojas, A., Tortajada, M., and Nogales, J. (2023) New insights on metabolic features of *Bacillus subtilis* based on multistrain genome-scale metabolic modeling. International. *Journal of Molecular Sciences* 24: 7091.

Blum-Oehler, G., Oswald, S., Eiteljörge, K., Sonnenborn, U., Schulze, J., Kruis, W., and Hacker, J. (2003) Development of strain-specific PCR reactions for the detection of the probiotic *Escherichia coli* strain Nissle 1917 in fecal samples. *Research in Microbiology* 154: 59–66.

Caspi, R., Billington, R., Keseler, I.M., Kothari, A., Krummenacker, M., Midford, P.E., et al. (2020) The MetaCyc database of metabolic pathways and enzymes - a 2019 update. *Nucleic Acids Research* 48: D445–D453.

de Bie, T.H., Witkamp, R.F., Jongsma, M.A. and Balvers, M.G.J. (2021) Development and validation of a UPLC-MS/MS method for the simultaneous determination of gamma-aminobutyric acid and glutamic acid in human plasma. *Journal of Chromatography B* 1164, 122519: 1-9.

Deriu, E., Liu, J.Z., Pezeshki, M., Edwards, R.A., Ochoa, R.J., Contreras, H., et al. (2013) Probiotic bacteria reduce *Salmonella typhimurium* intestinal colonization by competing for iron. *Cell Host & Microbe* 14: 26–37.

Devika, N.T., Jangam, A.K., Katneni, V.K., Patil, P.K., Nathamuni, S., and Shekhar, M.S. (2021) In silico prediction of novel probiotic species limiting pathogenic *Vibrio* growth using constraint-based genome scale metabolic modeling. *Front Cell Infect Microbiol* 11:.

Ebrahim, A., Lerman, J.A., Palsson, B.O., and Hyduke, D.R. (2013) COBRApy: COnstraints-Based Reconstruction and Analysis for Python. *BMC Syst Biol* 7: 74.

Fogarty, E. C., Schechter, M. S., Lolans, K., Sheahan, M. L., Veseli, I., Moore, R. M., Kiefl, E., Moody, T., Rice, P. A., Yu, M. K., Mimee, M., Chang, E. B., Ruscheweyh, H.-J., Sunagawa, S., Mclellan, S. L., Willis, A. D., Comstock, L. E., and Eren, A. M. (2024). A cryptic plasmid is among the most numerous genetic elements in the human gut. *Cell* 187: 1206-1222.e16.

Garcillán-Barcia, M. P., de la Cruz, F., and Rocha, E. P. C. (2025). The extended mobility of plasmids. *Nucleic Acids Research* 53: gkaf652.

Goodman, A.L., Kallstrom, G., Faith, J.J., Reyes, A., Moore, A., Dantas, G., and Gordon, J.I. (2011) Extensive personal human gut microbiota culture collections characterized and

708   manipulated in gnotobiotic mice. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 108: 6252–6257.

709 Grozdanov, L., Zähringer, U., Blum-Oehler, G., Brade, L., Henne, A., Knirel, Y.A., et al. (2002) A
710   single nucleotide exchange in the *wzy* gene Is responsible for the semirough O6
711   lipopolysaccharide phenotype and serum sensitivity of *Escherichia coli* strain Nissle 1917.
712   *J Bacteriol* 184: 5912–5925.

713 Güttsches, A.-K., Löseke, S., Zähringer, U., Sonnenborn, U., Enders, C., Gatermann, S., and
714   Bufe, A. (2012). Anti-inflammatory modulation of immune response by probiotic
715   *Escherichia coli* Nissle 1917 in human blood mononuclear cells. *Innate Immunity* 18: 204-
716   216.

717 Hare, P.J., Englander, H.E., and Mok, W.W.K. (2022) Probiotic *Escherichia coli* Nissle 1917
718   inhibits bacterial persisters that survive fluoroquinolone treatment. *Journal of Applied*
719   *Microbiology* 132: 4020–4032.

720 Huda-Faujan, N., Abdulamir, A.S., Fatimah, A.B., Muhammad Anas, O., Shuhaimi, M., Yazid,
721   A.M. and Loong, Y.Y. (2010) The impact of the level of the intestinal short chain fatty acids
722   in inflammatory bowel disease patients versus healthy subjects. *The Open Biochemistry*
723   *Journal* 4: 53-58

724 Jaworska, M., Stanczyk, M., Wilk, M., Kłaczkow, G., Anuszewska, E., Barzał, J. and Rzepecki, P.
725   (2012) New approach for amino acid profiling in human plasma by selective fluorescence
726   derivatization. *Amino Acids* 43 (4):1653–1661

727 Kan, A., Gelfat, I., Emani, S., Praveschotinunt, P., and Joshi, N.S. (2021) Plasmid vectors for in
728   vivo selection-free use with the probiotic *E. coli* Nissle 1917. *ACS Synthetic Biology* 10:
729   94–106.

730 Kanehisa, M., Furumichi, M., Sato, Y., Ishiguro-Watanabe, M., and Tanabe, M. (2021) KEGG:
731   integrating viruses and cellular organisms. *Nucleic Acids Res* 49: D545–D551.

732 Kim, D., Kim, Y., and Yoon, S. H. (2021). Development of a genome-scale metabolic model and
733   phenome analysis of the probiotic *Escherichia coli* strain Nissle 1917. *International Journal*
734   *of Molecular Sciences* 22: 2122.

735 King, Z.A., Lu, J., Dräger, A., Miller, P., Federowicz, S., Lerman, J.A., et al. (2016) BiGG Models:
736   A platform for integrating, standardizing and sharing genome-scale models. *Nucleic Acids*
737   *Research* 44: D515–D522.

738 Leonidou, N., Fritze, E., Renz, A., and Dräger, A. (2023) SBOannotator: a Python tool for the
739   automated assignment of systems biology ontology terms. *Bioinformatics* 39: btad437.

740 Lieven, C., Beber, M.E., Olivier, B.G., Bergmann, F.T., Ataman, M., Babaei, P., et al. (2020)
741   MEMOTE for standardized genome-scale metabolic model testing. *Nat Biotechnol* 38:
742   272–276.

743 Lin, Q., Jiang, Z., Zhong, B., Chen, J., Lv, Z., and Nie, Z. (2024) Unveiling the impact of cryptic
744   plasmids curing on *Escherichia coli* Nissle 1917: massive increase in Ag43c expression.
745   *AMB Expr* 14: 48.

746 Llaneras, F. (2011) *Interval and possibilistic methods for constraint-based metabolic models*. PhD
747   Dissertation, Universitat Politècnica de València.

748 Llaneras, F., Sala, A., and Picó, J. (2009) A possibilistic framework for constraint-based metabolic
749   flux analysis. *BMC Syst Biol* 3: 79.

750 Maltby, R., Leatham-Jensen, M.P., Gibson, T., Cohen, P.S., and Conway, T. (2013) Nutritional
751   basis for colonization resistance by human commensal *Escherichia coli* strains HS and

Nissle 1917 against *E. coli* O157:H7 in the mouse intestine. *PLoS ONE* 8: e53957.

Millard, P., Pérochon, J., and Létisse, F. (2021) Functional analysis of deoxyhexose sugar utilization in *Escherichia coli* reveals fermentative metabolism under aerobic conditions. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology* 87: e00719-21.

Monk, J.M., Charusanti, P., Aziz, R.K., Lerman, J.A., Premyodhin, N., Orth, J.D., et al. (2013) Genome-scale metabolic reconstructions of multiple *Escherichia coli* strains highlight strain-specific adaptations to nutritional environments. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 110: 20338–20343.

Monk, J.M., Koza, A., Campodonico, M.A., Machado, D., Seoane, J.M., Palsson, B.O., et al. (2016) Multi-omics quantification of species variation of *Escherichia coli* links molecular features with strain phenotypes. *Cell Systems* 3: 238–251.

Monk, J.M., Lloyd, C.J., Brunk, E., Mih, N., Sastry, A., King, Z., et al. (2017) iML1515, a knowledgebase that computes *Escherichia coli* traits. *Nat Biotechnol* 35: 904–908.

Morales, Y., Tortajada, M., Picó, J., Vehí, J., and Llaneras, F. (2014) Validation of an FBA model for *Pichia pastoris* in chemostat cultures. *BMC Syst Biol* 8: 142.

Moutinho, T.J., Neubert, B.C., Jenior, M.L., and Papin, J.A. (2022) Quantifying cumulative phenotypic and genomic evidence for procedural generation of metabolic network reconstructions. *PLoS Comput Biol* 18: e1009341.

Nogales, J. (2017) A practical protocol for genome-scale metabolic reconstructions. In *Hydrocarbon and Lipid Microbiology Protocols: Genetic, Genomic and System Analyses of Pure Cultures*. McGenity, T.J., Timmis, K.N., and Nogales, B. (eds). Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer, pp. 197–221.

O'Brien, E.J., Monk, J.M., and Palsson, B.O. (2015) Using Genome-scale models to predict biological capabilities. *Cell* 161: 971–987.

Oftadeh, O. and Hatzimanikatis, V. (2024) Genome-scale models of metabolism and expression predict the metabolic burden of recombinant protein expression. *Metab Eng* 84: 109–116.

Olier, M., Marcq, I., Salvador-Cartier, C., Secher, T., Dobrindt, U., Boury, M., et al. (2012) Genotoxicity of *Escherichia coli* Nissle 1917 strain cannot be dissociated from its probiotic activity. *Gut Microbes* 3: 501–509.

Orth, J.D., Conrad, T.M., Na, J., Lerman, J.A., Nam, H., Feist, A.M., and Palsson, B.Ø. (2011) A comprehensive genome-scale reconstruction of *Escherichia coli* metabolism—2011. *Molecular Systems Biology* 7: 535.

Orth, J.D., Thiele, I., and Palsson, B.Ø. (2010) What is flux balance analysis? *Nat Biotechnol* 28: 245–248.

Ow, D.S.-W., Lee, D.-Y., Yap, M.G.-S., and Oh, S.K.-W. (2009) Identification of cellular objective for elucidating the physiological state of plasmid-bearing *Escherichia coli* using genome-scale in silico analysis. *Biotechnology Progress* 25: 61–67.

Özkan, P., Sariyar, B., Ütkür, F.Ö., Akman, U., and Hortaçsu, A. (2005) Metabolic flux analysis of recombinant protein overproduction in *Escherichia coli*. *Biochemical Engineering* Journal 22: 167–195.

Park, H., Yeo, S., Ryu, C. B., and Huh, C. S. (2024). A streamlined culturomics case study for the human gut microbiota research. *Scientific Reports* 14: 20361.

Pearcy, N., Hu, Y., Baker, M., Maciel-Guerra, A., Xue, N., Wang, W., et al. (2021) Genome-scale metabolic models and machine learning reveal genetic determinants of antibiotic

resistance in *Escherichia coli* and unravel the underlying metabolic adaptation
mechanisms. *mSystems* 6: e00913-20.

Petersen, A.M., Schjørring, S., Gerstrøm, S.C., and Krogfelt, K.A. (2011) Treatment of
inflammatory bowel disease associated *E. coli* with ciprofloxacin and *E. coli* Nissle in the
streptomycin-treated mouse intestine. *PLoS One* 6: e22823.

Ponce-de-Leon, M., Calle-Espinosa, J., Peretó, J., and Montero, F. (2015) Consistency analysis
of genome-scale models of bacterial metabolism: A metamodel approach*. PLoS One* 10:
e0143626.

Revelles, O., Millard, P., Nougayrède, J.-P., Dobrindt, U., Oswald, E., Létisse, F., and Portais, J.-
C. (2013) The carbon storage regulator (Csr) system exerts a nutrient-specific control over
central metabolism *in Escherichia coli* strain Nissle 1917. *PLoS One* 8: e66386.

Rozkov, A., Avignone-Rossa, C. a., Ertl, P. f., Jones, P., O'Kennedy, R. d., Smith, J. j., et al.
(2004) Characterization of the metabolic burden on *Escherichia coli* DH1 cells imposed by
the presence of a plasmid containing a gene therapy sequence. *Biotechnology and*
Bioengineering 88: 909–915.

Schomburg, I., Chang, A., Placzek, S., Söhngen, C., Rother, M., Lang, M., et al. (2013) BRENDA
in 2013: integrated reactions, kinetic data, enzyme function data, improved disease
classification: new options and contents in BRENDA. *Nucleic Acids Res* 41: D764-772.

Schumann, S., Alpert, C., Engst, W., Klopfleisch, R., Loh, G., Bleich, A., and Blaut, M. (2014) Mild
gut inflammation modulates the proteome of intestinal *Escherichia coli*. *Environmental*
Microbiology 16: 2966–2979.

Średnicka, P., Roszko, M.Ł., Popowski, D., Kowalczyk, M., Wójcicki, M., Emanowicz, P., et al.
(2023) Effect of in vitro cultivation on human gut microbiota composition using 16S rDNA
amplicon sequencing and metabolomics approach. *Sci Rep* 13: 3026.

Thiele, I. and Palsson, B.Ø. (2010) A protocol for generating a high-quality genome-scale
metabolic reconstruction. *Nat Protoc* 5: 93–121.

Tortajada, M., Llaneras, F., and Picó, J. (2010) Validation of a constraint-based model of *Pichia*
pastoris metabolism under data scarcity. *BMC Syst Biol* 4: 115.

van't Hof, M., Mohite, O. S., Monk, J. M., Weber, T., Palsson, B. O., and Sommer, M. O. A. (2022).
High-quality genome-scale metabolic network reconstruction of probiotic bacterium
Escherichia coli Nissle 1917. *BMC Bioinformatics* 23: 566.

von Kamp, A. and Klamt, S. (2023) Balancing biomass reaction stoichiometry and measured
fluxes in flux balance analysis. *Bioinformatics* 39: btad600.

Weber, J., Hoffmann, F., and Rinas, U. (2002) Metabolic adaptation of *Escherichia coli* during
temperature-induced recombinant protein production: 2. Redirection of metabolic fluxes.
Biotechnol Bioeng 80: 320–330.

Wickham, H. (2009) *ggplot2: Elegant graphics for data analysis*, New York, NY: Springer New
York.

Zainuddin, H.S., Bai, Y., and Mansell, T.J. (2019) CRISPR-based curing and analysis of metabolic
burden of cryptic plasmids in *Escherichia coli* Nissle 1917. *Engineering in Life Sciences*
19: 478–485.

Zeng, H. and Yang, A. (2019) Quantification of proteomic and metabolic burdens predicts growth
retardation and overflow metabolism in recombinant *Escherichia coli*. *Biotechnology and*
Bioengineering 116: 1484–1495.

Zhou, S., Zhao, L., Zuo, W., Zheng, Y., Zhang, P., Sun, Y., Wang, Y., Du, G., and Kang, Z. (2024).
Minimizing endogenous cryptic plasmids to construct antibiotic-free expression systems
for *Escherichia coli* Nissle 1917. *Synthetic and Systems Biotechnology* 9: 165-175.
Zhu, W., Stevens, A. P., Dettmer, K., Gottfried, E., Hoves, S., Kreutz, M., Holler, E., Canelas, A.
B., Kema, I. and Oefner, P. J. (2011) Quantitative profiling of tryptophan metabolites in
serum, urine, and cell culture supernatants by liquid chromatography-tandem mass
spectrometry. *Analytical and Bioanalytical Chemistry* 401: 3249-3261.
847

    Figure Legends

Figure 1. Comparison of reactions (A) and metabolites (B) among available *Escherichia*

***coli* Nissle 1917 GEMs.**

Figure 2. External fluxes predicted by the models iDK1463 (blue), iHM1533 (orange), and

iPC1373 (green). Simulations were performed under aerobic conditions by constraining substrate

uptake rates to the corresponding experimental values. Panels A and B show predictions for

glucose in the wild type and the ΔcsrA51 mutant strains, respectively; panels C and D show

predictions for gluconate in the wild type and the ΔcsrA51 mutant; panel E and F corresponds to

fucose and rhamnose as sole carbon sources, respectively. Gray internal bars indicate FVA

ranges; colored bars (in blue, green and orange) represent the range of possibilistic MFA

solutions; circles denote FBA solution; and crosses mark experimental flux measurements. Fluxes

are displayed using a symlog scale with a linear threshold of 0.01 to highlight differences at low

magnitudes. Original flux values are provided in Supplementary Material S5.

Figure 3. Predicted flux distributions in central metabolism for the models iDK1463 (blue),

iHM1533 (orange), and iPC1373 (green) under wildtype conditions using glucose (A) and

gluconate (B). Simulations were performed by constraining the measured exchange fluxes to

their experimental values (Revelles et al., 2013). Circles denote FBA solution; triangles represent

possibilistic MFA at π = 1; and black crosses indicate experimental ^{13}C flux measurements. Fluxes

are shown on a linear scale and normalized to the carbon source uptake rate (set to 100). Flux

values can be found in Supplementary Material S6. Central metabolism reactions are grouped

as: glycolysis/gluconeogenesis (Glycolysis), tricarboxylic acid (TCA) cycle, anaplerotic reactions,

Entner-Doudoroff (ED) pathway, pentose phosphate pathway (PPP), and acetate/pyruvate

production. Reaction indices (1–24) correspond to the entries in Table S5, which list the

metabolite conversions (Revelles *et al.,* 2013) and their corresponding BiGG database reaction

IDs.

Figure 4. Metabolite profiling of *E. coli* Nissle (EcN) and K-12 in M9 medium with glucose

and Gut Microbiota Medium (GMM). A) Principal Component Analysis of HPLC quantified

metabolites for *E. coli* K-12 (circle) and EcN (diamond) cultured in GMM (yellow) or M9 (gray)

medium. B-I) Boxplots showing metabolite levels (in mg/L·OD600) grouped by strain and medium.

Each group includes three biological replicates, displayed as individual points (circles) within the

boxplots. Succinic, lactic, acetic, butyric and valeric acids correspond to SCFAs and fermentation-

related metabolites; while Arg (arginine), Orn (ornithine), Trp (tryptophan) are amino acids.

Positive values correspond to production of metabolites and negative, to consumption.

Figure 5. Simulation results of EcN models under M9 medium with glucose and gut

microbiota medium (GMM). The heatmap shows the FBA predicted fluxes for models iHM1533,

iDK1463 and iPC1373 under the *in silico* conditions of M9 medium with glucose (A) and GMM

medium (B), along with the corresponding experimental results for the EcN strain. Data are

displayed using a symlog scale to facilitate comparison between experimental measurements and

model predictions, including only those metabolites for which both experimental and simulated

values are available. The scale indicates consumed metabolites in orange, produced metabolites

in blue, and those with a value of zero –neither consumed nor produced– in gray. Experimental

values are provided in Supplementary Material S7; original flux values, in Supplementary Material

S8.

Table legends

Table 1. Main features of published genome-scale metabolic models (GEMs) of *Escherichia*

***coli* Nissle 1917.** For each model, the table reports the total number of reactions, metabolites

and genes, along with a brief description of its focus and the type of experimental validation used.

Table 2. Experimental data for EcN cultures and model consistency. Consistency values (π)

were calculated using the possibilistic MFA method for each dataset across the evaluated models:

iPC1373, iDK1463, and iHM1533. The data shown are the specific growth rate (h^{-1}), substrate

uptake (q_S), acetate formation (q_{ace}), pyruvate formation (q_{pyr}), CO_2 formation (q_{CO2}), glycogen

formation (q_{glyc}) and 1,2-propanediol formation (q_{12ppd}) obtained from datasets *(Revelles *et al*.,

2013) and **(Millard *et al*., 2021) under aerobic conditions.

Table 3. Comparison between experimental and model-predicted biomass growth rates.

For each experimental dataset, all measured external fluxes—except biomass—were constrained

to their experimental values within the standard deviation. The table shows the FBA-optimized

growth rate predicted for each model, evaluated both with and without plasmid consideration.

Table 1.

Model ID	CANYUN model	iDK1463	iHM1533
Reference	Moutinho *et al*., 2022	Kim *et al*., 2021	van't Hoff *et al*., 2022
Reactions	737	2984	3143
Metabolites*	2607 (1661)	2112 (1313)	2261 (1440)
Genes	277	1464	1533
Experimental validation	Phenome analysis in aerobic and anaerobic conditions with Biolog assays for carbon sources.	Phenome analysis in aerobic conditions with Biolog assays for carbon, nitrogen, phosphorus, sulfur, nutrient supplements and inhibitory substrates.	Phenome analysis in aerobic conditions with Biolog assays for carbon, nitrogen, phosphorus and sulfur sources. Previously published ^{13}C fluxomics data.
Focus	CANYUN method validation and example of utility.	Comparative metabolic traits with other *E. coli* strains relevant to commensalism and gut colonization.	Optimization of secondary metabolites production.

*Numbers in parentheses indicate non-redundant metabolites, counted only once regardless of their compartmental location.

Table 2.

Condition	μ	q_s	q_ace	q_CO2	q_pyr	q_glyc	q_12ppd	Consistency		
	(h^{-1})	mmol·gDW^{-1}·h^{-1}						π iPC1373	π iDK1463	π iHM1533
Glucose wt*	0.79 ±0.02	12.50 ±-1.00	6.30 ±0.10	—	n.d	0.003 ±0.010	—	1	1	1
Gluconate wt*	0.74 ±0.02	20.00 ±1.70	10.40 ±0.10	—	3.20 ±0.10	0.001 ±0.010	—	1	1	1
Glucose ΔcsrA51*	0.63 ±0.20	10.80 ±1.00	7.20 ±0.10	—	n.d.	0.057 ±0.014	—	1	1	1
Gluconate ΔcsrA51*	0.57 ±0.02	12.60 ±1.70	6.30 ±0.10	—	0.40 ±0.10	0.007 ±0.010	—	1	1	1
Fucose**	0.48 ±0.01	12.80 ±0.30	4.00 ±0.20	15.30± 2.40	—	—	11.10± 0.20	0.32	0.35	0.45
Rhamnose**	0.28 ±0.01	6.90 ±0.20	0.20 ±0.10	12.30± 0.70	—	—	5.50 ±0.10	0.41	0.45	0.60
Random glucose	0-10	0-10	0-10	—	0-10	0-10	—	< 0.1: 98%	< 0.1: 99%	< 0.1: 99%

Random datasets correspond to 100 automatically generated flux datasets used for consistency testing.
n.d., not detected; —, not measured.

Table 3.

Models excluding plasmid consideration				
	Exp.	**iPC1373**	**iDK1463**	**iHM1533**
Condition	Growth rate (h^{-1})			
Glucose wt	0.790	1.098	1.059	1.097
Gluconate wt	0.740	1.103	1.064	1.105
Glucose ΔcsrA51	0.630	0.893	0.881	0.914
Gluconate ΔcsrA51	0.570	0.958	0.925	0.961
Fucose	0.480	0.493	0.493	0.513
Rhamnose	0.280	0.334	0.335	0.348
Models including plasmid consideration				
	Exp.	**iPC1373**	**iDK1463**	**iHM1533**
Condition	Growth rate (h^{-1})			
Glucose wt	0.790	0.903	0.870	0.902
Gluconate wt	0.740	0.914	0.882	0.916
Glucose ΔcsrA51	0.630	0.816	0.805	0.836
Gluconate ΔcsrA51	0.570	0.771	0.743	0.771
Fucose	0.480	0.388	0.390	0.406
Rhamnose	0.280	0.236	0.238	0.248