Title

Generative AI-based design of hybrid transcriptional activator proteins with new DNA-

binding specificity

Authors

Sota Okuda[1,†], Atsushi Minami[2,†], Michio Aiko[3,†], Kohei Uetsuka[1], Kazuteru Miyazaki[4],

Kazumasa Ohtake[1,2], and Daisuke Kiga[1,2,3*]

Affiliations

1 Department of Electrical Engineering and Bioscience, Waseda University, Shinjuku-ku,

Tokyo 169-8050, Japan.

2 Research Institute for Science and Engineering, Waseda University, Shinjuku-ku,

Tokyo 169-8050, Japan.

3 The Smart Life Science Institute, Advanced Collaborative Research Organization for

Smart Society, Waseda University, Shinjuku-ku, Tokyo 169-8050, Japan.

4 Research Department, National Institution for Academic Degrees and Quality

Enhancement of Higher Education, Kodaira-shi, Tokyo 187-8587, Japan

† These authors contributed equally to this work.

* Correspondence to:

Daisuke Kiga (kiga@waseda.jp).

Abstract

Transcriptional control arises from the specific recognition of promoter DNA by

transcription factors (TFs), forming the basis of cellular information processing and gene

regulation. In synthetic biology, TF-promoter interactions are assembled into gene

circuits to program cellular behaviors. To ensure reliable circuit performance, most

synthetic gene circuits rely on well-characterized and orthogonal regulatory parts. This

reliance minimizes crosstalk but constrains circuit complexity and information

integration. Creating hybrid TFs that combine or interpolate promoter specificities could

therefore expand the design space of synthetic regulatory systems. However, it remains

unclear whether hybrid functions can be created by mixing amino acid sequences, and

how such functional integration could be achieved in a principled manner. Here we show

that a variational autoencoder (VAE) trained on LuxR-family DNA-binding domains can

generate transcription factors with hybrid and partially novel promoter recognition

properties. By sampling intermediate regions of the VAE-learned latent space, we

designed hybrid TFs that activate both the *lux* and *las* promoters. High-throughput sort-

seq assays together with individual *in vivo* assays revealed that a subset of functional

variants exhibited dual-responsive behavior while maintaining sequence-selective DNA

recognition. Together, these results provide a data-driven strategy for exploring

functional intermediate sequences between closely related proteins.

Introduction

Transcriptional control, mediated by the precise recognition of promoter DNA by transcription factors (TFs), is fundamental to information processing in natural cells and to the operation of synthetic gene circuits. In synthetic biology, which aims to engineer biological systems by assembling standardized genetic parts into programmable networks[1], TF-promoter interactions serve as the fundamental building blocks of gene circuits[2,3]. Within such circuits, transcriptional regulation plays a central role, with TFs acting as molecular switches that translate environmental or intracellular cues into gene expression outputs. To simplify design and minimize crosstalk, well-characterized and orthogonal parts have been predominantly used for constructing synthetic gene circuits[4–10]. While this strategy supports reliable circuit behavior, it also constrains circuit complexity and information density. To construct more sophisticated biological computation, increasingly complex information-processing architectures have been developed across molecular and cellular scales.

Recently, multi-input and multi-output genetic circuits have demonstrated neural network-like pattern recognition and decision-making *in vitro*[11–13] and in living cells[14–21]. Yet most of these systems still depend on assembling multiple components each of which has its major target, rather than using regulatory elements that combine multiple input/output specificities within a single element. Therefore, enabling compact gene circuits with multi-input and multi-output transcriptional logic requires transcription factors and promoters that interact across multiple regulatory axes. One promising strategy to achieve this is the design of dual-active hybrid TFs that combine recognition features of multiple parental regulators (**Fig. 1a**).

Given that protein function, including DNA recognition by TFs, is ultimately

dictated by its amino acid sequence, could hybrid sequences give rise to hybrid functions?

Several approaches have been explored to address this question, including recombination-

based methods such as domain swapping[22] and DNA shuffling[23]. Ancestral sequence

reconstruction (ASR)[24] offers a conceptually distinct route, inferring intermediate

sequences by tracing evolutionary trajectories within a protein family. These methods

have enabled the creation of chimeric proteins or functional intermediates between

homologous proteins. However, these approaches do not account for the residue-residue

interactions and sequence context that collectively determine folding, stability, and DNA-

recognition specificity in TFs.

Recent advances in deep generative modeling offer a fundamentally different

way to mix sequence information. Variational autoencoders (VAEs) are well known from

image generation for their ability to interpolate smoothly between examples, such as

producing intermediate handwritten digits by sampling along continuous trajectories in

latent space[25]. VAEs have recently been applied to protein sequence design, where VAEs

trained on natural sequence families can learn evolutionary constraints and generate

functional variants of enzymes, signal peptides, and nanobodies without requiring

structural information[26–32]. Notably, however, these applications have focused on

producing alternative variants within a single functional class; whether latent-space

interpolation can generate meaningful "intermediate" sequences that combine functional

features of two homologous transcription factors remains to be elucidated.

In this study, we employed a VAE to generate hybrid transcription factor

sequences derived from the parental TFs; LuxR and LasR. By constructing a diverse

library of VAE-generated proteins and assessing their transcriptional activation abilities,

we identified several proteins exhibiting dual promoter-recognition capabilities.

Furthermore, by combining a randomized promoter library with deep sequencing (sort-

seq), we systematically profiled the promoter recognition specificities of each variant.

Together with structural analyses based on AlphaFold3 predictions and molecular

dynamics simulations, we reveal the molecular basis underlying the DNA-binding

properties of these hybrid proteins. Our results provide valuable insights into the rational

design of proteins with hybrid functions.

Results

Design of hybrid transcription factors using a variational autoencoder (VAE)

We first sought to design hybrid transcription factors by applying a variational

autoencoder (VAE) to the DNA-binding domains (DBDs) of LuxR-family regulators.

LuxR-type transcription factors consist of an N-terminal ligand-binding receiver domain

and a C-terminal helix-turn-helix DBD that mediates promoter recognition. Since the

DBD alone is sufficient to bind target DNA and can activate transcription independently

of ligand binding[33,34], we focused our design efforts exclusively on this domain. This

allowed us to directly probe how sequence-level changes within the DBD alter promoter

specificity.

To generate hybrid sequences, we constructed a curated multiple sequence

alignment (MSA) of LuxR-family DBDs[35] and trained an MSA-VAE on this dataset[27,29,36].

The VAE comprises an encoder that compresses each aligned sequence into a low-

dimensional latent representation and a decoder that reconstructs sequences from these

representations. During training, the model simultaneously optimizes a reconstruction

objective and a regularization term that encourages the latent variables to follow a

multivariate Gaussian distribution, resulting in a structured latent space that captures

biophysical constraints in the input sequences (**Fig. 1b**). When encoded by the trained

model, the parental LuxR and LasR sequences occupied distinct regions of the latent

space (**Fig. 1c**). Other representative members of the LuxR family, including RhlR and

CinR, were also mapped to distinct positions, with clusters of related natural sequences

forming around each representative point (**Fig. 1c**). This segmentation indicates that the

diversity present in the training dataset is faithfully preserved in the latent space and that

the VAE captures family-level sequence relationships rather than collapsing them into a

single region. The clustering among these subfamilies also enabled the definition of an

interpolation point between the LuxR and LasR latent vectors, providing a principled way

to explore sequence variants that combine features of both regulators.

Using this latent-space representation, we sampled sequences from a

hyperspherical region centered at the midpoint between the LuxR and LasR latent vectors

(0.5-0.5 interpolation). This strategy enabled targeted sampling of hybrid sequences, in

contrast to prior VAE studies that sampled amino acid sequences closely related or

neighboring locations in the latent space for collecting similar variants[27,29,32,36]. Sampling

across the interpolation region produced a diverse set of candidate sequences that contain

novel combinations of parental residues while retaining global amino-acid usage patterns

of the LuxR family. From each of the top-performing VAE models, 20,000 sequences

were decoded from the local interpolation region. After removing redundant and gap-

containing sequences using CD-HIT, we obtained a pool of unique candidate hybrids (**Fig.**

1d).

Fig. 1 | Schematic of the VAE-based sequence generation strategy for hybrid TFs

a, Design and dual-sequence recognition of the hybrid transcription factor. Parental natural transcription factors (natural TFs: blue and orange) specifically bind to their respective target DNA sequences. This study aims to design the hybrid TF (colored in rainbow), formed by mixing of natural TFs, that exhibits dual recognition capability, enabling it to bind to both sequence and activate downstream gene expression for both targets. **b,** Schematic overview of the MSA-VAE architecture used for hybrid sequence design. Aligned LuxR-family DNA-binding domains (DBDs) are encoded into a low-dimensional latent representation and decoded back into sequence space. **c,** Latent-space projection of representative LuxR-family transcription factors. The positions of LuxR and LasR are indicated by a blue square and a red square, respectively. Additional representative family members are plotted using X-shaped markers. Natural sequences are shown as individual points. **d,** Sequence sampling from the LuxR-LasR interpolation region. Hybrid sequences were generated from a hyperspherical region centered at the midpoint between the LuxR and LasR latent vectors (0.5-0.5 interpolation), decoded, and filtered for redundancy using CD-HIT.

Functional characterization of VAE-designed TFs toward lux and las promoters

To determine whether the VAE-designed hybrid sequences exhibit functional

activity *in vivo*, we selected 9 candidates at random from the generated sequences and

evaluated their ability to activate transcription from the native *lux* and *las* promoters in

Escherichia coli. For each designed variant, we constructed two coding sequences that

differed only in their immediate N-terminal context: one beginning with Met ("M+CDS"),

and the other beginning Met followed by Ala ("MA+CDS") to account for potential N-

terminal context effects[37,38], resulting in a total of 18 constructs. The mixed

oligonucleotide pool was cloned and expressed in *E. coli*, and its ability to activate

transcription from the native *lux* and *las* promoters was quantified using GFP reporter

assays (**Fig. 2a**). Some of individual fluorescent colonies were isolated, and the

corresponding coding sequences were identified by sequencing prior to quantitative

analysis. Variants that were not recovered for quantitative analysis likely reflect a

combination of factors, including severe growth defects, unstable or insufficient

expression, lack of detectable promoter activation, or sampling bias inherent to colony-

based isolation. The impact of the N-terminal Ala insertion was heterogeneous across

variants, with no consistent trend observed between the two forms.

The quantitative assay using a flow-cytometry exhibited a wide range of

transcriptional activities for each TF across the two promoters (**Fig. 2b**). Under identical

assay conditions, wild-type LuxR showed robust activation of the *lux* promoter but

negligible activity at the *las* promoter, whereas wild-type LasR activated the *las* promoter

strongly and displayed weak but detectable activity toward the *lux* promoter. Notably, a

subset of constructs activated both promoters to varying degrees, revealing balanced dual-

responsive behavior that is not observed for the parental LuxR or LasR proteins. Among

the variants that activated both promoters, four constructs (8M, 5MA, 1M, and 9M)

displayed distinct activity profiles. Variants 8M and 5MA showed higher activation at the

las promoter than at the *lux* promoter, whereas 9M exhibited the opposite trend and 1M

showed an intermediate balance between the two parental proteins (**Fig. 2b**). Consistent

with these functional differences, an unrooted phylogenetic analysis placed 8M and 5MA

closer to LasR, while 9M was positioned nearer to LuxR, with 1M occupying an

intermediate branch (**Fig. 2c**). Sequence alignment of these variants further revealed

residue-level features that parallel their activity patterns: 9M uniquely retained Arg30

conserved in LuxR subfamily, whereas the other three variants carried the Ala at this

position conserved in LasR subfamily; and both 8M and 5MA preserved LasR-associated

Arg40 and Arg41 (**Supplementary Fig. S1**). Together, these observations indicate that

promoter preference in the VAE-designed hybrids reflects combinations of parental

sequence features at key DNA-contacting positions.

Fig. 2 | Functional validation of VAE-generated hybrid TFs

a, Schematic overview of the GFP reporter assay used to quantify transcriptional
activation by VAE-designed transcription factors. Each construct was expressed
in *E. coli*, and promoter activity was measured from GFP driven by the native *lux*
or *las* promoter. **b,** Transcriptional activation activities of VAE-designed variants
and wild-type LuxR and LasR toward the *lux* and *las* promoters. Bars represent
the geometric mean of GFP fluorescence measured by a flow-cytometry. A strain
harboring pET16b (an empty vector) is shown as a control (Ctrl). Data are shown
as the mean of three biological replicates, and error bars indicate the standard
error of the mean. **c,** (left) Unrooted phylogenetic tree of the parental LuxR-family
proteins and the four dual-responsive variants (8M, 5MA, 1M, and 9M). The tree
was inferred from the LuxR-family DBD alignment and visualized without an
assigned root. (right) Multiple sequence alignment of the variants shown in the
phylogenetic tree together with the wild-type LuxR and LasR DBDs. Positions
corresponding to residues 30, 40, and 41 discussed in the main text are
highlighted with orange triangles.

Promoter recognition profiles of VAE-designed proteins revealed by sort-seq

216    Building on the initial characterization of clones from 18 variants pool, we next

assessed promoter recognition across a larger set of VAE-designed sequences using a

massively parallel reporter assay (MPRA)[39,40]. Sixty additional VAE-designed DBD

sequences were randomly chosen, and two versions of each were created: one with

M+CDS and the other with MA+CDS, yielding a total of 120 unique variants. These

sequences were synthesized as an oligonucleotide pool and collectively cloned into the

expression vector to construct a pooled plasmid library, which was then transformed into

E. coli harboring a GFP reporter plasmid induced by either *lux* or *las* promoter.

Fluorescence from each cell was measured by a fluorescence-activated cell sorter (FACS),

and cells were sorted into predefined fluorescence bins for each promoter. Plasmid DNAs

from each bin were recovered and deep-sequenced (sort-seq)[41,42], with activity of each

variant quantified by counting exact matches to the designed sequences across bins,

normalizing these counts by the fraction of cells in each bin of histogram from FACS

analysis, and calculating a geometric mean activity score for each promoter (**Fig. 3a;**

Supplementary Fig. S2).

231    Sixteen variants of the 120 VAE-designed proteins in the sort-seq exhibited

measurable activation toward either promoter. Notably, many of these active variants

showed detectable responses at both promoters, indicating that dual-responsiveness was

a frequent outcome within the functional subset (**Fig. 3b**). These variants displayed a

broad dynamic range of activities, spanning strongly *lux*-biased, strongly *las*-biased, and

dual-responsive profiles. Despite this diversity, dual-responsive variants were more

prevalent than strictly promoter-specific ones. Overall, the population-level trends

captured by the sort-seq reflected the behaviors identified in the single-construct assays,

supporting the robustness of the functional patterns observed.

To validate the activities inferred from the sort-seq, we individually constructed

plasmids encoding selected variants (No. 20, 22, and 24, designated as 20L, 22L, and 24L,

respectively) and measured their promoter activation using the GFP reporter assay

described above (**Fig. 2a**). The individually tested clones reproduced the activity patterns

observed in the pooled screen, confirming the dual-responsive behaviors inferred from

the sort-seq data (**Fig. 3c**). These results demonstrate that the sort-seq reliably captures

the promoter-recognition properties of VAE-designed transcription factors.

Structural insights into promoter recognition by the transcription factors

To understand how LuxR-family transcription factors recognize their cognate

promoters and to identify residues potentially responsible for the altered specificity

observed in the VAE-designed variants, we modeled the complexes between LuxR or

LasR and the *lux* or *las* promoter sequences using AlphaFold3[43]. Four protein-DNA

complexes (LuxR•P*lux*, LuxR•P*las*, LasR•P*lux*, and LasR•P*las*) were initially predicted,

and the resulting structures were subjected to molecular dynamics simulations to examine

their stability and residue-level interactions.

Although global structural metrics such as RMSD and overall binding energetics

did not fully distinguish the four complexes (**Supplementary Fig. S3a**), the simulations

revealed reproducible patterns in specific residues that contribute to nucleotide

recognition in each protein (**Fig. 3d**). In LuxR, Arg30, described above, formed the only

consistently stable hydrogen bonds with specific bases (dT4, dG5, and dT6) within the

major groove, identifying it as a primary determinant of LuxR-specific base recognition.

This position is Ala30 in LasR, explaining the weaker and less specific base contacts

predicted for LasR at the same sites. In contrast, LuxR Thr31 engaged the DNA phosphate

backbone, suggesting a role in stabilizing DNA positioning rather than dictating base

identity; LasR carries an Asn31 at this site, which may alter backbone interactions without

imposing strong base preferences. A conserved Phe34 in both LuxR and LasR was

positioned for potential T-shaped π-π stacking with DNA bases (**Supplementary Fig.**

S3b), consistent with analogous interactions reported in another transcription factor

MarA[44]. LasR also contained two positively charged residues, Arg40 and Arg49, located

near the major groove; although direct hydrogen bonds were not consistently observed in

MD trajectories, both residues contributed strongly to total DNA-binding energy, whereas

the corresponding LuxR residues (Gln40 and Cys49) provided less energetic stabilization.

These differences highlight distinct recognition strategies employed by the two parental

regulators.

Notably, the VAE-designed variants 20L and 22L combined features of both

parental modes of DNA engagement (**Supplementary Fig. S3c**). At the Arg/Ala30

position, both variants carried the LasR-type Ala30, consistent with reduced LuxR-

specific base contacts. However, they also preserved the LuxR-type Thr31, potentially

maintaining similar DNA-backbone interactions. The LasR-associated Arg40 was

retained in both variants, while position 49 was occupied by Gln, intermediate in polarity

between the LuxR and LasR residues (Cys and Arg, respectively), suggesting partial

recapitulation of LasR-like electrostatic stabilization. Together with the conservation of

Phe34 and the universally retained Arg at position 48, these patterns suggest that 20L and

22L adopt hybrid combinations of the parental DNA-contacting residues, providing a

structural basis for their mixed and broadened promoter-recognition profiles.

Fig. 3 | Massively parallel reporter assays and structural features of VAE-designed TFs

a, Schematic overview of the sort-seq workflow. A total of 120 VAE-designed variants were constructed as a pooled plasmid library, transformed into *E. coli*, and sorted into fluorescence bins based on reporter output from the *lux* or *las* promoter. Plasmid DNA recovered from each bin was deep-sequenced, and activity scores were calculated for each variant from exact sequence counts across bins. **b,** Promoter-activation profiles of the 120 VAE-designed variants obtained from one of two biological replicate sort-seq experiments. The result of the replicate is shown in **Supplementary Fig. S4**. Each point represents the geometric mean activity score of a variant toward the *lux* or *las* promoter. Variants showing measurable activation include lux-biased, las-biased, and dual-

responsive sequences. **c,** Validation of pooled-screen results by individual clone
assays. Variants 20, 22, and 24 (20L, 22L, and 24L) were cloned individually and
assessed using the GFP reporter assay. The individually measured activities
recapitulate the promoter-recognition patterns inferred from the pooled deep-
sequencing data. **d,** Representative structural models of parental transcription
factors bound to their cognate promoters. AlphaFold-based models of LuxR
bound to the *lux* promoter (left) and LasR bound to the *las* promoter (right) after
molecular dynamics refinement. Proteins are shown in cartoon representation
with selected DNA-contacting residues highlighted as sticks, and DNA is shown
as a double helix.
310

Promoter recognition profiles of VAE-designed proteins revealed by deep sequencing

Since the VAE-designed proteins exhibited broadened activities at the native *lux*

and *las* promoters, it was essential to determine whether their apparent dual

responsiveness reflected genuine sequence preferences or merely nonspecific DNA

binding. To address this, we generated randomized promoter libraries by mutating

nucleotide positions presumed to influence recognition by LuxR-family regulators and

then assessed promoter-recognition specificity for wild-type LuxR, wild-type LasR, and

VAE-designed selected variants (20L and 22L) using an MPRA. The randomized

promoter libraries were synthesized from random oligonucleotides and cloned upstream

of a GFP reporter to create pooled plasmid libraries. Either wild-type LuxR, wild-type

LasR, 20L, or 22L was expressed in *E. coli* containing the promoter library, and

fluorescence output from individual cells was quantified by FACS (**Fig. 4a**). Cells were

sorted into multiple fluorescence bins for each transcription factor, and promoter

sequences from each bin were recovered and deep-sequenced (sort-seq). For each

promoter variant, we calculated an enrichment-based activity score from its distribution

across fluorescence bins.

Analysis of the randomized promoter libraries revealed that the VAE-designed

variants 20L and 22L did not simply exhibit indiscriminate DNA binding. Although the

VAE-designed variants showed higher mean activities across the promoter library, their

activity distributions exhibited greater variance than those of the wild-type proteins. This

broader spread reflects an expanded dynamic range of promoter activation rather than

loss of sequence-selective recognition (**Fig. 4b**). To further examine how their sequence

preferences were altered, we quantified nucleotide-level enrichment across randomized

positions for each transcription factor (**Fig. 4c**). Both 20L and 22L displayed preference

profiles broadly similar to those of LasR, especially in the *las* promoter library. These

trends align with structural modeling, which suggested that LasR makes broader and less

restrictive base contacts than LuxR, providing a plausible route by which LasR-like

variants could acquire activity at the *lux* promoter (**Fig. 3c, d**). In contrast, analysis of the

lux promoter library revealed that LuxR-like nucleotide preferences were partially

retained. For example, at position 2, LasR favors G over T, whereas LuxR most strongly

prefers T; notably, 20L and 22L similarly exhibited a T > G preference at this position.

At position 1, both 20L and 22L retained a primary preference for A, similar to LasR,

while additionally exhibiting increased tolerance for G, which is most preferred by LuxR.

The nucleotide preference patterns observed for wild-type LuxR and LasR were

consistent with those reported in previous studies, supporting the validity of the assay[45,46].

Notably, furthermore, the VAE variants preferentially activated a subset of sequences not

strongly activated by both wild-type TF, as revealed by mapping promoter activities into

a four-dimensional activity landscape where LuxR and LasR activities are plotted on two

axes and the 20L or 22L activity is represented by point coloration (**Fig. 4d**). This pattern

indicates that the VAE-designed factors do not simply interpolate between LuxR and

LasR specificity but instead acquire hybrid or partially novel recognition profiles.

Fig. 4 | Specificity of VAE-designed transcription factors toward
randomized promoter libraries

a, Schematic of the promoter library construction used for sort-seq. Randomized
promoter libraries were generated by mutating selected nucleotide positions
within the *lux* and *las* promoter regions and cloned upstream of a GFP reporter.
Cells expressing wild-type LuxR, wild-type LasR, or VAE-designed variants (20L
or 22L) were sorted into multiple fluorescence bins by FACS, and promoter
sequences from each bin were recovered and analyzed by deep sequencing to
calculate enrichment-based activity scores. **b,** Violin plots showing the
distribution of activity scores across all randomized promoter variants for each
transcription factor. Each violin illustrates the full activity distribution for wild-type
LuxR, wild-type LasR, 20L, or 22L. Horizontal bars indicate group means.
Pairwise differences in mean activity among the four DBDs were assessed by
one-way ANOVA followed by post hoc multiple-comparison testing. **c,**
Nucleotide-enrichment profiles derived from the randomized promoter libraries.
Position-wise nucleotide preferences are shown for wild-type LuxR, wild-type
LasR, 20L and 22L. The nucleotide identities of the native *lux* and *las* promoters
are indicated by black outlines at positions previously reported to be conserved

based on sequence logo analyses[45,46], shown in the corresponding LuxR and
LasR heatmaps, respectively. **d,** Four-dimensional activity landscape of promoter
responses to wild-type and VAE-designed transcription factors. Promoter
activities for wild-type LasR and LuxR are plotted on the horizontal and vertical
axes, respectively. Activities for 20L or 22L are encoded by color, and negative-
control fluorescence is represented by point size.
378

Discussion

Our study demonstrates that a variational autoencoder can effectively design hybrid transcription factors that bridge functional features of distinct LuxR-family regulators. By training an MSA-VAE on a curated alignment of LuxR-family DNA-binding domains and sampling sequences from the interpolated region between LuxR and LasR in latent space, we generated a series of hybrid DBDs that exhibited functional promoter activation *in vivo*. Notably, several of these VAE-designed proteins showed dual-responsive activity toward both the *lux* and *las* promoters, which is not naturally observed in either parental protein. This finding provides direct experimental support for the idea that intermediate sequences between homologous transcription factors can manifest intermediate or even expanded promoter-recognition capacities.

Conventional strategies for combining functionalities from homologous transcription factors such as domain swapping or DNA shuffling are inherently limited in how finely they can mix parental features. Because these approaches recombine blocks of residues rather than individual amino acids, they often disrupt local residue-residue and residue-nucleotide interactions that are essential for DNA recognition. Ancestral sequence reconstruction (ASR) offers an alternative, evolutionarily grounded route toward "intermediate" sequences, but in our experiments the ASR-derived candidates showed LuxR-like behavior: one reconstructed sequence expressed poorly, and the remaining two activated only the *lux* promoter (**Supplementary Fig. S5**). This limited divergence may reflect the intrinsic constraints of ASR, which infers residues independently at each position and therefore cannot capture co-variation of residues or inter-residue interactions that support stable DNA-binding interfaces. Moreover, ASR reconstructs the most probable ancestral states given the multiple sequence alignment;

consequently, biases in the underlying sequence dataset may be propagated into the

reconstructed sequences.

Beyond classical approaches, emerging protein design technologies also offer

alternative routes for engineering of transcription factors. For example, large protein

language models, trained on millions of diverse sequences, generate latent spaces that

capture broad biochemical trends[47,48]. However, it may not resolve local functional

distinctions among closely related regulators such as LuxR and LasR. Interpolation in

such global resolution is therefore unlikely to yield meaningful mixtures of parental

recognition features without additional constraints or task-specific fine-tuning.

Additionally, *de novo* DNA-binding domain design[49] enables the creation of entirely new

HTH scaffolds with programmable nucleotide preferences. As *de novo* frameworks

continue to improve, the design of hybrid or multi-specific transcription factors may

become achievable, providing an exciting future direction for synthetic gene circuit

engineering.

Structural modeling and MD simulations provided a mechanistic basis for the

promoter-recognition behaviors observed in the VAE-designed transcription factors.

LuxR and LasR differ at several DNA-contacting residues that shape their respective

base-recognition modes. LuxR forms more restrictive base-specific interactions, and

LasR rather relies on a broader and more permissive contact network (**Fig. 3d**). These

structural trends align with the sort-seq promoter library data: the VAE-designed variants

(20L and 22L) exhibited LasR-like nucleotide preferences while also activating a subset

of promoter sequences not efficiently recognized by either wild-type factor. Visualization

of promoter activities in a multidimensional activity landscape further revealed that these

engineered proteins occupy promoter-recognition regimes intermediate to, yet distinct

from, both parents. Together, the structural and sort-seq results suggest that the VAE-

generated hybrids achieve dual responsiveness not through indiscriminate DNA binding,

but by combining permissive LasR-like contacts with specific contributions from

individual residues, enabling access to a partially novel specificity space.

While this study demonstrates that a VAE trained on natural LuxR-family

sequences can generate transcription factors with hybrid or partially novel promoter

specificities, several limitations remain. Our experimental validation focused exclusively

on the LuxR-LasR axis, and the generality of this framework across other transcription

factor families remains to be tested. In addition, VAE-based design relies on the

evolutionary diversity present in the underlying sequence alignment; families with sparse

sequence representation may prove more challenging. Despite these constraints,

extending this framework to larger families, integrating richer functional readouts, and

iteratively updating the model with experimental data will further enhance its capacity to

design proteins such as transcriptional regulators for increasingly complex synthetic gene

circuits.

Methods

Creation of a dataset of LuxR-family proteins

LuxR-family protein sequences were collected based on the LuxI/R dataset

reported by Miranda *et al*[35]. The representative LuxI/R query sequences used in that study,

together with the LuxR and LasR sequences (NCBI RefSeq accession ID:

WP_213090604.1 and WP_003082999.1, respectively), were added to the dataset and

aligned using MAFFT[50]. Because all sequences in the dataset are arranged as LuxI (N-

terminal) followed by LuxR (C-terminal), the boundary between the LuxI and LuxR

regions was manually determined by referencing conserved N-terminal residues among

the representative receiver proteins. The LuxI region was then removed to retain only the

LuxR-family portion. Sequences that became excessively short after gap removal (shorter

than 200 aa), contained large internal gaps, or were duplicates were iteratively filtered out

using CD-HIT[51]. MAFFT alignment and filtering were repeated for several rounds to

obtain a consistent LuxR-family multiple sequence alignment.

The DNA-binding domain (DBD) dataset was derived from the LuxR-family

alignment using experimentally validated N-terminal deletion boundaries of the LuxR

and LasR variants used in our laboratory. These representative sequences were added to

the dataset, realigned with MAFFT, and the conserved leucine residue marking the N-

terminal DBD boundary was identified. In this study, this conserved leucine was defined

as residue 1 for all subsequent numbering. Regions upstream of the aligned leucine

position were removed, and C-terminal trimming was performed to match the boundaries

used by Miranda *et al*. Sequences shorter than 56 aa after trimming or containing

extensive gaps were removed, and identical sequences were clustered using CD-HIT.

MAFFT alignment and gap-based filtering were repeated twice to increase alignment

consistency and information density. The resulting dataset contained only the DBD

regions of LuxR-family proteins.

Model building and validation using VAE

We implemented a multiple-sequence-alignment variational autoencoder (MSA-

VAE) in PyTorch following architectures described by previous studies[29,36]. The model

was trained to maximize the evidence lower bound (ELBO), consisting of a binary cross-

entropy (BCE) reconstruction term and a Kullback-Leibler divergence (KLD)

regularization term:

$$\text{Loss} = \beta\,\text{KLD} + \text{BCE},$$

where β is a positive weighting coefficient. The KLD term encourages the encoder

posterior $q(z|x)$ to remain close to a standard normal prior, thereby promoting a smooth

and generalizable latent space. BCE was computed per aligned position using one-hot

encoded amino-acid categories[25].

To identify suitable model configurations, we performed a two-stage grid search

over (i) the dimension of the latent space, (ii) the size of hidden layers, (iii) the β

coefficient for the KLD term, and (iv) random seeds. Models were trained with a batch

size of 32, a learning rate of 1×10^{-3}, and the Adam optimizer. Early stopping was applied

when the validation ELBO failed to improve for 5 consecutive epochs.

Model quality was assessed using the pairwise amino-acid frequency correlation

between generated sequences and the natural sequences in the training dataset, as

previously described[29]. Higher correlation values indicate that the model captures

evolutionary constraints, including covariation patterns. Unlike previous studies that

sample uniformly across the latent space, we generated sequences from interpolation

regions between two latent vectors corresponding to selected parental sequences[35,36].

Because models with similar hyperparameters can nonetheless yield distinct latent-space

geometries, we selected the top 10 models ranked by the evaluation metric and used all

of them for sequence generation. For each model, the LuxR and LasR sequences were

encoded to obtain their latent means z_{LuxR} and z_{LasR}. A latent interpolation vector was then

defined as:

$$z_{\text{mix}} = 0.5\, z_{\text{LuxR}} + 0.5\, z_{\text{LasR}}$$

Sequences were sampled from a hyperspherical region centered at z_{mix} with a radius R

was defined as:

$$R = \frac{\|z_{\text{LuxR}} - z_{\text{LasR}}\|}{8}$$

Sampling was performed uniformly within this region by drawing random directions and

radii, followed by decoding the resulting latent points into amino acid sequences using

the VAE decoder. From this distribution, 20,000 sequences were generated per model.

After removing redundant sequences using CD-HIT[51], nine sequences were randomly

selected and used for experimental characterization.

Structural prediction and MD simulations

The structural models of the parental transcription factors (LuxR and LasR) in

complex with *lux* or *las* promoter sequences were predicted using AlphaFold3[43]. Since

LuxR-family regulators function as homodimers, all predictions were performed in the

dimeric state with the corresponding DNA duplex included as input.

MD   simulations   were   performed   using   GROMACS   2023.2   with   the

AMBER99SB-ILDN force field[52,53] as described previously[54]. Each complex was

solvated using the SPC216 water model in a cubic box and neutralized with 150 mM

NaCl. Electrostatic and van der Waals interactions were truncated at 1.0 nm, and long-

range electrostatics were calculated with the particle mesh Ewald method[55]. Energy

minimization was performed using the steepest descent algorithm, and the system was

then equilibrated at 300 K and 1 bar for 100 ps each in two steps: first under constant

volume (NVT), then under constant pressure (NPT). Temperature and pressure were

controlled using the V-rescale thermostat and Parrinello-Rahman barostat, respectively[56].

The LINCS algorithm was used to constrain bonds involving hydrogen atoms[57]. The

integration time step was set as 2 fs. Production runs of 100 ns were conducted under the

NPT ensemble without restraints, with three independent replicates for each complex.

The RMSD and hydrogen bonds profiles were generated by GROMACS modules. Images

were generated by PyMOL (The PyMOL Molecular Graphics System, Version 3.1.0

Schrödinger, LLC).

Construction of plasmids

An expression vector for LuxR DNA-binding domain (DBD) was constructed

from Ptet-LuxR on pSB6A1[59] by inverse PCR. An expression vector for the LasR DBD

was derived from a LasR construct on a pBR-origin, ampicillin-resistant vector under the

control of a constitutive promoter (BioBrick parts). The LasR expression cassette was

subsequently inserted into pTrc99A vector by inverse PCR. For VAE-designed proteins,

coding sequences were selected at random from the model-generated sequence pool,

codon usage of each sequence is optimized, and a ribosome-binding site was individually

designed using the RBS Calculator (v2.1)[60] to achieve comparable predicted translation

initiation   rates   across   variants.   Resultant   sequences   were   synthesized   as   an

oligonucleotide library (Integrated DNA Technologies, United States). Each sequence

was PCR-amplified, purified from PAGE gel, and inserted between the NheI and HindIII

sites of pTrc99A-DsRedExpress2. Promoter-reporter plasmids were constructed by

cloning GFP between the BamHI and PstI sites of the pSB3K3 backbone, followed by

inserting either the *lux* or *las* promoter (iGEM Parts Registry: BBa_R0062 or

BBa_K091117, respectively) between the EcoRI and BamHI sites to generate P*lux*-GFP

and P*las*-GFP reporters. Randomized promoter libraries were generated analogously

using synthesized oligonucleotides in which selected nucleotide positions of the *lux* or

las promoter were randomized (FASMAC Co., Ltd.), followed by PCR amplification and

insertion into the same pSB3K3-GFP backbone using the corresponding restriction sites.

For functional assays, each expression plasmid (or the empty vector pET16b(+)) and a

reporter plasmid were co-transformed into *Escherichia coli* DH5α.

In vivo assays of transcription activation abilities

For individual reporter assays, *E. coli* DH5α cells carrying an expression plasmid

and either the reporter plasmid were grown overnight in LB medium supplemented with

100 µg/mL of carbenicillin and 25 µg/mL of kanamycin. Overnight cultures were diluted

into fresh LB medium and further grown 1 h at 37°C with shaking. After dilution of flesh

culture, protein expression was induced by adding IPTG at a final concentration of 1 mM

or 0.33 mM, followed by incubation for 6 h at 37°C. GFP fluorescence and cell density

were quantified using either a plate reader (Synergy, Agilent BioTek) or a flow cytometer

(CytoFLEX, Beckman Coulter).

For MPRAs, *E. coli* DH5α cells were similarly co-transformed with a TF

expression plasmid and a reporter plasmid. For pooled TF library MPRA, the pooled

VAE-designed TF plasmid library was transformed into cells harboring either P*lux* or

P*las* reporter plasmid. For the randomized promoter-library MPRA, the promoter-GFP

library was transformed into cells harboring an individual TF expression plasmid (LuxR,

LasR, 20L, or 22L). In both cases, transformant colonies were collected from agar plates

and were grown overnight under the same conditions described above. Overnight cultures

were diluted into fresh LB medium and further grown 1 h at 37°C with shaking. After

dilution of flesh culture, protein expression was induced by adding IPTG at a final

concentration of 1 mM, followed by incubation for 10 h at 15°C and further 7.5 h at 37°C.

After induction, cells were washed, resuspended in PBS, and subjected to fluorescence-

activated cell sorting (FACS). For each assay, cells were sorted into multiple predefined

fluorescence bins based on GFP intensity, corresponding to different promoter-activation

levels (**Supplementary Fig. S2 and S6**). Cells collected from each bin were pelleted and

processed independently. The variable region derived from plasmid DNA (TF coding

sequence for the TF library; promoter insert for the promoter library) was amplified by

PCR using primers compatible with adapters. Amplicons from each bin were indexed,

pooled, and sequenced using an Illumina NextSeq 1000 Sequencing System, with

sequencing services provided by Bioengineering Lab. Co., Ltd. Sequence counts were

obtained by exact-match parsing, and enrichment-based activity scores were calculated

for each variant by comparing its representation across fluorescence bins, with counts

normalized by the fraction of cells collected in each bin.

Statistical analysis of promoter library activities

584   To assess whether activity distributions differed significantly among

transcription factors, both parametric and nonparametric statistical tests were performed.

One-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was applied to raw activity values, followed by

the Kruskal-Wallis test as a distribution-free alternative. Post hoc pairwise comparisons

were conducted using Dunn's test with Bonferroni correction. Homogeneity of variances

was assessed using Levene's test.

For constructing feature matrix X, each sequence was encoded using one-hot

encoding at the variable positions. For each variable position, four binary features

corresponding to nucleotides A, C, G, and T were generated. The response matrix Y

consisted of activity values for LuxR, LasR, 20L, and 22L. Raw activity values were

transformed to reduce skewness. The transformed values were then standardized (zero

mean and unit variance) independently for each transcription factor prior to multivariate

analysis. Partial least squares (PLS) regression was performed to model the relationship

between sequence features and transcriptional activity. PLS was chosen to extract latent

components of the sequence feature space that maximize covariance with the activity

measurements. The one-hot encoded sequence matrix X was used as the predictor matrix,

and the standardized activity matrix Y was used as the response matrix. Two PLS

components were retained for analysis. Model fitting was performed using the

PLSRegression implementation from scikit-learn. PLS regression coefficients were

extracted to quantify the contribution of each nucleotide at each variable position to

transcriptional activity. Coefficients were reshaped into matrices representing nucleotide

preferences (A, C, G, T) at each variable position.

Data availability

Data are available from the corresponding author upon request.

Acknowledgments

We thank R. Yoshida and T. Ueda for critical discussion of the manuscript and valuable suggestions; and the members of the Laboratory of Synthetic Biology (the D. Kiga group), particularly H. Shimokawa, Y. Takizawa, S. Nishimura and A. Sasaki. This work was financed by the JSPS KAKENHI (Grant numbers 19H00985, 21K19831, 21H05228, 22H04892, 23H04431, 24K03036, and 25K22848) to D.K., by JST CREST (Grant number JPMJCR21N4) to D.K. including AIP challenge program to S.O. and K.U., and by NINS Astrobiology Center program research (Grant numbers AB041011, AB0602, and AB0712) to D.K.

CRediT Author contributions

S.O.: conceptualization, data curation, investigation, methodology, funding acquisition, software. A.M.: formal analysis, investigation, methodology, software, visualization, writing – original draft, review and editing. M.A.: formal analysis, investigation, writing – review and editing. K.U.: investigation, funding acquisition. K.M.: resources. K.O.: supervision, writing – review and editing. D.K.: conceptualization, formal analysis, methodology, funding acquisition, project administration, resources, supervision, writing - review and editing.

Competing interests

The authors declare no competing interests.

References

1.   Cameron, D. E., Bashor, C. J. & Collins, J. J. A brief history of synthetic biology.

Nat. Rev. Microbiol. **12**, 381–390 (2014).

2.   Elowitz, M. B. & Leibler, S. A synthetic oscillatory network of transcriptional

regulators. *Nature* **403**, 335–338 (2000).

3.   Gardner, T. S., Cantor, C. R. & Collins, J. J. Construction of a genetic toggle switch

in Escherichia coli. *Nature* **403**, 339–342 (2000).

4.   Lutz, R. & Bujard, H. Independent and tight regulation of transcriptional units in

Escherichia coli via the LacR/O, the TetR/O and AraC/I1-I2 regulatory elements.

Nucleic Acids Res. **25**, 1203–1210 (1997).

5.   Zhan, J. *et al.* Develop reusable and combinable designs for transcriptional logic

gates. *Mol. Syst. Biol.* **6**, 388 (2010).

6.   Slusarczyk, A. L., Lin, A. & Weiss, R. Foundations for the design and

implementation of synthetic genetic circuits. *Nat. Rev. Genet.* **13**, 406–420 (2012).

7.   Nielsen, A. A. K. *et al.* Genetic circuit design automation. *Science* **352**, aac7341

(2016).

8.   Chen, Y. *et al.* Tuning the dynamic range of bacterial promoters regulated by ligand-

inducible transcription factors. *Nat. Commun.* **9**, 64 (2018).

9.   Meyer, A. J., Segall-Shapiro, T. H., Glassey, E., Zhang, J. & Voigt, C. A.

Escherichia coli "Marionette" strains with 12 highly optimized small-molecule

sensors. *Nat. Chem. Biol.* **15**, 196–204 (2019).

10. Du, P. *et al.* De novo design of an intercellular signaling toolbox for multi-channel

cell-cell communication and biological computation. *Nat. Commun.* **11**, 4226 (2020).

11. Qian, L., Winfree, E. & Bruck, J. Neural network computation with DNA strand

displacement cascades. *Nature* **475**, 368–372 (2011).

12. Cherry, K. M. & Qian, L. Scaling up molecular pattern recognition with DNA-based

winner-take-all neural networks. *Nature* **559**, 370–376 (2018).

13. Okumura, S. *et al.* Nonlinear decision-making with enzymatic neural networks.

Nature **610**, 496–501 (2022).

14. Xie, Z., Wroblewska, L., Prochazka, L., Weiss, R. & Benenson, Y. Multi-input

RNAi-based logic circuit for identification of specific cancer cells. *Science* **333**,

1307–1311 (2011).

15. Didovyk, A. *et al.* Distributed classifier based on genetically engineered bacterial

cell cultures. *ACS Synth. Biol.* **4**, 72–82 (2015).

16. Samaniego, C. C., Moorman, A., Giordano, G. & Franco, E. Signaling-based neural

networks for cellular computation. in *2021 American Control Conference (ACC)*

1883–1890 (IEEE, 2021).

17. Kanakov, O. *et al.* Multi-input distributed classifiers for synthetic genetic circuits.

PLoS One **10**, e0125144 (2015).

18. Li, X. *et al.* Synthetic neural-like computing in microbial consortia for pattern

recognition. *Nat. Commun.* **12**, 3139 (2021).

19. Rizik, L., Danial, L., Habib, M., Weiss, R. & Daniel, R. Synthetic neuromorphic

computing in living cells. *Nat. Commun.* **13**, 5602 (2022).

20. Chen, Z. *et al.* A synthetic protein-level neural network in mammalian cells. *Science*

386, 1243–1250 (2024).

21. Tang, L., Wang, J., Xu, K., Li, Z. & Song, J. Upgraded circular single-stranded DNA

regulators for multiple-input multiple-output gene circuits in mammalian cells. *Sci.*

Adv. **11**, eadv3396 (2025).

681 22. Bashton, M. & Chothia, C. The generation of new protein functions by the combination of domains. *Structure* **15**, 85–99 (2007).

683 23. Stemmer, W. P. DNA shuffling by random fragmentation and reassembly: in vitro recombination for molecular evolution. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **91**, 10747–10751 (1994).

686 24. Spence, M. A., Kaczmarski, J. A., Saunders, J. W. & Jackson, C. J. Ancestral sequence reconstruction for protein engineers. *Curr. Opin. Struct. Biol.* **69**, 131–141 (2021).

689 25. Kingma, D. P. & Welling, M. Auto-Encoding Variational Bayes. *arXiv [stat.ML]* (2013).

691 26. Strokach, A. & Kim, P. M. Deep generative modeling for protein design. *Curr. Opin. Struct. Biol.* **72**, 226–236 (2022).

693 27. Riesselman, A. J., Ingraham, J. B. & Marks, D. S. Deep generative models of genetic variation capture the effects of mutations. *Nat. Methods* **15**, 816–822 (2018).

695 28. Greener, J. G., Moffat, L. & Jones, D. T. Design of metalloproteins and novel protein folds using variational autoencoders. *Sci. Rep.* **8**, 16189 (2018).

697 29. Hawkins-Hooker, A. *et al.* Generating functional protein variants with variational autoencoders. *PLoS Comput. Biol.* **17**, e1008736 (2021).

699 30. Eguchi, R. R., Choe, C. A. & Huang, P.-S. Ig-VAE: Generative modeling of protein structure by direct 3D coordinate generation. *PLoS Comput. Biol.* **18**, e1010271 (2022).

702 31. Sevgen, E. *et al.* ProT-VAE: Protein Transformer Variational AutoEncoder for functional protein design. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **122**, e2408737122 (2025).

704 32. Boob, A. G. *et al.* Design of diverse, functional mitochondrial targeting sequences

across eukaryotic organisms using variational autoencoder. *Nat. Commun.* **16**, 4151 (2025).

33. Choi, S. H. & Greenberg, E. P. The C-terminal region of the Vibrio fischeri LuxR protein contains an inducer-independent lux gene activating domain. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **88**, 11115–11119 (1991).

34. Kiratisin, P., Tucker, K. D. & Passador, L. LasR, a transcriptional activator of Pseudomonas aeruginosa virulence genes, functions as a multimer. *J. Bacteriol.* **184**, 4912–4919 (2002).

35. Wellington Miranda, S. *et al.* A covariation analysis reveals elements of selectivity in quorum sensing systems. *Elife* **10**, (2021).

36. Kohyama, S., Frohn, B. P., Babl, L. & Schwille, P. Machine learning-aided design and screening of an emergent protein function in synthetic cells. *Nat. Commun.* **15**, 2010 (2024).

37. Hirel, P. H., Schmitter, M. J., Dessen, P., Fayat, G. & Blanquet, S. Extent of N-terminal methionine excision from Escherichia coli proteins is governed by the side-chain length of the penultimate amino acid. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **86**, 8247–8251 (1989).

38. Tobias, J. W., Shrader, T. E., Rocap, G. & Varshavsky, A. The N-end rule in bacteria. *Science* **254**, 1374–1377 (1991).

39. Inoue, F. & Ahituv, N. Decoding enhancers using massively parallel reporter assays. *Genomics* **106**, 159–164 (2015).

40. White, M. A. Understanding how cis-regulatory function is encoded in DNA sequence using massively parallel reporter assays and designed sequences. *Genomics* **106**, 165–170 (2015).

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

to characterize the biophysical mechanism of a transcriptional regulatory sequence.

Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A. **107**, 9158–9163 (2010).

42. Barnes, S. L., Belliveau, N. M., Ireland, W. T., Kinney, J. B. & Phillips, R. Mapping

DNA sequence to transcription factor binding energy in vivo. *PLoS Comput. Biol.*

15, e1006226 (2019).

43. Abramson, J. *et al.* Accurate structure prediction of biomolecular interactions with

AlphaFold 3. *Nature* **630**, 493–500 (2024).

44. Corbella, M. *et al.* The N-terminal helix-turn-helix motif of transcription factors

MarA and Rob drives DNA recognition. *J. Phys. Chem. B* **125**, 6791–6806 (2021).

45. Antunes, L. C. M., Ferreira, R. B. R., Lostroh, C. P. & Greenberg, E. P. A mutational

analysis defines Vibrio fischeri LuxR binding sites. *J. Bacteriol.* **190**, 4392–4397

(2008).

46. Gilbert, K. B., Kim, T. H., Gupta, R., Greenberg, E. P. & Schuster, M. Global

position analysis of the Pseudomonas aeruginosa quorum-sensing transcription

factor LasR. *Mol. Microbiol.* **73**, 1072–1085 (2009).

47. Kyro, G. W., Qiu, T. & Batista, V. S. A model-centric review of deep learning for

protein design. *arXiv [cs.LG]* (2025).

48. Xiao, Y. *et al.* Protein large language models: A comprehensive Survey. *arXiv [q-*

bio.BM] (2025) doi:10.48550/arXiv.2502.17504.

49. Glasscock, C. J. *et al.* Computational design of sequence-specific DNA-binding

proteins. *Nat. Struct. Mol. Biol.* **32**, 2252–2261 (2025).

50. Katoh, K., Misawa, K., Kuma, K.-I. & Miyata, T. MAFFT: a novel method for rapid

multiple sequence alignment based on fast Fourier transform. *Nucleic Acids Res.* **30**,

3059–3066 (2002).

51. Li, W. & Godzik, A. Cd-hit: a fast program for clustering and comparing large sets

of protein or nucleotide sequences. *Bioinformatics* **22**, 1658–1659 (2006).

52. Abraham, M. J. *et al.* GROMACS: High performance molecular simulations through

multi-level parallelism from laptops to supercomputers. *SoftwareX* **1–2**, 19–25

(2015).

53. Huang, J. *et al.* CHARMM36m: an improved force field for folded and intrinsically

disordered proteins. *Nat. Methods* **14**, 71–73 (2017).

54. Shigematsu, M. *et al.* RNase 2/EDN cleaves tRNA anticodon loops to generate

immunoactive RNAs. *bioRxiv* 815803 (2025) doi:10.1101/815803.

55. Darden, T., York, D. & Pedersen, L. Particle mesh Ewald: An $N{\cdot}\log(N)$ method for

Ewald sums in large systems. *J. Chem. Phys.* **98**, 10089–10092 (1993).

56. Parrinello, M. & Rahman, A. Polymorphic transitions in single crystals: A new

molecular dynamics method. *J. Appl. Phys.* **52**, 7182–7190 (1981).

57. Hess, B., Bekker, H., Berendsen, H. J. C. & Fraaije, J. G. E. M. LINCS: A linear

constraint solver for molecular simulations. *J. Comput. Chem.* **18**, 1463–1472 (1997).

58. Valdés-Tresanco, M. S., Valdés-Tresanco, M. E., Valiente, P. A. & Moreno, E.

Gmx_MMPBSA: A new tool to perform end-state free energy calculations with

GROMACS. *J. Chem. Theory Comput.* **17**, 6281–6291 (2021).

59. Sekine, R. *et al.* Tunable synthetic phenotypic diversification on Waddington's

landscape through autonomous signaling. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **108**, 17969–

17973 (2011).

60. Salis, H. M. The ribosome binding site calculator. *Methods Enzymol.* **498**, 19–42

(2011).

Fig. 1

Fig. 2

Fig. 3

a

amplified from oligopool library

+

E. coli library

FACS

Deep-seq

profiling of each variant

count

b

Activity for P*las*

10⁵

10⁴

10³

10²

22L
20L

LasR

24L

Ctrl

LuxR

10² 10³ 10⁴ 10⁵

Activity for P*lux*

c

Activity for P*las*

10⁶

10⁵

10⁴

10³

22L

LasR

20L

24L

Ctrl

LuxR

10³ 10⁴ 10⁵ 10⁶

Activity for P*lux*

d

Complex of LuxR•Plux

R4
H35 S18 R48
T31
Q40
R30
dT4
dG5 dT6

R49
F34
dC4

Complex of LasR•Plas

Fig. 4