

1 **Growth efficiency as a cellular objective in *Eschericia coli***

2

3 Tommi Aho^{1*}, Juha Kesseli¹, Olli Yli-Harja¹, Stuart A. Kauffman^{1,2}

4

5 ¹ Department of Signal Processing, Tampere University of Technology,

6 Korkeakoulunkatu 1, 33720 Tampere, Finland

7 ² Complex Systems Center, University of Vermont, U.S.A

8 Author email addresses: tommi.aho@tut.fi, juha.kesseli@tut.fi, olli.yli-harja@tut.fi,

9 stuart.kauffman@uvm.edu

10 * Corresponding author. Contact details: tommi.aho@tut.fi, tel. +358 40 1981304, fax

11 +358 3 3115 4989

12

13 **Abstract**

14 The identification of cellular objectives is one of the central topics in the research of
15 microbial metabolic networks. In particular, the information about a cellular objective is
16 needed in flux balance analysis which is a commonly used constrained-based metabolic
17 network analysis method for the prediction of cellular phenotypes. The cellular objective
18 may vary depending on the organism and its growth conditions. It is probable that
19 nutritionally scarce conditions are very common in the nature and, in order to survive in
20 those conditions, cells exhibit various highly efficient nutrient processing systems like
21 enzymes. In this study, we explore the efficiency of a metabolic network in
22 transformation of substrates to new biomass, and we introduce a new objective function
23 simulating growth efficiency.

24

25 We examined the properties of growth efficiency using a metabolic model for *Eschericia*
26 *coli*. We found that the maximal growth efficiency is obtained at a finite nutrient uptake
27 rate. The rate is substrate-dependent and it typically does not exceed 20 mmol/h/gDW.

28 We further examined whether the maximal growth efficiency could serve as a cellular
29 objective function in metabolic network analysis, and found that cellular growth in batch
30 cultivation can be predicted reasonably well under this assumption. The fit to
31 experimental data was found slightly better than with the commonly used objective
32 function of maximal growth rate.

33

34 Based on our results, we suggest that the maximal growth efficiency can be considered as
35 a plausible optimization criterion in metabolic modeling for *E. coli*. In the future, it

36 would be interesting to study growth efficiency as a cellular objective also in other
37 cellular systems and under different cultivation conditions.

38

39 **KEYWORDS:** constraint-based modeling; metabolism; microorganism

40 **1. Introduction**

41 Flux balance analysis (FBA; [9, 21]) has been successfully applied to genome-scale
42 models of microorganisms in order to characterize their metabolic capabilities [16]. FBA
43 makes it possible to simulate different growth phenotypes attained under different
44 environmental conditions and genetic modifications. The analysis can be performed
45 without kinetic parameters in biochemical reactions equations, but using only
46 stoichiometric and thermodynamic constraints. Typically, an objective function,
47 representing the true cellular objective, needs also to be determined in flux balance
48 analysis.

49 FBA is one of the constraint-based modeling methods that are based on the steady state
50 assumption. The assumption states that the concentrations of metabolites not freely
51 exchangeable with the environment are in a steady state. Given a metabolic network of m
52 metabolites and n reactions, the network structure and the stoichiometric coefficients in
53 reactions can be expressed in an $m \times n$ stoichiometric matrix S . Using S and the steady
54 state assumption, it is possible to form the following set of equations to comprehensively
55 characterize all the feasible metabolic flux distributions:

56

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dc}{dt} &= Sv = 0 \\ v_i^{lb} &\leq v_i \leq v_i^{ub} \quad i = 1, \dots, n \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

57 In Equation (1), c is a vector of concentrations of non-exchangeable metabolites, and v is
58 a vector of reaction rates. The lower and upper bounds of reaction rates are defined by
59 v_i^{lb} and v_i^{ub} , respectively. The bounds for reaction rates can be used to constrain specific
60 reactions to be irreversible, and to constrain the substrate uptake rate that usually is an
61 important parameter in constraint-based metabolic modeling. In FBA it is often assumed
62 that microorganisms aim to maximize their growth rate [8]. Therefore, a specific reaction
63 is implemented to describe the generation of new biomass. In FBA the maximum rate of
64 this reaction is determined using Linear Programming under the constraints of Equation
65 (1). Currently, the maximal growth rate has established usage as an objective function but
66 the rationale for cells always pursuing at maximal growth remains debatable [8].
67 Therefore, the research for other possible objective functions continues active. Other
68 suggested functions include the maximization of ATP yield [19, 17], the minimization of
69 the overall intracellular flux [4, 3], the maximization of ATP yield per flux unit [5], the
70 maximization of biomass yield per flux unit [18], the minimization of glucose
71 consumption [15], the minimization of reaction steps needed to produce biomass [13], the
72 maximization of ATP yield per reaction step [18], the minimization of redox potential
73 [12], the minimization of ATP producing fluxes [12], and the maximization of ATP
74 producing fluxes [11, 6, 12]. Similarly to these studies, FBA provides the methodological
75 framework also for our study of growth efficiency.

76 In the present work, we define the concept of growth efficiency and hypothesize that
77 *Escherichia coli* uses it as the cellular objective. Maximal growth efficiency as the cellular
78 objective would allow bacteria to utilize substrates efficiently to the production of new
79 biomass while producing only little amount of waste, heat, or other side-products. In this
80 work we explore the properties of growth efficiency using a genome-wide metabolic
81 model for *Escherichia coli* [7] and study whether the growth efficiency could be
82 considered as a plausible cellular objective in phenotypic simulations.

83 **2. The definition and calculation of growth efficiency**

84 We define the growth efficiency η as the growth rate v_{bm} (i.e. biomass production rate)
85 divided by the substrate uptake rate v_s ($\eta = v_{bm} / v_s$). Because v_{bm} is largely determined by
86 v_s , and in the following analysis we specifically focus on the effects of v_s to η , we now
87 define so-called growth efficiency function as $\eta = H(v_s)$ and explore its properties. This
88 simplification ignores specific other factors affecting η via v_{bm} but the sensitivity of η to
89 these factors will also be examined. The key assumption in our approach is that under
90 specific conditions bacteria actively work to tune the substrate uptake rate such that the
91 growth efficiency η will be maximized. That is, the bacteria aim at substrate uptake rate

92 v_s^* that is optimal in the sense of $v_s^* = \arg \max_{v_s} H(v_s)$.

93

94 In order to characterize the properties of growth efficiency and to study its use as a
95 cellular objective function, we apply the constraints of Equation (1) and set maximal η as

96 the objective in Flux Balance Analysis. The problem is a linear-fractional problem where
97 η , that is the ratio of biomass production rate to the substrate uptake rate, is maximized:

$$\begin{aligned} & \max && \eta \\ & s.t. && Sv = 0 \\ & && v_{irr} \geq 0 \\ & && v_i^{lb} \leq v_i \leq v_i^{ub} \quad \forall i \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

99 We used the metabolic model iAF1260 for *Eschericia coli* [2] to study growth efficiency.
100 Different substrates in cultivation media were modeled by changing the uptake bounds of
101 the corresponding substrates. Different gene knockouts were modeled by setting the
102 lower and upper bounds of the respective enzymatic reactions to zero. We examined
103 substrate uptake rates v_s between 0 and 50 mmol/h/grams of cell dry weight
104 (mmol/h/gDW). The linear-fractional optimization problem in Equation (2) was solved
105 by sampling the allowed values v_s , (60 samples in equal distances between 0 and 50),
106 maximizing v_{bm} in each case, and selecting the value for v_s that maximizes η . The analysis
107 was performed using COBRAToolbox [2] and the Linear Programming problems were
108 solved using glpk (<http://www.gnu.org/software/glpk/>).

109

110 **3. Properties of growth efficiency**

111 **3.1 Maximum of growth efficiency**

112 The growth efficiency function $H(v_s)$ obtains its maximum at a finite substrate uptake
113 rate v_s . This is illustrated in Figure 1 which shows the predicted growth rate and growth

114 efficiency for a wild-type *E. coli* strain in glucose minimal media assuming varying
115 glucose uptake rates. While the growth rate increases monotonically as the function of the
116 glucose uptake rate, the growth efficiency has a maximum at $v_s^* = 9.2$ mmol/h/gDW. If
117 the uptake rate is greater than v_s^* , the cell starts to secrete increasing amounts excess
118 metabolites like acetate.

119

120 **3.2 Sensitivity of growth efficiency to model uncertainties**

121 Metabolic network models are based on well known and validated information on
122 stoichiometric coefficients in biochemical reactions. However, the models also include
123 specific uncertainties. We examined the robustness of the growth efficiency function
124 against four model parameters: (1) the maximal oxygen uptake rate, (2) ATP requirement
125 for growth associated maintenance (GAM), (3) ATP requirement for non-growth
126 associated maintenance (NGAM), and (4) the phosphorus to oxygen (P/O) ratio that
127 reflects the efficiency of ATP synthesis in the electron transfer chain. These parameters
128 have been identified most critical to the behavior of the iAF1260 model [7]. We first
129 examined the form of the growth efficiency function while varying the maximal oxygen
130 uptake rate between 0 and 50 mmol/h/gDW (the original value being 18.5 mmol/h/gDW).
131 Second, GAM and NGAM were varied for +/- 50% of their original values (59.81 and
132 8.39 mmol/h/gDW, respectively) by constraining the respective reaction rates. Finally,
133 P/O ratios 0.5, 1.0, 1.75, and 2.67 were tested by modifying the stoichiometric
134 coefficients in the electron transfer chain and constraining specific reactions of the
135 electron transfer chain (similarly as described in [7]). Figure 2 shows that all four

136 parameters affect the growth efficiency function. Oxygen uptake rate has the most drastic
137 effect which shifts v_s^* , i.e., the glucose uptake rate at which the maximum of growth
138 efficiency is obtained. GAM and NGAM have similar effects of shifting v_s^* but the effect
139 is more moderate. The increased P/O ratio increases the maximum growth efficiency
140 without notable effects to v_s^* .

141

142 **3.3 Substrate uptake rate distributions**

143 Because we assume a bacterium to self-regulate the substrate uptake rate to the maximum
144 η at a finite v_s^* , we are able to set the substrate uptake rate unconstrained. Usually in FBA
145 it is crucial to constrain the substrate uptake rate properly. Otherwise, as shown in the
146 upper panel of Figure 1, the growth rate simply increases monotonically with increasing
147 substrate input rate. In the following analysis, we simulated 10 different cultivation and
148 1261 genetic conditions to study the distribution of v_s^* . Figure 3 shows the results for
149 phenotypes that are predicted to be viable (i.e., the growth rate is greater than 0.1 h^{-1}). For
150 them, the substrate uptake rate v_s^* always remains at a finite range. Typical values for v_s^*
151 are from 5 to 20 mmol/h/gDW. The largest v_s^* is obtained under the knockouts of
152 components of ATP synthase, in particular in pyruvate cultivation. The blockage of ATP
153 synthase requires that the needed ATP is synthesized by other mechanisms, such as
154 glycolysis and the citric acid cycle, which requires a large substrate uptake rate.

155

156 **3.4 The relation of growth efficiency and overflow**

157 **metabolism**

158 In situations where the maximal growth is achieved, a bacterium may not be able to
159 transform all the substrate efficiently to new biomass but an increasing amount of
160 material is directed to waste. This phenomenon of overflow metabolism has been
161 extensively studied as it is detrimental in industrial applications. In the case of *E. coli*,
162 overflow metabolism directs valuable carbon to acetate production instead of biomass
163 generation. This inhibits growth and it may also disturb product synthesis [20].

164

165 We studied the relationship between the maximal growth efficiency and overflow
166 metabolism by simulating all single gene knockouts in the iAF1260 model under varying
167 carbon sources. We found that usually the substrate uptake rate at the maximal growth
168 efficiency (v_s^*) equals to the substrate uptake rate at the start of overflow metabolism
169 (i.e., the start of acetate production). There are few exceptions to this rule, for example,
170 when the knockout is directed to specific genes of ATP synthase, pyruvate
171 dehydrogenase, or succinate dehydrogenase. Thus, we reason that the maximal growth
172 efficiency is a concept of its own, and it cannot be directly interpreted as the substrate
173 uptake rate threshold above which overflow metabolism starts.

174

175 The use of the maximal growth criterion in growth phenotype simulation may easily
176 produce estimates that are sub-optimal in growth efficiency and likely to express

177 overflow metabolism. In order to illustrate the sub-optimality under the maximal growth
178 criterion, we calculated the loss of growth efficiency using the above-mentioned set of
179 1261 genetic and 10 environmental conditions. In simulations with the maximal growth
180 criterion, the maximal substrate uptake rate was constrained to 10 mmol/h/gDW. The
181 relative loss in growth efficiency was determined as the growth efficiency under the
182 maximal growth criterion divided by the maximal achievable growth efficiency. Figure 4
183 summarizes the calculated loss ratios. In the figure, the loss of growth efficiency at
184 maximal growth demonstrates that maximal growth wastes input substrate energy.

185 **4. Maximal growth efficiency as a cellular objective**

186 We examined whether the maximal growth efficiency is a plausible cellular objective for
187 *E. coli* cultivated in a small-scale batch process. Therefore, we used the metabolic model
188 iAF1260 to predict the cellular growth rate assuming *E. coli* maximizes the growth
189 efficiency. The growth predictions were compared to two experimental data sets as
190 follows.

191

192 First, we predicted the viability for mutant strains carrying single gene deletions. The
193 predictions were produced for 1117 mutant strains cultivated under glucose minimal
194 media [1]. Each mutant strain in the data set has been experimentally determined to be
195 either viable or inviable. For 982 viable mutants, the viability was correctly predicted (i.e.
196 True Positive rate was 97%) and, for 76 inviable mutants, the inviability was correctly

197 predicted (True Negative rate was 72%). The results are identical with the prediction
198 results obtained using the maximal growth criterion.

199

200 Second, we predicted the growth rate for 5,096 growth conditions, consisting of 91 single
201 gene knockout strains cultivated under 56 different media conditions. The optical density
202 (OD) of *E. coli* grown in these conditions has been measured in a high-throughput
203 experimental screen using the Biolog platform (<http://www.biolog.com>), and the data has
204 been set available through the ASAP database [10]. Figure 5 shows the growth
205 predictions for each of the growth conditions versus the corresponding OD value. Under
206 the maximal growth criterion, the Spearman correlation between the predicted growth
207 rates and the experimental OD values was 0.19 while under the maximal growth
208 efficiency criterion the Spearman correlation was 0.24. We also fitted linear models to
209 both data in order to further compare the phenotype prediction performance of the two
210 criteria. Under the maximal growth criterion, the linear model had residual standard error
211 of 0.83 and the adjusted R^2 was 0.59. Under the maximal growth efficiency criterion, the
212 linear model had residual standard error of 0.76 and the adjusted R^2 was 0.65. The better
213 fit in the case of the maximal growth efficiency was confirmed using Akaike's
214 information criterion (12,537.83 for maximal growth criterion versus 11,639.86 for
215 maximal growth efficiency criterion).

216 **5. Conclusions**

217 The identification of cellular survival strategies and their simulation by realistic objective
218 functions have fundamental importance on phenotype prediction in metabolic analysis. It

219 is probable that there is no single survival strategy that is optimal in all situations but the
220 strategy is likely to depend on growth conditions of a microorganism [8]. Feist and
221 Palsson discuss three qualitatively different environments: nutritionally rich, nutritionally
222 scarce, and elementally limited [8]. Nutritionally rich laboratory-like conditions are
223 probably very rare in the nature and thus, maximal growth is probably an unrealistic
224 objective function in most of the situations. In a study by Schuetz et al. [18] it was found
225 that under nutrient scarcity in continuous cultivations, the best prediction accuracy was
226 achieved using linear maximization of ATP or biomass yields. On the other hand, in
227 unlimited growth on glucose in oxygen or nitrogen respiring batch cultures, the best
228 prediction accuracy was achieved by nonlinear maximization of the ATP yield per flux
229 unit.

230

231 In this work we introduced a concept called growth efficiency and characterized its
232 properties. The study was performed using the metabolic model iAF1260 for *Eschericia*
233 *coli*. As a result we found that the growth efficiency function has its maximum within a
234 finite substrate uptake rate. According to our predictions, the substrate uptake rate at
235 which the maximal growth efficiency is obtained (v_s^*) varies typically from 5 to 20
236 mmol/h/gDW. Our simulations with several different cultivation media and a set of single
237 gene knockouts demonstrated that the optimal rate v_s^* depends on the cultivation and
238 genetic conditions. For example, with sucrose the median uptake rate of v_s^* was 4.5
239 mmol/h/gDW while with pyruvate the median rate was 17 mmol/h/gDW. We also found
240 that the growth efficiency function is affected by specific parameters that usually remain
241 unsure in metabolic network models. In particular, oxygen uptake and ATP requirement

242 for growth associated maintenance affect v_y^* , and increasing P/O ratio in electron transfer
243 chain increases growth efficiency while maintaining the form of the growth efficiency
244 function.

245

246 A straight-forward application of growth efficiency is to use it as an optimization
247 criterion (i.e., objective function) for predictions of cellular growth. We explored this
248 possibility and validated our computational predictions using two sets of experimental
249 data. We found that maximal growth efficiency can be considered as a feasible
250 optimization criterion in metabolic modeling. The criterion predicted the given
251 experimental data slightly better than the commonly applied maximal growth rate
252 criterion.

253

254 In this study we used data from batch cultivations to validate the feasibility of growth
255 efficiency as an objective function. However, based on the work by Schuetz et al. [18],
256 we hypothesize that the growth efficiency criterion could perform better in situations
257 where cells are under nutrient scarcity, i.e. they are cultivated in nutrient-limiting
258 chemostats. Such chemostat data was not available in this study, and the hypothesis
259 should be validated in a future study.

260

261 Considering maximal growth efficiency as a cellular objective suggests that cells can
262 save nutrients in the benefit of other cells or to be used to themselves at a later moment.
263 This raises the question about the mechanisms, e.g. quorum sensing, which bacteria
264 growing in colonies may use to tune their growth rate in each growth situation. As a

265 further point we note that if it proves true that bacterial cells maximize the growth
266 efficiency per unit food or energy uptake, this picks out an optimal rate of energy
267 utilization, hence an optimal displacement from chemical equilibrium for non-
268 equilibrium living cells. We note that we lack the theory of an optimal displacement from
269 equilibrium for living, non-equilibrium, cells. Jacques Monod, in *Chance and Necessity*,
270 notes that optimally growing bacteria give off little heat [14]. This may be consonant
271 with maximal growth efficiency, so that the maximal amount of energy coming into cells
272 goes into biomass production and minimizes waste heat.

273

274 **Acknowledgments**

275 This work was supported by the Academy of Finland (Finnish Programme for Centres of
276 Excellence in Research 2006-2011) and the FiDiPro programme of Finnish Funding
277 Agency for Technology and Innovation.

278

279 **References**

280

281 [1] T. Baba, T. Ara, M. Hasegawa, Y. Takai, Y. Okumura, M. Baba, K.A. Datsenko,
282 M. Tomita, B.L. Wanner, H. Mori, Construction of *Escherichia coli* K-12 in-frame,
283 single-gene knockout mutants: the Keio collection, *Mol. Syst. Biol.* 2 (2006) 2006.0008.

284

285 [2] S.A. Becker, A.M. Feist, M.L. Mo, G. Hannum, B.Ø. Palsson, M.J. Herrgard,
286 Quantitative prediction of cellular metabolism with constraint-based models: The
287 COBRA Toolbox, Nat. Protocols 2 (2007) 727-738.
288

289 [3] L.M. Blank, L. Kuepfer, U. Sauer, Large-scale ¹³C-flux analysis reveals mechanistic
290 principles of metabolic network robustness to null mutations in yeast, Genome Biol. 6
291 (2005) R49.
292

293 [4] H.P.J. Bonarius, V. Hatzimanikatis, K.P.H. Meesters, C.D. de Gooijer, G. Schmid, J.
294 Tramper, Metabolic flux analysis of hybridoma cells in different culture media using
295 mass balances, Biotechnol. Bioeng. 50 (1996) 299–318.
296

297 [5] M. Dauner, U. Sauer, Stoichiometric growth model for riboflavin-producing *Bacillus*
298 *subtilis*, Biotechnol. Bioeng. 76 (2001) 132–143.
299

300 [6] O. Ebenhoh, R. Heinrich, Evolutionary optimization of metabolic pathways.
301 Theoretical reconstruction of the stoichiometry of ATP and NADH producing systems,
302 Bull. Math. Biol. 63 (2001) 21–55.
303

304 [7] A.M. Feist, C.S. Henry, J.L. Reed, M. Krummenacker, A.R. Joyce, P.D. Karp, L.J.
305 Broadbelt, V. Hatzimanikatis, B.Ø. Palsson, A genome-scale metabolic reconstruction for
306 *Escherichia coli* K-12 MG1655 that accounts for 1260 ORFs and thermodynamic
307 information, Mol. Syst. Biol. 3 (2007) 121.

308

309 [8] A.M. Feist, B.Ø. Palsson, The biomass objective function, *Curr. Opin. Microbiol.*, 13
310 (2010) 344-349.

311

312 [9] D.A. Fell, J.R. Small, Fat synthesis in adipose tissue. An examination of
313 stoichiometric constraints, *Biochem J* 238 (1986) 781–786.

314

315 [10] J.D. Glasner, P. Liss, G. Plunkett 3rd, A. Darling, T. Prasad, M. Rusch, A. Byrnes,
316 M. Gilson, B. Biehl, F.R. Blattner, N.T. Perna, ASAP, a systematic annotation package
317 for community analysis of genomes, *Nucleic Acids Res.* 31 (2003) 147-151.

318

319 [11] R. Heinrich, F. Montero, E. Klipp, T.G. Waddell, E. Melendez-Hevia, Theoretical
320 approaches to the evolutionary optimization of glycolysis: thermodynamic and kinetic
321 constraints, *Eur. J. Biochem.* 243 (1997) 191–201.

322

323 [12] A.L. Knorr, R. Jain, R. Srivastava, Bayesian-based selection of metabolic objective
324 functions, *Bioinformatics* 23 (2007) 351–357.

325

326 [13] E. Meléndez-Hevia, A. Isidoro, The game of the pentose phosphate cycle, *J. Theor.*
327 *Biol.* 117 (1985) 251-263.

328

329 [14] J. Monod, *Chance and Necessity: An Essay on the Natural Philosophy of Modern*
330 *Biology*, first ed., Knopf, New York, 1971.

331

332 [15] A.P. Oliveira, J. Nielsen, J. Forster, Modeling *Lactococcus lactis* using a genome-
333 scale flux model,. BMC Microbiol 5 (2005) 39.

334

335 [16] N.D. Price, J.L. Reed, B.Ø. Palsson, Genome-scale models of microbial cells:
336 evaluating the consequences of constraints, Nature Rev. Microbiol. 2 (2004) 886-897.

337

338 [17] R. Ramakrishna, J.S. Edwards, A. McCulloch, B.Ø. Palsson, Flux-balance analysis
339 of mitochondrial energy metabolism: consequences of systemic stoichiometric
340 constraints, Am. J. Physiol. Regul. Integr. Comp. Physiol. 280 (2001) R695-R704.

341

342 [18] R. Schuetz, L. Kuepfer, U. Sauer, Systematic evaluation of objective functions for
343 predicting intracellular fluxes in *Escherichia coli*, Mol. Syst. Biol. 3 (2007) 119.

344

345 [19] W.M. van Gulik, J.J. Heijnen, A metabolic network stoichiometry analysis of
346 microbial growth and production formation, Biotech. Bioeng. 48 (1995) 681-698.

347

348 [20] K. Valgepea, K. Adamberg, R. Nahku, P.-J. Lahtvee, L. Arike, R. Vilu, Systems
349 biology approach reveals that overflow metabolism of acetate in *Escherichia coli* is
350 triggered by carbon catabolite repression of acetyl-CoA synthetase, BMC Syst. Biol. 4
351 (2010) 166.


352

353 [21] A. Varma, B.Ø. Palsson, Stoichiometric flux balance models quantitatively predict
354 growth and metabolic by-product secretion in wild-type *Escherichia coli* W3110, Appl.
355 Environ. Microbiol. 60 (1994) 3724–3731.

356

357


358 **Figures**



359

360 Figure 1. Maximal growth efficiency is obtained at a finite substrate uptake rate. The
361 upper panel depicts the growth rate and the acetate secretion rate as the function of
362 glucose uptake rate. The growth rate is a monotonically increasing function without a
363 maximum. The lower panel shows the growth efficiency as the function of glucose
364 uptake rate, i.e., the growth efficiency function $H(v_s)$.


365



366

367 Figure 2. The robustness of the growth efficiency function against four uncertain model
 368 parameters. (A) oxygen uptake rate, (B) growth associated maintenance, (C) non-growth
 369 associated maintenance, (D) P/O ratio.


370



371

372 Figure 3. Distributions of substrate uptake rates under the maximal growth efficiency
 373 criterion. The uptake rate is calculated using both criteria for 1261 gene knockout strains
 374 in 10 carbon sources (glc: glucose, succ: succinate, gal: galactose, ala-D: D-alanine, pyr:


375 pyruvate, cit: citrate, fru: fructose, rmn: rhamnose, suc: sucrose, man: mannose). All the
376 distributions are presented as boxplots. The distributions are so concentrated that their
377 data points without outliers appear together as a black bar. Dots represent outliers. Eight
378 data points representing the largest substrate uptake rate (224 mmol/h/gDW for deletions
379 of ATP synthase components in pyruvate cultivation) are not shown.
380



381

382 Figure 4. Sub-optimality of growth efficiency under the maximal growth criterion. The
383 relative loss in growth efficiency under the maximal growth rate criterion is depicted for
384 1261 gene knockout strains in 10 cultivation conditions. The bar represents the median of
385 the 1261 mutants. Almost all the mutants are very close to the median so they cluster
386 under the bar. The distribution is right skewed and the points are at least 2.7 S.D. above
387 or occasionally below the median. The median in almost all culture conditions shows a
388 loss of growth efficiency under the maximal growth rate criterion.

389



390

391 Figure 5. The correspondence of predicted growth rates and experimentally observed
 392 optical density. OD values are presented as the function of the predicted growth rates.
 393 The upper and the lower panel present the predictions under the maximal growth criterion
 394 and the maximal growth efficiency criterion, respectively. A linear model is fitted to both
 395 data. In simulations with the maximal growth criterion, the maximal substrate uptake rate
 396 was constrained to 10 mmol/h/gDW.