
Promoters regulated by repressors with fast binding kinetics can have large transcriptional bursts

Namiko Mitarai, Szabolcs Semsey, Kim Sneppen *

Center for Models of Life, Niels Bohr Institute, Blegdamsvej 17, 2100 Copenhagen, Denmark.

* E-mail: sneppen@nbi.dk

Abstract

Transcriptional repression may cause transcriptional noise by a competition between repressor and RNA polymerase binding. Although promoter activity is often governed by a single limiting step, we argue here that the size of the noise strongly depends on whether this step is the initial equilibrium binding or one of the subsequent steps. In particular, the multi-step transcription initiation process allows weak promoters and repressors having fast binding kinetics to have substantial noise. Therefore the architecture of the promoter has implications for estimating the on-rates for transcriptional repressors in living cells.

Introduction

With recent availability of the technology for counting individual mRNAs in *E. coli* cells [1–4], it has become feasible to quantify the interplay between noise in gene expression and dynamics around the promoter. The degree of cell-to-cell variability in the number of a given mRNA is often quantified by the Fano factor, the ratio between the variance and the mean. The Fano factor exceeds one when the transcription is bursty. Such transcription burstiness can be obtained from a model where a gene switches between an "on-state" with high promoter activity and an "off-state" with low activity [1, 3–7]. Such a simple scenario can be realized by different molecular mechanisms.

Transcriptional regulators influence RNA polymerase (RNAP) access to promoters, and may cause alternating periods of low and high promoter activity, depending on the presence or absence of the regulator near the promoter (Fig. 1). When the repressor is the source of the burstiness, the measurements of the Fano factor for mRNA levels may allow for quantification of the relative sizes of on-rates of transcriptional repressors and on-rates of RNAP [7]. A recent study [7] reported Fano factors in the presence of a transcriptional repressor. The measured dependence of noise on repressor concentration was reproduced by using a one-step model for transcription initiation, assuming that RNAP binding to the promoter sequence is the rate limiting step.

However, transcription initiation in *Escherichia coli* involves at least three steps: closed complex, open complex and elongation initiation [8, 9] (see Fig. 2) of which the two later steps are often limiting [8, 10–12]. Measuring the distributions of time intervals between two subsequent transcription events directly demonstrated that the tetA promoter has at least two limiting steps [13]. In cases where promoter activity is limited by later steps of the initiation process, the RNAP is bound to the promoter for a longer period. This inhibits the access for subsequent RNAP's as well as for

transcription factors in the occluded region [14] as indicated by the red squares in Fig. 1. Here we analyse how this mutual exclusion influences the noise level. By taking the multi-step transcription initiation explicitly into account, our study emphasizes that although the activity of a promoter may be limited by a single bottleneck process, it does matter whether this limiting process is early or late in the transcription initiation process.




Figure 1. Illustration of the competition between a simple transcriptional repressor (blue) and the RNA polymerase (red) in terms of the time intervals. They occlude the promoter for each other. Notice that a bound RNAP takes time to initiate transcription. It is only when the promoter is open, that there is a direct competition for the available space. The probability that the repressor wins this competition is $k_b/(k_b + r_{on})$ where r_{on} is the effective on-rate of the RNAP (see Fig. 2) and k_b is the binding rate of the repressor. The number of times the RNAP binds before the repressor rebinds is given by r_{on}/k_b .

Results and Discussion

Figure 2 illustrates the interplay between a simple transcriptional repressor, acting solely by promoter occlusion, and the activity of the promoter it regulates. The sequential process implies that a promoter limited by the elongation initiation rate r_f can have an “on-rate” r_{on} which is much higher than its overall initiation rate $r \approx r_{on} \cdot r_f / (r_{on} + r_f)$ [15]. Noticeably, a repressor that exclusively acts through promoter occlusion only interferes with r_{on} . Whereas the average mRNA level $\langle m \rangle$ will be determined by r , the noise is primarily determined by r_{on} , in terms of a Fano factor

$$\nu = \frac{\text{variance}(m)}{\langle m \rangle} \sim 1 + \frac{r_{on}}{k_b} \quad (1)$$

for substantially repressed genes. That is, genes where the concentration dependent on-rate of the repressor k_b is much higher than the off rate k_u [6]. The increase of ν with r_{on}/k_b reflects the number of transcription initiations between each repressor binding event.

The difference of eq. (1) from the simple promoter model [3, 7] is that noise can be large for a weak promoter in case it is limited by later steps in the transcription initiation (e.g. the lac promoter). The noise is typically measured as a function of the average mRNA number $\langle m \rangle$ [3, 4, 7]. The extended model in Fig. 2 predicts [6]

$$\langle m \rangle = \frac{r_{on}/\gamma}{1 + R + k_b/k_u}, \quad (2)$$




Figure 2. a) Three-step promoter model of [8] is here simplified to a two-step process that focuses on the difference between the time $1/r_{on}$ of the RNA polymerase association and the time consumed by subsequent steps ($1/r_f$, see also extension in Methods). The equations for r and ν ignore the additional time of 0.5-1sec for promoter clearance [15], and corrections of order γ/r_f . In vitro data for LacUV5 is $r_1/r_{-1} = 0.16[\text{RNAP}]/nM$, $r_2 = 0.095/\text{sec}$, $r_3 = 2/\text{sec}$ [10] where $[\text{RNAP}]$ is free RNA polymerase concentration. b,c) Fano factor as a function of mRNA number $\langle m \rangle$ with $r/\gamma = 15.7$, $\gamma = \ln(2)/(117\text{sec})$ [19] and $R = 10, 1$, and 0.1 . Solid lines are for the two-step model, while symbols are obtained by three-step model with combinations of r_1 , r_{-1} , r_2 , and r_3 corresponding to the used R and r . b) Assuming 9.8 tetramers per cell we set $k_b = 1/(4.3\text{sec})$. k_u is varied to change $\langle m \rangle$. c) $k_u = 1/(560\text{sec})$ from [21] and k_b is varied to change $\langle m \rangle$.

where the aspect ratio $R = r_{on}/r_f$ characterizes the promoter architecture [15], k_b/k_u quantifies the binding of the repressor, and γ is the mRNA degradation rate.

For a fixed repressor concentration (constant k_b)

$$\nu \approx 1 + \frac{r_{on}}{k_b^*} \cdot \left(1 - \frac{\langle m \rangle}{m_{max}}\right)^2 \quad (3)$$

where the approximation ignores a reduction term in Fano factor, which is small when $\langle m \rangle < m_{max}$, see Fig 2a. The prefactor is governed by the γ -corrected association rate $k_b^* \approx k_b + \gamma(R + 1)(1 - \frac{\langle m \rangle}{m_{max}}) \sim k_b$. ν decreases monotonically with $\langle m \rangle$ when the change is caused by increased k_u (by operator mutations).

When considering reproducing the Fano factors measured on the Lac system [7], a one-step model ($R \ll 1$) would require very small k_b values. Indeed [7] uses the binding rate for one Lac tetramer to be one per 6.3 minutes. However, this rate may be too slow given that the association rate of one Lac-dimer is estimated to be about 1/3.5 min [16], and is found to bind 5 fold slower than a Lac-tetramer [17, 18], suggesting an association rate per tetramer of 1/42 sec in an *E. coli* cell. The multi-step models can give high Fano factors at much higher values of k_b . Spassky et al. [10] measured that

open complex formation takes $1/r_2 \sim 10$ sec for the lacUV5 promoter in vitro, which combined with $r \sim 11$ sec from [7, 19] suggest that this later step is rate limiting and that $R \gg 1$. Our analysis assuming $R = 10$ and on-rate of a single Lac-tetramer of $1/42$ sec gives the Fano factors of ~ 4 with ~ 10 tetramers per cell (Fig.2b).

Consider now a given operator (constant k_u) and change $\langle m \rangle$ by regulating the repressor concentration (k_b). The Fano factor in this case is

$$\nu \approx 1 + \frac{\gamma}{k_u^*} \cdot \langle m \rangle \cdot \left(1 - \frac{\langle m \rangle}{m_{max}} \right), \quad (4)$$

with the γ -corrected dissociation rate $k_u^* \approx k_u + \gamma \cdot \langle m \rangle / m_{max} \approx k_u$. Eq. (4) is non-monotonic, with largest ν at half maximum expression $\langle m \rangle \sim m_{max}/2$. The functional dependence of ν with $\langle m \rangle$ in Eq. (4) does not depend on R , but the interpretation of the underlying dynamics does. Noticeably, to obtain a given repression level m/m_{max} for a promoter with $R \gg 1$ the repressor needs a factor $(1 + R)$ stronger binding than naively expected. This reflects that the repressor has to act in the reduced time where the promoter is not occupied by RNA polymerase [6], see Fig. 1. A corollary of this interplay is that estimates of repressor binding energies from promoter activities also rely on the non-equilibrium aspects of the RNAP-promoter dynamics.

Notice that the above analyses only apply to repressors that act by simple occlusion, and do not affect the post binding steps of transcription initiation. In case a transcriptional repressor acts by stalling the isomerization step [11, 12], it does not occlude the RNAP binding site and the noise should scale with r as suggested by the $R \ll 1$ limit [3]. In case the transcriptional regulator is an activator, it may act through modification of r_1 , r_{-1} , r_2 or r_3 [11] but will not occlude the promoter, and we therefore expect the burstiness to be reproduced by considering an overall initiation rate modulation as implied in the formalism of [3].

In summary, with this short paper we wanted to clarify the interplay between time-scales of transcription initiation, and time-scales of transcriptional repressors in prokaryotes. The Fano factor may indeed be used as a tool to measure the ratio of two competing rates (eq .1). By exposing for example a promoter with large r_{on} to different repressors, one may compare repressor dynamics. Conversely, by exposing different promoters to the same repressor/operator combination, one may quantify their relative on-rates for RNAP. Naturally such studies would be facilitated by reporter messages with relatively large lifetimes (small γ). Central in such an analysis is to realize that transcriptional noise is primarily sensitive to the first steps of the transcription initiation process (Fig. 2), which are often not rate-limiting.

Methods

Here we summarise the derivation of the Fano factor. The reaction scheme and parameters are defined in Fig. 2. In the three-step transcription initiation model, the promoter can be in one of the following four states: free (f), RNAP forming a closed complex (c), RNAP forming an open complex (o), and bound by the transcriptional repressor (T). In this model repressor binding does not influence open complex formation or the rate of elongation initiation. We denote the probability for the promoter to be in the state α and having m mRNAs at time t to be $P_m^\alpha(t)$, where α can be f , c , o , or T . Assuming that a mRNA is produced at the moment the RNAP

fires and ignoring the clearance time, we have the following master equations:

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{dP_m^f(t)}{dt} &= r_3 P_{m-1}^o(t) + k_u P_m^T(t) + r_{-1} P_m^c(t) - (r_1 + k_b) P_m^f(t) \\
&\quad + \gamma \left[(m+1) P_{m+1}^f(t) - m P_m^f(t) \right], \\
\frac{dP_m^c(t)}{dt} &= r_1 P_m^f(t) - (r_{-1} + r_2) P_m^c(t) + \gamma \left[(m+1) P_{m+1}^c(t) - m P_m^c(t) \right], \\
\frac{dP_m^o(t)}{dt} &= r_2 P_m^c(t) - r_3 P_m^o(t) + \gamma \left[(m+1) P_{m+1}^o(t) - m P_m^o(t) \right], \\
\frac{dP_m^T(t)}{dt} &= k_b P_m^f(t) - k_u P_m^T(t) + \gamma \left[(m+1) P_{m+1}^T(t) - m P_m^T(t) \right].
\end{aligned}$$

The probability to have m mRNA in the system at time t irrespective of the promoter/operator state is given by $P_m(t) \equiv P_m^f(t) + P_m^c(t) + P_m^o(t) + P_m^T(t)$. The Fano factor $\nu = (\langle m^2 \rangle - \langle m \rangle^2) / \langle m \rangle$ was obtained by calculating $\langle m \rangle = \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} m P_m$ and $\langle m^2 \rangle = \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} m^2 P_m$ in the steady state using the generating function method [20]. The resulting Fano factor for the 3-step model is given by

$$\nu_{3\text{-step}} = 1 + \frac{\frac{r_{on}}{k_b} - R \cdot K \cdot (1 + K^*) - \frac{r_{on}^2}{r_2 r_3} K K^* - \frac{r_{on}^2}{r_1 r_3} \left[1 + \frac{\gamma}{r_2} \right] K (1 + K^*)}{\left[1 + K^* (1 + R) + \frac{\gamma}{r_3} (1 + K^*) \left(1 + \frac{r_{on} \gamma}{r_1 r_2} \right) + K^* \frac{r_{on} \gamma}{r_3 r_2} \right] \cdot [1 + K \cdot (1 + R)]}.$$

Similarly, the full expression of the Fano factor for the effective two-step model (RNAP binding and elongation initiation) is obtained to be

$$\nu_{2\text{-step}} = 1 + \frac{(r_{on}/k_b) - R \cdot K \cdot (1 + K^*)}{\left[1 + K^* (1 + R) + (\gamma/r_f)(1 + K^*) \right] \cdot [1 + K \cdot (1 + R)]}.$$

Acknowledgments

References

1. Golding I, Paulsson J, Zawilski SM, Cox EC (2005) Real-time kinetics of gene activity in individual bacteria. *Cell* 123: 1025–1036.
2. Taniguchi Y, Choi PJ, Li GW, Chen H, Babu M, et al. (2010) Quantifying e. coli proteome and transcriptome with single-molecule sensitivity in single cells. *Science* 329: 533–538.
3. So Lh, Ghosh A, Zong C, Sepúlveda LA, Segev R, et al. (2011) General properties of transcriptional time series in escherichia coli. *Nature genetics* 43: 554–560.
4. Sanchez A, Golding I (2013) Genetic determinants and cellular constraints in noisy gene expression. *Science* 342: 1188–1193.
5. Mitarai N, Dodd IB, Crooks MT, Sneppen K (2008) The generation of promoter-mediated transcriptional noise in bacteria. *PLoS computational biology* 4: e1000109.
6. Nakanishi H, Mitarai N, Sneppen K (2008) Dynamical analysis on gene activity in the presence of repressors and an interfering promoter. *Biophysical journal* 95: 4228–4240.

-
7. Jones DL, Brewster RC, Phillips R (2014) Promoter architecture dictates cell-to-cell variability in gene expression. *Science* 346: 1533–1536.
 8. McClure WR (1980) Rate-limiting steps in rna chain initiation. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 77: 5634–5638.
 9. Hawley DK, McClure WR (1980) In vitro comparison of initiation properties of bacteriophage lambda wild-type pr and x3 mutant promoters. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 77: 6381–6385.
 10. Spassky A, Kirkegaard K, Buc H (1985) Changes in the dna structure of the lac uv5 promoter during formation of an open complex with escherichia coli rna polymerase. *Biochemistry* 24: 2723–2731.
 11. Roy S, Garges S, Adhya S (1998) Activation and repression of transcription by differential contact: two sides of a coin. *Journal of Biological Chemistry* 273: 14059–14062.
 12. Roy S, Semsey S, Liu M, Gussin GN, Adhya S (2004) Galr represses galp1 by inhibiting the rate-determining open complex formation through rna polymerase contact: a galr negative control mutant. *Journal of molecular biology* 344: 609–618.
 13. Muthukrishnan AB, Kandhavelu M, Lloyd-Price J, Kudasov F, Chowdhury S, et al. (2012) Dynamics of transcription driven by the tet promoter, one event at a time, in live escherichia coli cells. *Nucleic acids research* 40: 8472–8483.
 14. Bendtsen KM, Erdőssy J, Csiszovszki Z, Svenningsen SL, Sneppen K, et al. (2011) Direct and indirect effects in the regulation of overlapping promoters. *Nucleic acids research* 39: 6879–6885.
 15. Sneppen K, Dodd IB, Shearwin KE, Palmer AC, Schubert RA, et al. (2005) A mathematical model for transcriptional interference by rna polymerase traffic in escherichia coli. *Journal of molecular biology* 346: 399–409.
 16. Hammar P, Leroy P, Mahmutovic A, Marklund EG, Berg OG, et al. (2012) The lac repressor displays facilitated diffusion in living cells. *Science* 336: 1595–1598.
 17. Hsieh M, Brenowitz M (1997) Comparison of the dna association kinetics of the lac repressor tetramer, its dimeric mutant lacI adi, and the native dimeric gal repressor. *Journal of Biological Chemistry* 272: 22092–22096.
 18. Oehler S, Eismann ER, Krämer H, Müller-Hill B (1990) The three operators of the lac operon cooperate in repression. *The EMBO journal* 9: 973.
 19. Petersen C (1987) The functional stability of the lacz transcript is sensitive towards sequence alterations immediately downstream of the ribosome binding site. *Molecular and General Genetics MGG* 209: 179–187.
 20. Van Kampen NG (1992) *Stochastic processes in physics and chemistry*, volume 1. Elsevier.
 21. Hammar P, Walldén M, Fange D, Persson F, Baltekin Ö, et al. (2014) Direct measurement of transcription factor dissociation excludes a simple operator occupancy model for gene regulation. *Nature genetics* 46: 405–408.