

# The protein cost of metabolic fluxes: prediction from enzymatic rate laws and cost minimization

Elad Noor<sup>1</sup>, Avi Flamholz<sup>2</sup>, Arren Bar-Even<sup>3</sup>, Dan Davidi<sup>4</sup>, Ron Milo<sup>4</sup>, Wolfram Liebermeister<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Institute of Molecular Systems Biology, Eidgenössische Technische Hochschule Zürich, Switzerland, <sup>2</sup>Department of Molecular and Cellular Biology, University of California, Berkeley, California, United States of America, <sup>3</sup>Max Planck Institute for Molecular Plant Physiology, Golm, Germany, <sup>4</sup>Department of Plant Sciences, The Weizmann Institute of Science, Rehovot, Israel, <sup>5</sup>Institute of Biochemistry, Charité – Universitätsmedizin Berlin, Germany

## Abstract

Bacterial growth depends crucially on metabolic fluxes, which are limited by the cell's capacity to maintain metabolic enzymes. The necessary enzyme amount per unit flux is a major determinant of metabolic strategies both in evolution and bioengineering. It depends on enzyme parameters (such as  $k_{\text{cat}}$  and  $K_M$  constants), but also on metabolite concentrations. Moreover, similar amounts of different enzymes might incur different costs for the cell, depending on enzyme-specific properties such as protein size and half-life. Here, we developed enzyme cost minimization (ECM), a scalable method for computing enzyme amounts that support a given metabolic flux at a minimal protein cost. The complex interplay of enzyme and metabolite concentrations, e.g. through thermodynamic driving forces and enzyme saturation, would make it hard to solve this optimization problem directly. By treating enzyme cost as a function of metabolite levels, we formulated ECM as a numerically tractable, convex optimization problem. Its tiered approach allows for building models at different levels of detail, depending on the amount of available data. Validating our method with measured metabolite and protein levels in *E. coli* central metabolism, we found typical prediction fold errors of 3.8 and 2.7, respectively, for the two kinds of data. ECM can be used to predict enzyme levels and protein cost in natural and engineered pathways, establishes a direct connection between protein cost and thermodynamics, and provides a physically plausible and computationally tractable way to include enzyme kinetics into constraint-based metabolic models, where kinetics have usually been ignored or oversimplified.

**Keywords:** Metabolic flux; Enzyme cost; Enzyme kinetics; Kinetic model; Convex optimization; Central carbon metabolism.

## 1 Introduction

The biochemical world is remarkably diverse, and this is only the tip of the iceberg as new pathways and chemicals are still discovered routinely. Even for model organisms, such as *E. coli*, the exhaustive mapping of their metabolic network is (almost) complete only on the stoichiometric level, but far from perfect when it comes to our understanding of metabolic fluxes, how they are dynamically realized, and how they support cell fitness [1]. Furthermore, the rational designing of novel and efficient metabolic pathways is still a big challenge and metabolic engineering projects require considerable efforts even for relatively simple metabolic tasks. Among the different possible criteria [2], one key to understanding the choices of metabolic routes, both in naturally evolved and engineered organisms, may be enzyme cost. Quite often, cells use metabolic pathways in ways that seem irrational, such as in the case of aerobic fermentation (known as the Crabtree effect in yeast or the Warburg effect in cancer cells [3]). However, apparently yield-inefficient fluxes can sometimes be explained by an economic use




Figure 1: Enzyme cost in metabolism. (a) Measured enzyme levels in *E. coli* central metabolism (molecule counts displayed as rectangle areas). Colors correspond to the network graphics in Figure 3. To predict such protein levels, and to explain the differences between enzymes, we start from known metabolic fluxes and assume that these fluxes are realised by a cost-optimal distribution of enzyme levels. (b) Enzyme-specific flux depends on a number of physical factors. Under ideal conditions, an enzyme molecule catalyses its reaction at a maximal rate given by the enzyme's forward catalytic constant (top left). The rate is reduced by microscopic reverse fluxes (center left) and by incomplete saturation with substrate (causing waiting times between reaction events) or by allosteric inhibition or incomplete activation (bottom left). With lower catalytic rates (center), realizing the same metabolic flux requires larger amounts of enzyme (right).

of enzyme resources [4, 5]. Pathway structures that require too much enzyme per unit flux will be outcompeted during evolution and will not be efficient for use in biotechnological applications. Thus, a quantitative analysis of resource investment in enzyme production, predicting the amount of enzyme needed to support a given flux, as well as the optimal enzyme levels along pathways, would be valuable steps towards a rational design of metabolic pathways.

To understand why specific enzymes or pathways occupy larger or smaller areas of the proteome [6], we could proceed in two steps, determining first the metabolic fluxes and then enzyme levels needed to realise these fluxes. Metabolic fluxes can be measured based on isotope-labeled tracer experiments in combination with computational modeling. Methods for flux prediction *ab initio* rely on mechanistic aspects (chemical mass balances and kinetics) and economic aspects (cost and benefit of pathway fluxes) and combine them in different ways. Constraint-based methods like Flux Balance Analysis (FBA) determine fluxes by requiring steady states – i.e., fluxes must be such that internal metabolite levels remain constant in time – and assuming that natural selection maximizes some benefit function (e.g., maximal yield of biomass). Different optimality criteria for fluxes can be combined in a multi-objective optimization [7, 1]. In some cases, the second law of thermodynamics is used to put further constraints on fluxes or metabolite levels [8, 9, 10, 11]. Some extensions of FBA [12, 13, 14] use metabolite log-concentrations as extra variables and constrain fluxes to flow only in the direction of thermodynamic driving forces, i.e., towards lower chemical potentials. This links flux directions to reactant concentrations, and by including bounds on metabolite levels, flux directions become restricted. These links between fluxes and metabolite concentrations hold independently of specific reaction kinetics. The relationship between fluxes and metabolite concentrations can be used also in opposite direction – i.e. given all flux directions, certain metabolite profiles can be excluded [14]. The set of feasible metabolite profiles can be depicted as a polytope in the space of metabolites' log-concentrations. To further narrow down the metabolite concentration profiles, the Max-min Driving Force (MDF) method [15] chooses profiles that ensure sufficient driving forces, thus keeping reactions distant from chemical equilibrium.

Typically, constraint-based methods do well in defining a space of feasible fluxes and assessing their benefits, but much less in predicting the necessary enzyme levels and the cost of making and maintaining the enzymes. Thus, flux prediction and in designing efficient pathways in bioengineering, how can we estimate the protein demand of a

reaction or pathway, needed to sustain a desired flux? It is often assumed that the flux in a reaction is proportional to the enzyme level. FBA methods use this assumption to translate enzyme expression, as a proxy for protein burden, into flux bounds or linear flux cost functions [16]. For practical reasons (computational tractability and lack of detailed knowledge), flux cost are often represented by the sum of absolute fluxes [17, 18]. To obtain better proxies of protein demand or related cellular burdens, fluxes have been weighted by “flux burdens” that account for different catalytic constants  $k_{\text{cat}}$  [19, 2], protein size and lifetime [20], or equilibrium constants [17]. In reality, however, enzyme demand does not only depend on fluxes, but also on metabolite levels, which in turn are determined by the non-linear kinetics of all enzymes. Therefore, it is not only the choice of numerical cost weights, but the very relation between enzyme amounts and fluxes that needs to be clarified.

For a simple estimate, we can assume that each enzyme molecule works at its maximal rate, the catalytic constant  $k_{\text{cat}}$ . In this case, enzyme demand is given by the flux divided by the catalytic constant [19, 2]. To translate enzyme demand into cost, the different sizes or effective lifetimes of enzymes can be considered [20]. The notion of Pathway Specific Activity [2] applies this principle to measure the efficiency of entire pathways (while assuming that enzyme levels are optimally distributed), and provides a direct way to compare between alternative pathways. However, by assuming that enzymes operate at their maximal capacity, we underestimate the true enzyme demand (see Figure 1). Enzymes typically do not operate at full capacity. This is due to backward fluxes, incomplete substrate saturation, allosteric regulation, and regulatory post-translational modifications. Below, we will refer to allosteric regulation only, but other types of posttranslational regulation, e.g., by phosphorylation, could be treated similarly. The relative backward fluxes depend on the ratio between product and substrate concentrations, called mass-action ratio. Whenever the mass-action ratio deviates from its equilibrium value, called equilibrium constant, this deviation can be conceptualized as a thermodynamic driving force. A driving force determines the relative backward flux and thus affects reaction kinetics and enzymatic efficiency [21, 22]. With smaller forces, the relative backward flux becomes larger, enzyme usage becomes less efficient, and enzyme demand increases [23, 4] – a situation that, in models, can be avoided by applying the MDF method. In fact, a cost increase due to backward fluxes can be included in the principle of minimal fluxes in FBA [17]. However, metabolites do not just affect the thermodynamic forces, as acknowledged in thermodynamic FBA, but affect kinetics as reactants and allosteric effectors. While the relative backward fluxes depend on thermodynamic forces, the forward flux depends on the availability of substrate molecules. At sub-saturating substrate levels, enzyme molecules spend some time waiting for substrate molecules, thus reducing their average catalyzed flux. Likewise, enzyme saturation with product can reduce the fraction of enzyme molecules available for catalysis.

Thus, converting metabolic fluxes into enzyme demand can be difficult because enzymes may not realize their maximal capacity. Since the decrease in enzyme efficiency depends mostly on metabolite concentrations, enzyme and metabolite profiles must be considered together. However, this quickly becomes a cyclic inference problem because steady-state metabolite levels depend again on enzyme profiles. Since many metabolites (e.g., co-factors such as ATP) participate in several pathways, enzyme demands may be coupled across the entire metabolic network. Moreover, there may be many possible enzyme and metabolite profiles that realize the same flux distribution. To determine a single solution, one can make the assumption that the most reasonable enzyme profile for realizing a given flux is the one with the minimal associated cost. This assumption may be justified if we focus on biological systems shaped by evolution, or on engineered pathways that should be efficient. A direct optimisation of enzyme levels can be difficult, but there is a tractable approach in which metabolite levels are treated as free variables, which determine the enzyme levels, and therefore enzyme cost. This approach, together with a minimization of metabolite concentrations [24], has been previously applied to predict enzyme and metabolite levels in metabolic systems [23] and to compare structural variants of glycolysis by their enzyme cost of ATP production [4].

However, to make such optimization schemes generally applicable, some open problems need to be addressed. First, our knowledge of the kinetic rate laws and parameters contains large gaps for the vast majority of enzymes

[25], and combining rate constants from different sources may lead to inconsistent models [26, 27]. Second, the optimization problem may be numerically hard for large networks and realistic rate laws. To turn enzyme cost minimization into a generally applicable method, we address a number of questions: (i) When setting up models for enzyme cost prediction, how can we deal with missing, uncertain, or conflicting data on rate constants? Are there approximations, for instance based on thermodynamics, that yield good predictions with fewer input parameters? (ii) How do factors such as  $k_{\text{cat}}$  value, driving force, or rate law affect enzyme demand, and how do they shape the optimal metabolic state? (iii) How can enzyme optimisation be formulated as a numerically tractable optimality problem? Existing approaches for flux and enzyme prediction have focused on different aspects (stationary state, energetics, kinetics, enzyme or flux costs, molecular crowding). The new approach, which uses kinetics to translate fluxes into enzyme demand, shows how these approaches are logically related, and how heuristic assumptions by other methods, e.g. an avoidance of small driving forces, follow from enzyme economy as a general principle. We show that enzyme cost minimization is closely related to cost-benefit approaches, which treat cell fitness as a function of enzyme levels [28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33]. Some general results of these approaches, e.g., relationships between enzyme costs and metabolic control coefficients, can be recovered.

## 2 Results

### 2.1 Enzyme cost landscape of a metabolic pathway

Given a pathway flux profile and a kinetic model of the pathway, one can predict the enzyme demand by assuming that cells minimize the enzyme cost in that pathway. A reaction rate  $v = E \cdot r(\mathbf{c})$  depends on enzyme level  $E$  and metabolite concentrations  $c_i$  through the enzymatic rate law,  $r(\mathbf{c})$ . If the metabolite levels were known, we could directly compute enzyme demands  $E = v/r(\mathbf{c})$  from fluxes, and similarly calculate the flux-specific enzyme demand  $E/v = 1/r(\mathbf{c})$ . However, metabolite levels are often unknown and vary between experimental conditions. Therefore, there can be many solutions for  $E$  and  $\mathbf{c}$  realizing one flux distribution. To select one of them, we employ an optimality principle: we define an enzyme cost function (for instance, total enzyme mass) and choose the enzyme profile with the lowest cost while restricting the metabolite levels to physiological ranges and imposing some thermodynamic constraints. As we shall see below, the solution is in many cases unique. Let us demonstrate this procedure with a simple example (Figure 2 (a)). In the pathway  $X \rightleftharpoons A \rightleftharpoons B \rightleftharpoons Y$ , the external metabolite levels  $[X]$  and  $[Y]$  are fixed and given, while the intermediate levels  $[A]$  and  $[B]$  need to be found. As rate laws for all three reactions, we use reversible Michaelis-Menten (MM) kinetics

$$v = E \frac{k_{\text{cat}}^+ s/K_S - k_{\text{cat}}^- p/K_P}{1 + s/K_S + p/K_P} \quad (1)$$

with enzyme level  $E$ , substrate and product levels  $s$  and  $p$ , turnover rates  $k_{\text{cat}}^+$  and  $k_{\text{cat}}^-$ , and Michaelis constants  $K_S$  and  $K_P$ . In kinetic modeling, steady-state concentrations would usually be obtained from given enzyme levels and initial conditions through numerical integration. Here, instead, we fix a desired pathway flux  $v$  and compute the enzyme demand as a function of metabolite levels:

$$E(s, p, v) = v \frac{1 + s/K_S + p/K_P}{k_{\text{cat}}^+ s/K_S - k_{\text{cat}}^- p/K_P}. \quad (2)$$

Figure 2 shows how the enzyme demand in each reaction depends on the logarithmic reactant concentrations. To obtain a positive flux, substrate levels  $s$  and product levels  $p$  must be restricted: for instance, to allow for a positive flux in reaction 2, the rate law numerator  $k_{\text{cat}}^+ [A]/K_S - k_{\text{cat}}^- [B]/K_P$  must be positive. This implies that  $[B]/[A] < K_{\text{eq}}$  where the reaction's equilibrium constant  $K_{\text{eq}}$  is determined by the Haldane relationship,  $K_{\text{eq}} = (k_{\text{cat}}^+/k_{\text{cat}}^-) \cdot (K_P/K_S)$ . With all model parameters set to 1, we obtain the constraint  $[B]/[A] < 1$ ,




Figure 2: Enzyme demand in a metabolic pathway. (a) Pathway with reversible Michaelis-Menten kinetics (equilibrium constants, catalytic constants, and  $K_M$  values are set to values of 1,  $[A]$  and  $[B]$  denote the variable concentrations of intermediates A and B in mM). The external metabolite levels  $[X]$  and  $[Y]$  are fixed. Plots (b)-(d) show the enzyme demand of reactions 1, 2, and 3 at given flux  $v = 1$  according to Eq. (2). Grey regions represent infeasible metabolite profiles. At the edges of the feasible region (where A and B are close to chemical equilibrium), the thermodynamic driving force goes to zero. Since small forces must be compensated by high enzyme levels, edges of the feasible region are always dark blue. For example, in reaction 1 (panel (b)), enzyme demand increases with the level of A (x-axis) and goes to infinity as the mass-action ratio  $[A]/[X]$  approaches the equilibrium constant (where the driving force vanishes). (e) Total enzyme demand, obtained by summing all enzyme levels. The metabolite polytope – the intersection of feasible regions for all reactions – is a triangle, and enzyme demand is a cup-shaped function on this triangle. The minimum point defines the optimal metabolite levels and optimal enzyme levels. (f) As the  $k_{cat}$  value of the first reaction is lowered by a factor of 5, states close to the triangle edge of reaction 1 become more expensive and the optimum point is shifted away from the edge. (g) The same model with a physiological upper bound on the concentration  $[A]$ . The bound defines a new triangle edge. Since this edge is not caused by thermodynamics, it can contain an optimum point, in which driving forces are far from zero and enzyme costs are kept low.

i.e.,  $\ln[B] - \ln[A] < 0$ , putting a straight boundary on the feasible region (Figure 2 (c)). Close to chemical equilibrium ( $[B]/[A] \approx K_{eq}$ ), the enzyme demand  $E_2$  approaches infinity. Beyond that ratio ( $[B]/[A] > K_{eq}$ ) no positive flux can be achieved (grey region). Such a threshold exists for each reaction (see Figure 2 (b)-(d)). The remaining feasible metabolite profiles form a triangle in log-concentration space, which we call *metabolite polytope*  $\mathcal{P}$  (Figure 2 (e)), and Eq. (2) yields the total enzyme demand  $E_{tot} = E_1 + E_2 + E_3$ , as a function on the metabolite polytope. The demand increases steeply towards the edges and becomes minimal in the center. The minimum point marks the optimal metabolite profile, and via Eq. (2) we obtain the resulting optimal enzyme profile.

The metabolite polytope and the large enzyme demand at its boundaries follow directly from thermodynamics. To see this, we consider the unitless *thermodynamic driving force*  $\Theta = -\Delta_r G' / RT$  [34] derived from the reaction Gibbs free energy  $\Delta_r G'$ . The thermodynamic force can be written as  $\Theta = \ln \frac{K_{eq}}{[B]/[A]}$ , i.e., the driving force is positive whenever  $[B]/[A]$  is smaller than  $K_{eq}$ , and it vanishes if  $[B]/[A] = K_{eq}$ . How is this force related to enzyme cost? A reaction's net flux is given by the difference  $v = v^+ - v^-$  of forward and backward fluxes, and the ratio  $v^+/v^-$  depends on the driving force as  $v^+/v^- = e^\Theta$ . Thus, only a fraction  $v/v^+ = 1 - e^{-\Theta}$  of the forward flux acts as a net flux, while the remaining forward flux is cancelled by the backward flux (SI Figure S1). Close to chemical equilibrium, where the mass-action ratio  $[B]/[A]$  approaches the equilibrium constant  $K_{eq}$ , the driving force goes to zero, the reaction's backward flux increases, and the flux per enzyme level drops. This is what happens at the triangle edges in Figure 2: a reaction approaches chemical equilibrium, the driving force  $\Theta$

goes to zero, and large enzyme amounts are needed for compensation. Exactly on the edge, the driving force vanishes and no enzyme level, no matter how large, can support a positive flux. The quantitative cost depends on model parameters: for example, by lowering a  $k_{\text{cat}}$  value, the cost for the enzyme increases at the boundary becomes steeper and the optimum point is shifted away from the boundary (see Figure 2 (f) and SI Figure S2).

## 2.2 Enzyme cost as a function of metabolite profiles

The prediction of optimal metabolite and enzyme levels can be extended to models with general rate laws and complex network structures. In general, enzyme demand depends not only on driving forces and  $k_{\text{cat}}$  values, but also on the kinetic rate law, which includes  $K_M$  values and allosteric regulation. Thus, we need to model these factors and approximate them when kinetic information is missing. The rate of a reaction depends on enzyme level  $E$ , forward catalytic constant  $k_{\text{cat}}^+$  (i.e. the maximal possible forward rate per unit of enzyme, in  $\text{s}^{-1}$ ), driving force (i.e., the ratio of forward and backward fluxes), and on kinetic effects such as substrate saturation or allosteric regulation. If all active fluxes are positive, reversible rate laws like the Michaelis-Menten kinetics in Eq. (1) can be factorized as [22]

$$v = E \cdot k_{\text{cat}}^+ \cdot \eta^{\text{th}} \cdot \eta^{\text{kin}}. \quad (3)$$

With some rate laws,  $\eta^{\text{kin}}$  can be further subdivided into  $\eta^{\text{kin}} = \eta^{\text{sat}} \cdot \eta^{\text{reg}}$ , where  $\eta^{\text{reg}}$  refers to certain types of allosteric regulation (see example in Box 1). Negative fluxes, which would complicate our formulae, can be avoided by orienting the reactions in the direction of fluxes. The reversible Michaelis-Menten rate law Eq. (1), for instance, can be written in this separable form [22]:

$$v = E k_{\text{cat}}^+ \frac{s/K_S \left(1 - \frac{k_{\text{cat}}^- p/K_P}{k_{\text{cat}}^+ s/K_S}\right)}{1 + s/K_S + p/K_P} = E k_{\text{cat}}^+ \underbrace{\left(1 - \frac{k_{\text{cat}}^- p/K_P}{k_{\text{cat}}^+ s/K_S}\right)}_{\eta^{\text{th}}} \underbrace{\frac{s/K_S}{1 + s/K_S + p/K_P}}_{\eta^{\text{kin}}}, \quad (4)$$

and similar factorizations exist for reactions of any stoichiometry (see SI S1.1). The term  $E \cdot k_{\text{cat}}^+$  describes the maximal reaction velocity, which is reduced, depending on metabolite levels, by condition-specific factors  $\eta^{\text{th}}$ ,  $\eta^{\text{sat}}$  and  $\eta^{\text{reg}}$  (see Fig 1b), accounting for backward fluxes, incomplete substrate saturation, saturation with product, or allosteric regulation. The thermodynamic factor  $\eta^{\text{th}}$  can be expressed in terms of the driving force  $\Theta \equiv -\Delta_r G' / RT$  by the general formula  $\eta^{\text{th}} = 1 - e^{-\Theta}$ , which also applies to reactions with multiple substrates and products [22]. The factors  $\eta^{\text{kin}}$  depends on the rate law and thus on the enzyme mechanism considered (see SI S1.1). Enzyme demand can be quantified as a concentration (e.g., enzyme molecules per volume) or mass concentration (where enzyme molecules are weighted by their molecular weights). If rate laws, fluxes, and metabolite levels are known, the enzyme demand of a single reaction  $l$  follows from Eq. (3) as

$$E_l(\mathbf{c}, v_l) = v_l \cdot \frac{1}{k_{\text{cat},l}^+} \cdot \frac{1}{\eta_l^{\text{th}}(\Theta(\mathbf{c}))} \cdot \frac{1}{\eta_l^{\text{sat}}(\mathbf{c})} \cdot \frac{1}{\eta_l^{\text{reg}}(\mathbf{c})}. \quad (5)$$

To determine the enzyme demand of an entire pathway, we sum over all reactions:  $E_{\text{tot}} = \sum_l E_l$ . Based on its enzyme demands  $E_l$ , we can associate each metabolic flux with an enzyme cost  $q = \sum_l h_{E_l} E_l$ , describing the effort of maintaining the enzymes. The burdens  $h_{E_l}$  of different enzymes represent, e.g., differences in molecular mass, post-translation modifications, enzyme maintenance, overhead costs for ribosomes, as well as effects of misfolding and non-specific catalysis. The enzyme burdens  $h_{E_l}$  can be chosen heuristically, for instance, depending on enzyme sizes, amino acid composition, and lifetimes (see SI S2.1). Setting  $h_{E_l} = m_l$  (protein mass in Daltons),  $q$  will be in gram protein per gram cell dry weight. Considering the specific amino acid composition of

enzymes, we can also assign specific costs to the different amino acids. Alternatively, an empirical cost per protein molecule can be established by the level of growth impairment that an artificial induction of protein would cause [35, 36]. Thus, each reaction flux  $v_l$  is associated with an enzyme cost  $q_l$ , which can be written as a function  $q_l(v_l, \mathbf{c}) \equiv h_{E_l} E_l(\mathbf{c}, v_l)$  of flux and metabolite concentrations. From now on, we refer to log-scale metabolite concentrations  $s_i = \ln c_i$  to obtain simple optimality problems below. From the separable rate law Eq. (5), we obtain the enzyme cost function

$$q(\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{v}) \equiv \sum_l h_{E_l} E_l(v_l, \mathbf{s}) = \sum_l h_{E_l} \cdot v_l \cdot \frac{1}{k_{cat,l}^+} \cdot \frac{1}{\eta_l^{th}(\mathbf{s})} \cdot \frac{1}{\eta_l^{sat}(\mathbf{s})} \cdot \frac{1}{\eta_l^{reg}(\mathbf{s})} \quad (6)$$

for a given pathway flux  $\mathbf{v}$ . If the fluxes are fixed and given, our enzyme cost becomes, at least formally, a function of the metabolite levels. We call it *enzyme-based metabolic cost* (EMC) to emphasize this fact. The cost function is defined on the metabolite polytope  $\mathcal{P}$ , a convex polytope in log-concentration space containing the feasible metabolite profiles. Like the triangle in Figure 2, the polytope is defined by physiological and thermodynamic constraints. It can be bounded by two types of faces: On “E-faces”, one reaction is in equilibrium, and enzyme cost goes to infinity; “P-faces” stem from physiological metabolite bounds. The shape of the cost function depends on rate laws, rate constants, and enzyme burdens, and its minimum points can be inside the polytope or on a P-face (see Figure 2 (f)).

### 2.3 Enzyme cost minimization

The cost function  $q(\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{v})$  reflects a trade-off between fluxes to be realized and enzyme expression to be minimized, where the relation between fluxes and enzyme levels is not fixed, but depends on metabolite log-concentrations  $\mathbf{s}$ . Wherever trade-offs exist in biology, it is common to assume that evolution converges to Pareto-optimal solutions [1], e.g., metabolic states for which there are no other solutions that have the same flux but with a lower cost  $q$ , or the same cost  $q$  but with a higher flux. Therefore, for a given measured flux  $\mathbf{v}$ , we may expect to find profiles of metabolite and enzyme concentrations that minimize  $q$ . We can now use this principle to predict metabolite and enzyme concentrations in cells. As with our simple model in Figure 1, minimizing the enzyme cost on the metabolite polytope yields an optimal metabolite profile, from which the optimal enzyme profile can be computed using Eq. (5).

The resulting method, which we call enzyme cost minimization (ECM), is a convex optimization problem and can be solved with local optimizers. Enzyme demand and enzyme cost functions, for single reactions or pathways, are differentiable, convex functions on the metabolite polytope. This convexity holds for a variety of rate laws, including rate laws describing polymerization reactions [37], and even for the more complicated problem of preemptive enzyme expression, i.e., a cost-optimal choice of enzyme levels that allows the cell to deal with a number of future conditions (see SI S3.5). If a model contains non-enzymatic reactions, this changes the shape of the metabolite polytope, but not the enzyme cost function, and the polytope remains convex, e.g., if the non-enzymatic reactions are irreversible with mass-action rate laws (see Methods). Obviously, metabolite and enzyme levels may be under various other constraints that are not reflected in our pathway model. To assess how easily the metabolic state can be adapted to external requirements, we can study the cost of deviations from the optimal metabolite levels. If the cost function  $q(\mathbf{s})$  has a broad optimum as in Figure 2, cells may flexibly realize metabolite profiles around the optimal point, and the choice of metabolite levels may vary from cell to cell. We can quantify the tolerable variations by relaxing the optimality assumptions and a computing tolerance range for each metabolite level. To apply ECM in practice, we developed a workflow in which a kinetic model is constructed, a consistent set of kinetic constants is determined by parameter balancing [38, 39], and optimal metabolite and enzyme levels are predicted along with their tolerance ranges. Different types of EMC function and constraints (e.g., allowed ranges for metabolite levels) can be chosen. Missing data (e.g.,  $K_M$  values), can

### Box 1: Separable rate laws and enzyme cost function

According to Eq. (3), reversible rate laws can be factorized into five terms that depend on metabolite levels in different ways [22]. For a reaction  $S \rightleftharpoons P$  with reversible Michaelis-Menten kinetics Eq. (1), a driving force  $\theta = -\Delta_r G' / RT$ , and a prefactor for non-competitive allosteric inhibition, the rate law can be written as


$$v = E \cdot k_{\text{cat}}^+ \cdot \underbrace{[1 - e^{-\theta}]}_{\eta^{\text{th}}} \cdot \underbrace{\frac{s/K_S}{1 + s/K_S + p/K_P}}_{\eta^{\text{kin}}} \cdot \frac{1}{1 + x/K_I}$$

$$\text{Rate} = \underbrace{E}_{\text{enzyme level}} \cdot \underbrace{k_{\text{cat}}^+}_{\text{forward catalytic constant}} \cdot \underbrace{\eta^{\text{th}}}_{\text{thermodynamic factor}} \cdot \underbrace{\eta^{\text{kin}}}_{\text{kinetic factor}} \cdot \frac{1}{1 + x/K_I}$$

with inhibitor concentration  $x$ . In the example, with non-competitive allosteric inhibition, the kinetic factor  $\eta^{\text{kin}}$  could even be split into a product  $\eta^{\text{sat}} \cdot \eta^{\text{reg}}$ . The first two terms in our example,  $E \cdot k_{\text{cat}}^+$ , represent the maximal velocity (the rate at full substrate-saturation, no backward flux, full allosteric activation), while the following factors decrease this velocity for different reasons: the factor  $\eta^{\text{th}}$  describes a decrease due to backward fluxes (see SI Figure S1) and the factor  $\eta^{\text{kin}}$  describes a further decrease due to incomplete substrate saturation and allosteric regulation (see Figure 1 b). While  $k_{\text{cat}}^+$  is an enzyme-specific constant (yet, dependent on conditions such as pH, ionic strength, or molecular crowding in cells; unit 1/s), the efficiency factors are concentration-dependent, unitless, and can vary between 0 and 1. The thermodynamic factor  $\eta^{\text{th}}$  depends on the driving force (and thus, indirectly, on metabolite levels), and the equilibrium constant is required for its calculation. The saturation factor  $\eta^{\text{sat}}$  depends directly on metabolite levels and contains the  $K_M$  values as parameters. Allosteric regulation yields additive or multiplicative terms in the rate law denominator, which in our example and can be captured by a separate factor  $\eta^{\text{reg}}$ . The enzyme cost for a flux  $v$ , with an enzyme burden  $h_E$ , can be written as

$$q = h_E \cdot E = h_E \cdot v \cdot \frac{1}{k_{\text{cat}}^+} \cdot \underbrace{\frac{1}{[1 - e^{-\theta}]}}_{1/\eta^{\text{th}}} \cdot \underbrace{\frac{1 + s/K_S + p/K_P}{s/K_S}}_{1/\eta^{\text{kin}}} \cdot [1 + x/K_I]$$

and contains the terms from the rate law in inverse form. The first factors,  $h_E v / k_{\text{cat}}^+$ , define a minimum enzyme cost, which is then increased by the following efficiency factors. Again,  $1/\eta^{\text{kin}}$  can be split into  $1/\eta^{\text{sat}} \cdot 1/\eta^{\text{reg}}$ . By omitting some of these factors, one can construct simplified enzyme cost functions with higher specific rates, or lower enzyme demands (compare Figure 1b). For a closer approximation, the factors may be substituted with constant numbers between 0 and 1. The conversion between fluxes and enzyme levels, in both directions, is shown below.



On a logarithmic scale, rates and enzyme cost can be split into sums of efficiency terms. (a) Starting from the logarithmic enzyme level (dashed line on top), we add the terms  $\log k_{\text{cat}}^+$ ,  $\log \eta^{\text{th}}$ , and  $\log \eta^{\text{kin}}$ , and obtain better and better approximation of the rate. In the example shown,  $k_{\text{cat}}^+$  has a numerical value smaller than 1. The more precise approximations (with more terms) yield smaller rates. The ECF4 arrows refer to other possible rate laws with additional terms in the denominator. (b) Enzyme demand is shaped by the same factors (see Eq. (5)). Starting from a desired flux (bottom line), the predicted demand increases as more terms are considered.

thus be handled in two ways: either, by using a simplified EMC function that does not require this parameter, or by relying on parameter values that are chosen by the workflow based on parameter balancing.



EMC function	$\eta^{\text{th}}(\Theta(\mathbf{c}))$	$\eta^{\text{kin}}(\mathbf{c})$	Parameters	Denominators	Depends on
EMC0 (“Sum of fluxes”)	-	-	-		
EMC1 (“Capacity-based”)	-	-	$h_E, k_{\text{cat}}^+$		
EMC2 (“Energy-based”)	✓	-	$h_E, k_{\text{cat}}^+, K_{\text{eq}}$	$D^S, D^{\text{SP}}$	Driving force
EMC3 (“Saturation-based”)	✓	✓	$h_E, k_{\text{cat}}^+, K_{\text{eq}}, K_M$	$D^{1S}, D^{1\text{SP}}$	Metabolite levels
EMC4 (“Kinetics-based”)	✓	✓	$h_E, k_{\text{cat}}^+, K_{\text{eq}}, K_M$	general	Metabolite levels

Table 1: Simplified enzyme cost functions. By omitting some terms in Eq. (5), we obtain a number of cost functions with simple dependencies on enzyme parameters and metabolite levels. Terms marked by ✓ appear explicitly in the rate and cost formulae, while other terms are omitted or set to constant values. The EMC0 function yields the sum of fluxes, EMC1 functions contain enzyme-specific flux burdens based on  $k_{\text{cat}}$  and  $h$  values (i.e., replacing reaction rates by their maximal velocities). EMC2 depends on metabolite levels only via the driving forces. EMC3 functions are based on simplified rate laws, and EMC4 functions capture all rate laws, possibly including allosteric regulation. The rate law denominators  $D^S, D^{\text{SP}}, D^{1S}$ , and  $D^{1\text{SP}}$  are described in SI S1.1, the EMC functions themselves in SI S2.2.

## 2.4 Which factors shape the optimal enzyme profile and how?

What determines the demand for specific enzymes? If the metabolite levels are known, we can easily see by analyzing the efficiency factors in Eq. (6) (see Box 1). By omitting some factors or replacing them by constant numbers  $0 < \eta \leq 1$ , simplified enzyme cost functions with fewer parameters can be obtained. For example,  $\eta^{\text{th}} = 1$  would imply an infinite driving force  $\Theta \rightarrow \infty$  and a vanishing backward flux,  $\eta^{\text{kin}} = 1$  implies full substrate saturation, as well as full allosteric activation and no allosteric inhibition (or no allosteric regulation at all). In these limiting cases, enzyme activity will not be reduced, and enzyme demand will be given by the capacity-based estimate  $v/k_{\text{cat}}^+$ , a lower estimate of the actual demand. Instead of omitting an efficiency factor, it can also be set to a constant value between 0 and 1. Such simplifications and the resulting enzyme cost functions with fewer parameters can be practical if rate constants are unknown.

Depending on the type of data available (e.g.,  $k_{\text{cat}}$  values, equilibrium constants, or even  $K_M$  values), one may choose between different types of cost functions with different data requirements: EMC0 (“sum-of-fluxes-based” same prefactors for all enzymes), EMC1 (“capacity-based”, setting all  $\eta = 1$  and thus replacing reaction rates by the maximal velocities), EMC2 (“energy-based”; considering driving forces, and setting  $\eta^{\text{kin}} = 1$ ), EMC3 (“saturation-based”, assuming simple rate laws depending on products of substrate or product concentrations, and including the driving forces), and EMC4 functions (“kinetics-based”; with dependence on individual metabolite levels). Details of the simplified EMC functions are given in Table 1 and SI S2. Each EMC function is a lower bound on the following functions; i.e., even if only a simplified cost function can be used, it will always yield a lower bound on the actual enzyme cost.

Let us consider the different simplifications in more detail. As long as fluxes are the only data available, we may assign identical catalytic constants and enzyme burdens to all enzymes and assume that all reactions run at their maximal velocities. Then, enzyme levels and fluxes will be proportional across the network and the cost function Eq. (6) will be of type EMC0 and proportional to the sum of fluxes. However, catalytic constants span many orders of magnitude [25] and enzyme molecular masses are quite variable as well, suggesting that EMC0 is a strong oversimplification. In contrast, if individual  $k_{\text{cat}}^+$  and  $h_{E_l}$  values are known, we obtain an EMC1 cost function, which is still independent of metabolite levels. In the flux cost function  $\sum_l a_{v_l}^{\text{cat}} v_l$ , each enzyme has an individual flux burden  $a_{v_l}^{\text{cat}} = h_{E_l}/k_{\text{cat}l}^+$ , and the same ratios have been used as cost weights in FBA with flux minimization [17] or molecular crowding [19]. If  $k_{\text{cat}}$  values are unknown, they may be replaced by “typical” values (see [25]). The enzyme burdens  $h_E$  can subsume factors like protein size, protein lifetime, covalent modifications, or space restrictions (see [20] and SI S2.1); if these are unknown, one may assume that all enzymes are equally costly, setting their burdens to  $h_{E_l} = 1$ . While the specific costs  $h_E$  are relatively uniform, the  $k_{\text{cat}}$  values vary within five orders of magnitude [25], and are thus the major determinant of  $a_{v_l}^{\text{cat}}$ .

However, by setting  $\eta^{\text{th}} = \eta^{\text{kin}} = 1$ , we may obtain unrealistic results. First, the simplifying assumption  $\eta^{\text{th}} = \eta^{\text{kin}} = 1$  implies uncontrollable metabolic states. In a kinetic model with completely irreversible and substrate-saturated enzymes, the reaction rates would be *independent* of metabolite levels and the steady state would depend on finely tuned enzyme levels. Any random variation of the enzyme levels would lead to non-steady states, with fast accumulation or depletion of intermediate metabolites. Such states are extremely fragile and thus uncontrollable. When assuming efficiencies  $\eta^{\text{th}}$  or  $\eta^{\text{kin}}$  smaller than 1, we accept an increased cost and thereby acknowledge that controllability must be paid by enzyme investments. Second, EMC1 functions underestimate all enzyme costs, and in reactions close to chemical equilibrium the errors may become large. At a reaction Gibbs energy of  $\Delta_r G' = -0.1 RT$ , the efficiency of the catalyzing enzyme decreases by a factor of  $\eta^{\text{th}} = 1 - e^{0.1} \approx 0.1$ , and the demand for enzyme increases by a factor of  $1/\eta^{\text{th}} \approx 10$ . To account for this effect, we can use EMC2 functions, considering the thermodynamic factor  $\eta_l^{\text{th}} = 1 - e^{-\Theta_l(s)}$ . The driving forces are expressed in terms of metabolite log-concentrations  $\Theta_l(s)$  and equilibrium constants, which need to be known. This factor approaches infinity as reactions reach equilibrium (i.e. where  $\Theta_l \rightarrow 0$ ), which is what keeps reactions away from equilibrium during cost minimization (see, for example, Figure 2).

Compared to the following EMC3 and EMC4 functions, the advantage of EMC2 functions is that they are based on equilibrium constants only, i.e., on a physical property of the reacting compounds that does not depend on the enzyme at all. Several *in silico* methods exist to estimate  $K_{\text{eq}}$  for virtually any biochemical reaction [40, 41] and the values can be easily obtained at <http://equilibrator.weizmann.ac.il/> [42]. Methods like MDF [15] and mTOW [23] have been developed to address exactly this situation, where detailed kinetic information is hard to obtain. We discuss the relation between EMC2 and MDF in SI S4. Of course, in all of these cases,  $k_{\text{cat}}$  values still have to be guesstimated or set to identical values for all enzymes. Aside from the EMC2 function, there are other energy-based estimates of the enzyme cost. For instance, the enzyme demand in Figure 2 (an EMC3 function with kinetic constants, fluxes, and enzyme burdens set to 1) has the energy-based cost  $a_v^{\text{pw}} = \sum_l [1 - e^{-\Theta(c)}]^{-1}$  as a lower estimate. Since  $1 - e^{-x} \leq x$  for all positive  $x$ , an even lower estimate is  $\sum_l \Theta(c)^{-1}$  (Figures S3 and S4 in SI). Some variants of FBA relate fluxes to metabolite profiles, which are then required to be thermodynamically feasible, i.e., within the metabolite polytope. ECM constrains the metabolite profiles even further: as shown in Figure 2, profiles close to an E-face are very costly and can never be optimal. This holds for EMC2 functions and for the more realistic enzyme costs, which will even be higher. Thus, regions close to E-faces can be excluded from the polytope. At P-faces, defined by physiological bounds, there will be no such increase, so the optimum may lie on a P-face (see Figure 2 (f)). To do so, we simply define lower bounds for all driving forces (see SI S4): these bounds can be used both in ECM or in thermodynamic FBA to reduce the search space for metabolite profiles.

The next logical step is to relax the assumption that  $\eta^{\text{kin}} = 1$ . Just like the thermodynamic factor  $\eta^{\text{th}}$ , the kinetic factors  $\eta^{\text{sat}}$  and  $\eta^{\text{reg}}$  can be used to define tighter constraints on metabolite levels. However, unlike  $\eta^{\text{th}}$ , the kinetic terms can take various forms and contain many kinetic parameters. To obtain simple, but reasonable formulae, we first consider rate laws in which enzyme molecules exist only in three possible states: unbound, bound to all substrate molecules, or bound to all product molecules. Metabolites affect the rate only through the mass-action terms  $S = \prod_i (s_i/K_{M_i})$  (for substrates) and  $P = \prod_j p_j/K_{M_j}$  (for products), and the degree of saturation is determined by  $\eta^{\text{kin}} = S/(1+S+P)$ , where the formula contains only one Michaelis-Menten constant for all substrates and (optionally) one for all products. Since EMC3 requires both  $k_{\text{cat}}$  and  $K_M$  values for every enzyme, and  $k_{\text{cat}}$  values are more likely to be known than  $K_M$  values, there is no real reason to consider cases where the  $k_{\text{cat}}$  value is not known. EMC3 represents a good balance between complexity and requirement for kinetic parameters, and is a practical cost function if simple, realistic rate laws are desired. The EMC4 functions, finally, represent general rate laws and  $\eta^{\text{kin}}$  can take many different forms depending on mechanism and order of enzyme-substrate binding. Again, for simplicity, we resort to analyzing only a small set of relatively general templates for EMC4, known as convenience kinetics [43] or modular rate laws [21]. Nevertheless, our formalism




Figure 3: Predicted enzyme levels in *E. coli* central metabolism. (a) Network model with pathways marked by colors. Flux magnitudes are represented by the arrows' thickness. (b) The ratio flux/ $k_{cat}^+$  (EMC1) as a predictor for enzyme levels. Points on the dashed line would represent precise predictions. (c) Enzyme levels predicted by the energy-based EMC2(S) function. Vertical bars indicate tolerance ranges obtained from a relaxed optimality condition (allowing for a one percent increase in total enzyme cost). (d) Enzyme levels predicted with EMC3 function representing fast substrate or product binding. (e) Enzyme levels predicted with EMC4 function based on the common modular rate law [21]. In all sub-figures (b-e), RMSE is the root mean squared error (in log<sub>10</sub>-scale) of our predictions compared to the measured enzyme levels, and  $r$  stands for the Pearson correlation coefficient. Predictions are based on fluxes from [44],  $k_{cat}^+$  and  $K_M$  values from BRENDA [45], and compared to protein data from [46]. For metabolite predictions, see SI Figure S6.

allows a much wider range of rate laws, and we consider EMC4 a wild-card cost function that covers almost any well-behaved metabolic rate law (see SI S2.2 for more details).

## 2.5 Enzyme and metabolite levels in *E. coli* central metabolism

To benchmark our prediction of metabolite and enzyme levels and to see whether more complex EMC functions improve the predictions, we applied ECM to a model of *E. coli* central metabolism, containing three major pathways: glycolysis, the pentose phosphate pathway, and the TCA cycle (see Figure 3 (a), and Methods for modeling details). Figure 3 (b-d) compares predicted enzyme profiles to measured protein levels [46]. The absolute values of predicted enzyme levels arise directly from the model, using the fluxes reported in [44] (e.g., glucose uptake rate 8.13 mmol/gCDW/h), while cellular protein concentrations were obtained from proteomics data (measured in similar conditions [46]) and assuming an average cell volume of  $\sim 1$  fL ( $10^{-15}$  liters) [47]. EMC4 predicts values that are in the right order of magnitude and reflect differences in enzyme levels along the pathways. The prediction error of 0.43 for enzyme levels (RMSE: root mean square error on a log<sub>10</sub> scale) corresponds to a typical fold error of  $10^{\text{RMSE}} = 2.7$ . In line with the measured protein levels, the predicted enzyme levels tend to be larger in glycolysis than in TCA and pentose phosphate pathway, reflecting the larger fluxes. Predicted metabolite concentrations (RMSE 0.58, corresponding to a typical fold error of 3.8), thermodynamic forces and  $c/K_M$  ratios are shown in a supplementary file.

We note that the predicted enzyme levels become more accurate when stepping up to more complex cost functions,




Figure 4: Enzyme demand in central metabolism. (a) Measured fluxes for all reactions (black dots on top) lead to an enzyme demand (bottom). The enzyme demand, predicted by using the energy-based EMC2s cost function, can be split into factors representing enzyme capacity and thermodynamics (see Box 1). Bars show predicted enzyme levels in mM for individual enzymes on logarithmic scale (compare Figure 1 b). Yellow dots denote measured enzyme levels (in mM). Note that the bars do not represent additive costs, but multiplicative cost terms on logarithmic scale; therefore, the relevant feature of the blue bars is not their absolute lengths, but their differences between enzymes. (b) The kinetics-based EMC4cm cost function includes saturation terms and yields more accurate predictions. Starting from the capacity cost (in blue), the thermodynamic (purple) and saturation (red) terms increase the enzyme demands and make them less variable between enzymes (on log-scale). Note that flux data (circle) and protein data (yellow dots) are identical in both plots.

with a prediction error decreasing monotonously from 1.34 to 0.43. The capacity-based enzyme cost (EMC1) assumes that enzymes operate at full capacity ( $v = E k_{cat}^+$ ) and therefore underestimates all enzyme levels (Figure 3 (c)). In reality, many reactions in central metabolism are reversible and many substrates do not reach saturating concentrations. When taking these effects into account, the predictions come closer to measured enzyme levels (Figure 3 (c-d)). For instance, FUM (fumarase, fumA) and MDH (malate dehydrogenase) have a much higher predicted level in EMC2-4 than in EMC1 since the thermodynamics-based costs account for their low driving force. Similarly, the predicted levels of two pentose-phosphate enzymes (Ribulose-5-phosphate epimerase RPE and ribose phosphate isomerase RPI) are much higher in EMC3 and EMC4 because of their low affinity to the substrate ribulose-5-phosphate (Ru5P). In some cases, however, the more complex EMC4 fails to improve the prediction over the simpler methods and can actually make them worse. For instance, the 6-phosphogluconolactonase (PGL) and pyruvate kinase (PYK) reactions are underestimated in all cases and do not improve significantly in EMC4. Glucose 6-phosphate dehydrogenase (ZWF) is predicted quite well by EMC2-3, but its level is overestimated in EMC4. Overall, the EMC4 function performs substantially better on average than the simpler cost functions even though it relies on a much larger set of parameters, many of which are known with low certainty. To test the sensitivity of our results to the choice of proteomic data, we repeated the entire analysis using measured enzyme concentrations from [48] and reached essentially the same findings.

Although ECM puts enzymes on a pedestal due to their relatively high cost, the metabolite concentrations are key to minimizing that cost. One would thus expect to find a good correspondence between the predicted metabolite profile and concentrations measured *in vivo*, especially when the predictions of the enzyme levels are good. Since some of the EMC functions leave metabolite levels underdetermined, we penalized very high or low metabolite concentrations by adding a second, concentration-dependent objective to the optimization problem. In particular for EMC0 and EMC1, this regularization term is the only term – aside from global constraints – that determines the metabolite concentrations since metabolites have no effect on enzyme cost whatsoever. In all other cases, the term mostly influences metabolites that have a minimal effect on the cost. Comparing the EMC metabolite

prediction with in vivo experimental data, as shown in SI Figure S6, the predicted metabolite levels are in the correct scale. Similarly to enzyme level predictions, the error decreases from EMC1 to EMC4cm, where we find a prediction error of about 0.58 (corresponding to a typical fold error of 3.8), slightly higher than the prediction error for enzymes (see Figure 3 (e)).

Can we now explain the cellular enzyme levels? Figure 4, just like the scheme in Figure 1 (b), shows the specific contributions to enzyme demand in each reaction. A simple (EMC2) prediction based on driving forces predicts the thermodynamic cost terms already quite reliably and improves the enzyme prediction. However, accounting for incomplete substrate saturation, described by the saturation cost term, has an even larger effect on cost in most enzymes. For practical cost estimates, for instance when computing flux burdens for FBA, we can conclude that multiplying the experimentally determined  $k_{\text{cat}}$  values by energetic factors tends to improve the results. However, total enzyme demand will still be underestimated.

### 3 Discussion

When applying mathematical models to learn about biology, one typically faces a conflict between desired model accuracy and the amount of available data. Metabolic systems are known to abide to several physical and physiological considerations, all of which are mathematically well-described (e.g. flux balance, thermodynamics, kinetics, and cost-benefit optimality). Taking all of these aspects into account would create very detailed models but at the price of considerably increasing the demand for data. Here, we obtain a flexible modelling method by combining the two main modelling approaches, constraint-based and kinetic modelling, in a new way: with fixed metabolic fluxes, kinetic models are used to determine a cost-optimal state. The tiered approach in ECM allows for different levels of detail, which can easily be matched to the amount of existing data. The minimal requirement for running ECM is to have a metabolic network with given steady-state fluxes, while the maximal requirement would be a fully parameterized kinetic model. Although similar approaches exist in dynamic modeling [49, 39] and enzyme optimization [23, 4, 15], ECM extends these ideas to the most general kinetic rate laws and cost functions, while proving that the emerging optimization problem is convex and thus easily (albeit numerically) solvable. We discuss the advances made by ECM in detail by listing these five points:

**1. Solving the enzyme optimality problem in metabolite space** One way of modelling the cost and benefit of enzymes is to study kinetic models and to treat enzyme levels as free variables to be optimized. However, this calculation can be hard because enzyme profiles may lead to one, several, or no steady states, and the resulting optimality problem can be non-convex. By using fluxes, and then metabolite concentrations, as our primary variables, we drastically simplify this task. In thermodynamic FBA, known flux directions are used to determine a set of feasible metabolite profiles, the metabolite polytope. Here, the same set is used as a space for screening, sampling, and optimization of metabolic states; accordingly bounds on metabolite concentrations or driving forces can be easily formulated as linear constraints. Using log-concentrations as free variables, we can enumerate all possible metabolite profiles, solve for the enzyme profiles, and obtain a systematic parametrization of all (steady and non-steady) states (see SI Figure S5) – which renders a screening of enzyme space obsolete.

**2. Convexity** The metabolite polytope does not only provide a good search space, but it also facilitates optimization because enzyme cost is a convex function of the metabolite log-concentrations (see SI S3.2). Convexity makes the optimization tractable and scalable (see SI S3.2) – unlike a direct optimization in enzyme space. Simple convexity holds for a wide range of rate laws and for extended versions of the problem, e.g., including bounds on the sum of (non-logarithmic) metabolite levels or bounds on weighted sums of enzyme fractions. By adding a regularization term, representing biological side objectives, we can even ensure strict convexity, and thus the existence of a unique optimum that can be efficiently found.

**3. Separable rate laws disentangle individual enzyme cost effects** To assess how different physical factors

shape metabolic states, we focused on separable rate laws, which lead to a series of easily interpretable, convex cost functions. The terms in these functions represent specific physical factors and require different kinetic and thermodynamic data for their calculation. By neglecting some of the terms, one obtains different approximations of the true enzyme cost. The more terms are considered, the more precise our predictions about metabolic states becomes (see Figure 2.2 and SI S2). Of course, it is often important to keep models simple and the number of parameters small, and therefore the stripped-down versions of ECM can be useful as well. For instance, in some conditions such as batch-fed *E. coli*, a simple enzyme economy might still be a realistic approximation. Our results for EMC4 (see Figure 3) indicate that indeed one can predict enzyme levels quite well even with this relatively simple objective. Finally, in conditions where ECM's predictions are far from the measured enzyme levels, we can use this information to focus on specific enzymes or pathways that deviate the most, and that may therefore display optimization or adaptations beyond simple resource-optimality.

**4. Relationship to other optimality approaches** Beyond the practical advantages of using factorized enzyme cost functions, they also allow us to easily compare our method to earlier modeling and optimization approaches. These approaches typically focused on only one or two of the factors that are taken into account in ECM, and many of them can be reformulated as approximations of ECM (as we have shown for MDF [15] and, by proxy, earlier thermodynamic profiling methods [50, 51]). For instance, the optimization performed by FBA with flux minimization is equivalent to using EMC0, while EMC1 is based on the same principles as FBA with molecular crowding [19] and pathway specific activities [2]. Thermodynamic profiling methods [50, 51, 15] which use driving forces as a proxy for the cost, can be compared to EMC2 (where all  $k_{\text{cat}}$  are assumed to be equal, see SI S4). To our knowledge, ECM is the first method that accounts for substrate and product saturation (as well as allosteric) effects in the optimization process and guarantees a convex, i.e., relatively tractable optimality problem. Moreover, ECM highlights how different aspects of metabolism are linked: most importantly, thermodynamic feasibility [15] is generalised by the quantitative notion of thermodynamic efficiency, which then turns out to be a natural precondition for enzyme economy.

**5. Improved parameters for flux analysis** Accordingly, results from ECM can be used to improve flux analysis [13, 23]. First, ECM can be used to define more realistic flux cost functions for FBA. In practice, the cost weights used so far (typically, defined by  $k_{\text{cat}}$  values and enzyme sizes) could be adjusted by dividing them by efficiency factors obtained from our workflow. Furthermore, ECM could be “embedded” into FBA by screening possible flux distributions (e.g., elementary flux modes) and characterising each of them by quantitative cost. Then the most cost-favorable mode could be picked. This could be seen as a version of minimal-flux FBA, but one that uses kinetic knowledge instead of the various heuristic assumptions that go into FBA. Second, we can derive realistic bounds on thermodynamic forces based on kinetics and enzyme cost, or lower/upper bounds on substrates/products concentrations to avoid extreme saturation effects. All these constraints follow systematically from setting upper limits on the individual efficiency factors (see SI S4). By applying them in thermodynamics-based flux analysis, we shrink the metabolite polytope and exclude stripes at its boundary where costs would be too high to allow for an optimal state. Similarly, by giving individually weights to thermodynamic driving forces, MDF could be used as a method to optimize some lower bound on the system's enzyme cost (see SI S4).

The assumption that enzyme levels are continuously cost-optimized is of course debatable. There is ample evidence that cells assume apparently sub-optimal states in order to maintain robust homeostasis or to gain metabolic flexibility for addressing future challenges [1]. Moreover, a random drift by mutations may affect the cell states as long as the impact on fitness is not very high. For example, an allosterically regulated enzyme will often not reach its maximal possible activity, so investment in enzyme production appears to be wasted. Nevertheless, cells pay this price in order to gain the ability to adjust quickly to changes (i.e. within seconds rather than the minutes required for altering gene expression). A simple principle of cost optimality, as in ECM can be justify in several ways. First, some alternative objectives can be integrated into ECM by adding them to the objective function. We have tried to keep our method as general as possible to facilitate such objectives, e.g.

by allowing for non-linear, convex enzyme costs ( $h(E)$ ). In particular, metabolite levels may be under additional constraints or optimality pressures because they appear in pathways outside our model, which may favor high or low levels of the metabolites. Also chemical molecule properties, such as hydrophobicity or charge, may affect the preferable metabolite levels in cells [52]. For instance, if our model captures an ATP-producing pathway, low ATP levels will be energetically favorable, whereas other ATP-consuming pathways would favor higher ATP levels. To account for this trade-off, a requirement for sufficiently high ATP levels can be included in our ECM model by constraints or additional objectives  $b^{(c)}(c)$  that penalize low ATP levels. If metabolite levels are kept far from their upper or lower physiological bounds, this will allow for more flexible adjustments in case of perturbation.

If enzyme profiles were shaped by optimal resource allocation, as assumed in ECM, this would have consequences for the shapes of enzyme and metabolite profiles. Enzyme cost, thermodynamic forces, and an avoidance of low substrate levels would be tightly entangled, and the shapes of enzyme profiles would reflect the role of enzymes in metabolism, i.e., the way in which they control metabolic concentrations and fluxes. Among other things, this would imply three general properties of enzyme profiles:

**1. Enzyme cost is related to thermodynamics** In FBA, thermodynamic constraints and flux costs appear as completely unrelated aspects of metabolism. Thermodynamics is used to restrict flux directions, and to relate them to metabolite bounds, while flux costs are used to suppress unnecessary fluxes. In ECM, thermodynamics and flux cost appear as two sides of a coin. Like in FBA, flux profiles are thermodynamically *feasible* if they lead to a finite-sized metabolite polytope, allowing for positive forces in all reactions. However, the values of these forces also play a role in shaping the enzyme cost function on that polytope. Together, metabolite polytope and enzyme cost function (as in Figure 2) summarize all relevant information about flux cost.

**2. Enzyme profiles reflect local metabolic necessities** What are the factors that determines the levels of specific enzymes? High levels are required whenever catalytic constants, driving forces, or substrate concentrations are low. Accordingly, an efficient use of enzymes requires metabolite profiles with sufficient driving forces (for energetic efficiency) and sufficient substrate levels (for saturation efficiency). Trade-offs between these requirements, together with predefined bounds, will shape the optimal metabolite profiles [23]: in a linear pathway, a need for energetic efficiency will push substrate concentrations up and product concentrations down; the need for saturation efficiency has the same effect. However, since the product of one reaction is the substrate of another reaction, there will be trade-offs between efficiencies in different reactions. Therefore, where enzymes are costly or show low  $k_{\text{cat}}$  values, we may expect a strong pressure on sufficient driving forces and substrate levels.

**3. Enzyme profiles reflect global effects of enzyme usage** If enzyme profiles follow a cost-benefit principle, costly enzymes should provide large benefits. Such a correspondence has been predicted, for example, from kinetic models in which flux is maximised at a fixed total enzyme investment [53]: in optimal states, high-abundance enzymes exert a strong control on the flux, and enzymes with strong flux control are highly abundant. If this applies in reality, then highly investment (e.g., large enzyme levels shown in Figure 1 a) could be seen as a sign of large benefit, in terms of flux control. Here, we studied a different optimality problem (fixing the fluxes and optimizing enzyme levels under constraints on metabolite levels), and obtain a more general result. The optimal enzyme cost profile obtained by ECM is a linear combination of flux control coefficients and, possibly, control coefficients on metabolites that hit upper or lower bounds (see SI S3.7). In simple cases (e.g., the example in Figure 2), where there is only one flux mode and no metabolite hits a bound, and enzyme demands and flux control coefficients will be directly proportional.

Beyond the analysis of central metabolism, ECM can be applied to select candidate pathways in metabolic engineering projects. A prediction of enzyme demands or specific activities (SI S5.1) can be helpful at different stages of pathway design. The optimal expression profile for a pathway can be determined, critical steps in a pathway can be detected (i.e., steps where lowering the enzyme's flux-specific cost  $a_{v_i}$  would be most important), and enzyme demand and cost can be compared between pathway structures. This type of application is not unique

to ECM, and although several of the methods that we mention throughout this manuscript [54, 55, 56, 2, 23, 4] have been used for this purpose in the past, we believe that ECM manages to bring them all under one umbrella.

## Acknowledgements

The authors thank Hermann-Georg Holzhütter, Andreas Hoppe, Uwe Sauer, Tomer Shlomi, and Naama Tepper for inspiring discussions. WL is supported by the German Research Foundation (LI 1676/2-1). EN is supported by a SystemsX.ch TPdF fellowship. RM is supported by ERC:novcarbfix.

## References

- [1] R. Schuetz, N. Zamboni, M. Zampieri, M. Heinemann, and U. Sauer. Multidimensional optimality of microbial metabolism. *Science*, 336(6081):601–604, 2012.
- [2] A. Bar-Even, E. Noor, N.E. Lewis, and R. Milo. Design and analysis of synthetic carbon fixation pathways. *PNAS*, 107(19):8889–8894, 2010.
- [3] O. Warburg, K. Posener, and E. Negelein. Ueber den Stoffwechsel der Tumoren. *Biochemische Zeitschrift*, 152:319–344, 1924.
- [4] A. Flamholz, E. Noor, A. Bar-Even, W. Liebermeister, and R. Milo. Glycolytic strategy as a tradeoff between energy yield and protein cost. *PNAS*, 110(24):10039–10044, 2013.
- [5] M. Basan, S. Hui, H. Okano, Z. Zhang, Y. Shen, J.R. Williamson, and T. Hwa. Overflow metabolism in *Escherichia coli* results from efficient proteome allocation. *Nature*, 528:99, 2015.
- [6] W. Liebermeister, E. Noor, A. Flamholz, D. Davidi, J. Bernhardt, and R. Milo. Visual account of protein investment in cellular functions. *PNAS*, 111(23):8488–8493, 2014.
- [7] R. Schuetz, L. Kuepfer, and U. Sauer. Systematic evaluation of objective functions for predicting intracellular fluxes in *Escherichia coli*. *Molecular Systems Biology*, 3:119, 2007.
- [8] D. A. Beard, S. Liang, and H. Qian. Energy balance for analysis of complex metabolic networks. *Biophysical Journal*, 83(1):79–86, 2002.
- [9] D.A. Beard, E. Babson, E. Curtis, and H. Qian. Thermodynamic constraints for biochemical networks. *J. Theor. Biol.*, 228(3):327–333, 2004.
- [10] F. Yang, H. Qian, and Daniel A. Beard. Ab initio prediction of thermodynamically feasible reaction directions from biochemical network stoichiometry. *Metabolic Engineering*, 7(4):251–259, 2005.
- [11] R.M.T. Fleming, C.M. Maes, M.A. Saunders, Y. Ye, and B.Ø. Palsson. A variational principle for computing nonequilibrium fluxes and potentials in genome-scale biochemical networks. *J. Theor. Biol.*, 292:71–77, 2012.
- [12] C.S. Henry, M.D. Jankowski, L.J. Broadbelt, and V. Hatzimanikatis. Genome-scale thermodynamic analysis of *E. coli* metabolism. *Biophys. J.*, 90:1453–1461, 2006.
- [13] C.S. Henry, L.J. Broadbelt, and V. Hatzimanikatis. Thermodynamics-based metabolic flux analysis. *Biophys J.*, 92(5):1792–1805, 2007.
- [14] A. Hoppe, S. Hoffmann, and H.-G. Holzhütter. Including metabolite concentrations into flux-balance analysis: Thermodynamic realizability as a constraint on flux distributions in metabolic networks. *BMC Syst. Biol.*, 1(1):23, 2007.



- [15] E. Noor, A. Bar-Even, A. Flamholz, E. Reznik, W. Liebermeister, and R. Milo. Pathway thermodynamics uncovers kinetic obstacles in central metabolism. *PLoS Comp. Biol.*, 10:e100348, 2014.
- [16] T. Shlomi, M. Cabili, M. Herrgard, B.Ø. Palsson, and E. Rupp. Network-based prediction of human tissue-specific metabolism. *Nature Biotechnology*, 26(9):1003, 2008.
- [17] H.-G. Holzhütter. The principle of flux minimization and its application to estimate stationary fluxes in metabolic networks. *Eur. J. Biochem.*, 271(14):2905–2922, 2004.
- [18] N.E. Lewis, K.K. Hixson, T.M. Conrad, J.A. Lerman, P. Charusanti, A.D. Polpitiya, J.N. Adkins, G. Schramm, S.O. Purvine, D. Lopez-Ferrer, K.K. Weitz, R. Eils, R. König, R.D. Smith, , and B ØPalsson. Omic data from evolved e. coli are consistent with computed optimal growth from genome-scale models. *Mol. Syst Biol.*, 6:390, 2010.
- [19] Q.K. Beg, A. Vazquez, J. Ernst, M.A. de Menezes, Z. Bar-Joseph, A.-L. Barabási, and Z.N. Oltvai. Intracellular crowding defines the mode and sequence of substrate uptake by Escherichia coli and constrains its metabolic activity. *PNAS*, 104(31):12663–12668, 2007.
- [20] A. Hoppe, C. Richter, and H.-G. Holzhütter. Enzyme maintenance effort as criterion for the characterization of alternative pathways and length distribution of isofunctional enzymes. *Biosystems*, 105(2):122–129, 2011.
- [21] W. Liebermeister, J. Uhlendorf, and E. Klipp. Modular rate laws for enzymatic reactions: thermodynamics, elasticities, and implementation. *Bioinformatics*, 26(12):1528–1534, 2010.
- [22] E. Noor, A. Flamholz, W. Liebermeister, A. Bar-Even, and R. Milo. A note on the kinetics of enzyme action: a decomposition that highlights thermodynamic effects. *FEBS Letters*, 587(17):2772–2777, 2013.
- [23] N. Tepper, E. Noor, D. Amador-Noguez, H.S. Haraldsdóttir, R. Milo, J. Rabinowitz, W. Liebermeister, and T. Shlomi. Steady-state metabolite concentrations reflect a balance between maximizing enzyme efficiency and minimizing total metabolite load. *PLoS ONE*, 8(9):e75370, 2013.
- [24] S. Schuster and R. Heinrich. Minimization of intermediate concentrations as a suggested optimality principle for biochemical networks. *Journal of Mathematical Biology*, 29(5):425–442, 1991.
- [25] A. Bar-Even, E. Noor, Y. Savir, W. Liebermeister, D. Davidi, D.S. Tawfik, and R. Milo. The moderately efficient enzyme: evolutionary and physicochemical trends shaping enzyme parameters. *Biochemistry*, 21:4402–4410, 2011.
- [26] K. van Eunen, J. Bouwman, P. Daran-Lapujade, J. Postmus, A.B. Canelas, F.I. Monsenides, R. Orij, I. Tuzun, J. van den Brink, G.J. Smits, W.M. van Gulik, S. Brul, J.J. Heijnen, J.H. de Winde, M.J. de Mattos, C. Kettner, J. Nielsen, H.V. Westerhoff, and B.M. Bakker. Measuring enzyme activities under standardized in vivo-like conditions for systems biology. *FEBS Journal*, 277:749760, 2010.
- [27] K. Smallbone, H.L. Messiha, K.M. Carroll, C.L. Winder, N. Malys, W.B. Dunn, E. Murabito, N. Swainston, J.O. Dada, F. Khan, P. Pir, E. Simeonidis, I Spasić, J. Wishart, D. Weichart, N.W. Hayes, D. Jameson, D.S. Broomhead, S.G. Oliver, S.J. Gaskell, J.E. McCarthy, N.W. Paton, H.V. Westerhoff, D.B. Kell, and P. Mendes. A model of yeast glycolysis based on a consistent kinetic characterisation of all its enzymes. *FEBS Letters*, 587:28322841, 2013.
- [28] J.G. Reich. Zur Ökonomie im Proteinhaushalt der lebenden Zelle. *Biomed. Biochim. Acta*, 42(7/8):839–848, 1983.
- [29] E. Klipp, R. Heinrich, and H.-G. Holzhütter. Prediction of temporal gene expression. Metabolic optimization by re-distribution of enzyme activities. *Eur. J. Biochem.*, 269:1–8, 2002.

- [30] W. Liebermeister, E. Klipp, S. Schuster, and R. Heinrich. A theory of optimal differential gene expression. *BioSystems*, 76:261–278, 2004.
- [31] D. Molenaar, R. van Berlo, D. de Ridder, and B. Teusink. Shifts in growth strategies reflect tradeoffs in cellular economics. *Molecular Systems Biology*, 5:323, 2009.
- [32] L. Zelcbuch, N. Antonovsky, A. Bar-Even, A. Levin-Karp, U. Barenholz, M. Dayagi, W. Liebermeister, A. Flamholz, E. Noor, S. Amram, A. Brandis, T. Bareia, I. Yofe, H. Jubran, and R. Milo. Spanning high-dimensional expression space using ribosome-binding site combinatorics. *Nucleic Acids Research*, 41(9):e98, 2013.
- [33] M.E. Lee, A. Aswani A.S. Han, C.J. Tomlin, and J.E. Dueber. Expression-level optimization of a multi-enzyme pathway in the absence of a high-throughput assay. *Nucleic Acids Res.*, 41(22):10668–10678, 2013.
- [34] D.A. Beard and H. Qian. Relationship between thermodynamic driving force and one-way fluxes in reversible processes. *PLoS ONE*, 2(1):e144, 2007.
- [35] E. Dekel and U. Alon. Optimality and evolutionary tuning of the expression level of a protein. *Nature*, 436:588–692, 2005.
- [36] I. Shachrai, A. Zaslaver, U. Alon, and E. Dekel. Cost of unneeded proteins in E. coli is reduced after several generations in exponential growth. *Molecular Cell*, 38:1–10, 2010.
- [37] J.S. Hofmeyr, O.P.C. Gqwaka, and J.M. Rohwer. A generic rate equation for catalysed, template-directed polymerisation. *FEBS Letters*, 587:2868–2875, 2013.
- [38] T. Lubitz, M. Schulz, E. Klipp, and W. Liebermeister. Parameter balancing for kinetic models of cell metabolism. *J. Phys. Chem. B*, 114(49):16298–16303, 2010.
- [39] N.J. Stanford, T. Lubitz, K. Smallbone, E. Klipp, P. Mendes, and W. Liebermeister. Systematic construction of kinetic models from genome-scale metabolic networks. *PLoS ONE*, 8(11):e79195, 2013.
- [40] M.D. Jankowski, C.S. Henry, L.J. Broadbelt, and V. Hatzimanikatis. Group contribution method for thermodynamic analysis of complex metabolic networks. *Biophys. J.*, 95(3):1487–1499, 2008.
- [41] E. Noor, H.S. Haraldsdottir, R. Milo, and R.M.T. Fleming. Consistent estimation of Gibbs energy using component contributions. *PLOS Comp. Biol.*, 9:e1003098, 2013.
- [42] A. Flamholz, E. Noor, A. Bar-Even, and R. Milo. equilibrator – the biochemical thermodynamics calculator. *Nucleic Acids Research*, 40(D1):D770–D775, 2012.
- [43] W. Liebermeister and E. Klipp. Bringing metabolic networks to life: convenience rate law and thermodynamic constraints. *Theor. Biol. Med. Mod.*, 3:41, 2006.
- [44] B.R.B.H. van Rijsewijk, A. Nanchen, S. Nallet, R.J. Kleijn, and U. Sauer. Large-scale <sup>13</sup>C-flux analysis reveals distinct transcriptional control of respiratory and fermentative metabolism in escherichia coli. *Mol. Syst. Biol.*, 7(477):477, 2011.
- [45] I. Schomburg, A. Chang, C. Ebeling, M. Gremse, C. Heldt, G. Huhn, and D. Schomburg. BRENDA, the enzyme database: updates and major new developments. *Nucleic Acids Research*, 32:Database issue:D431–433, 2004.
- [46] A. Schmidt, K. Kochanowski, S. Vedelaar, E. Ahrné, B. Volkmer, L. Callipo, K. Knoops, M. Bauer, R. Aebbersold, and M. Heinemann. The quantitative and condition-dependent escherichia coli proteome. *Nature Biotechnology*, page doi:10.1038/nbt.3418, 2015.

- [47] Ron Milo. What is the total number of protein molecules per cell volume? A call to rethink some published values. *BioEssays*, 35(12):10501055, 2013.
- [48] L. Arike, K. Valgepea, L. Peil, R. Nahku, K. Adamberg, and R. Vilu. Comparison and applications of label-free absolute proteome quantification methods on *Escherichia coli*. *J Proteomics*, 75(17):5437–5448, 2012.
- [49] R. Steuer, T. Gross, J. Selbig, and B. Blasius. Structural kinetic modeling of metabolic networks. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA*, 103(32):11868–11873, 2006.
- [50] V. Hatzimanikatis, C. Li, J.A. Ionita, C.S. Henry, M.D. Jankowski, and L.J. Broadbelt. Exploring the diversity of complex metabolic networks. *Bioinformatics*, 21(8):1603–1609, 2005.
- [51] S.D. Finley, L.J. Broadbelt, and V.Hatzimanikatis. Computational framework for predictive biodegradation. *Biotechnol. Bioeng.*, 104(6):1086–1097, 2009.
- [52] A. Bar-Even, E. Noor, A. Flamholz, J.M. Buescher, and R. Milo. Hydrophobicity and charge shape cellular metabolite concentrations. *PLoS Computational Biology*, 7(10):e1002166, 2011.
- [53] R. Heinrich and E. Klipp. Control analysis of unbranched enzymatic chains in states of maximal activity. *J. Theor. Biol.*, 182(3):243–252, 1996.
- [54] R. Heinrich, F. Montero, E. Klipp, T.G. Waddell, and E. Meléndez-Hevia. Theoretical approaches to the evolutionary optimization of glycolysis – thermodynamic and kinetic constraints. *Eur. J. Biochem.*, 243:191–201, 1997.
- [55] E. Meléndez-Hevia, T.G. Waddell, R. Heinrich, and F. Montero. Theoretical approaches to the evolutionary optimization of glycolysis – chemical analysis. *Eur. J. Biochem.*, 244:527–543, 1997.
- [56] E. Klipp and R. Heinrich. Competition for enzymes in metabolic pathways: implications for optimal distributions of enzyme concentrations and for the distribution of flux control. *BioSystems*, 54:1–14, 1999.
- [57] R. Wegscheider. Über simultane Gleichgewichte und die Beziehungen zwischen Thermodynamik und Reaktionskinetik homogener Systeme. *Z. Phys. Chem.*, 39:257–303, 1902.
- [58] J.B.S. Haldane. *Enzymes*. Longmans, Green and Co., London. (republished in 1965 by MIT Press, Cambridge, MA), 1930.
- [59] M. Kanehisa, S. Goto, S. Kawashima S, and A. Nakaya. The KEGG databases at genomnet. *Nucleic Acids Research*, 30:42–46, 2002.
- [60] L. Gerosa, B.R.B.H. van Rijsewijk, D. Christodoulou, K. Kochanowski, T.S.B. Schmidt, E. Noor, and U. Sauer. Pseudo-transition analysis identifies the governing regulation of microbial nutrient adaptations from steady state data. *Cell Systems*, 1:270–282, 2015.
- [61] K. Zhuang, G.N. Vemuri, and R. Mahadevan. Economics of membrane occupancy and respiro-fermentation. *MSB*, 7:500, 2011.
- [62] K.A. Dill, K. Ghosh, and J.D. Schmit. Physical limits of cells and proteomes. *PNAS*, 108(44):17876–17882, 2011.
- [63] M. Eames and T. Kortenme. Cost-benefit tradeoffs in engineered lac operons. *Science*, 336:911–915, 2012.
- [64] H. Akashi and T. Gojobori. Metabolic efficiency and amino acid composition in the proteomes of *Escherichia coli* and *Bacillus subtilis*. *PNAS*, 99(6):3695–3700, 2002.

## 4 Methods

**Metabolite polytope and enzyme cost functions** A metabolic network with given flux directions, equilibrium constants, and metabolite bounds defines the *metabolite polytope*. This convex polytope  $\mathcal{P}$  in the space of log-concentrations  $s_i = \ln c_i$  represents the set of feasible metabolite profiles. The flux profile used can be stationary (e.g. determined by FBA or  $^{13}\text{C}$  MFA) or non-stationary (like experimentally measured fluxes, directly inserted into a model). If the provided flux directions are thermodynamically infeasible, the metabolite polytope will be an empty set,  $\mathcal{P} = \emptyset$ . The faces of the metabolite polytope arise from two types of inequality constraints. First, the physical ranges  $s_i^{\min} \leq s_i \leq s_i^{\max}$  of metabolite levels define a box-shaped polytope (bounded by P-faces). Some metabolite levels may even be constrained to fixed values. Second, each reaction must dissipate Gibbs free energy, and to make this possible, driving forces and fluxes must have the same signs ( $\Theta_l \cdot v_l > 0$ ), and thus  $\text{sign}(v_l) = \text{sign}(\Delta_r G'_l / RT + \sum_i n_{il} s_i)$ . The resulting constraints define E-faces of the metabolite polytope (representing equilibrium states,  $\Theta_l = 0$ ). Close to these faces, enzyme cost goes to infinity.

### Enzyme cost minimization can be formulated as a convex optimality problem for metabolite levels

Enzyme cost minimization (ECM) uses a metabolic network, a flux profile  $\mathbf{v}$ , kinetic rate laws, enzyme burdens, and bounds on metabolite levels to predict optimal metabolite and enzyme concentrations. The enzyme cost of reactions or pathways is a convex function on the metabolite polytope (proof in SI S3.2), that is, a metabolite vector  $\mathbf{s}$ , linearly interpolated between vectors  $\mathbf{s}_a$  and  $\mathbf{s}_b$ , cannot have a higher cost than the interpolated cost of  $\mathbf{s}_a$  and  $\mathbf{s}_b$ . Convexity also holds for cost functions  $h(\mathbf{E})$  that are non-linear, but convex over  $\mathbf{E}$ . Some EMC functions are even strictly convex (i.e., Eq. (S18) holds with a  $<$  sign instead of  $\leq$ ). In contrast, simplified EMC functions can be constant (as in EMC0 and EMC1), or constant in certain directions in the metabolite polytope (as in EMC2, under combined metabolite variations that do not affect the driving forces) (see SI S3.1). To find an optimal state, we choose an EMC function and minimize the total enzyme cost within the metabolite polytope. Optimal metabolite profiles, enzyme profiles, and enzyme costs are obtained by solving the enzyme cost minimization (ECM) problem

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{s}^{\text{opt}}(\mathbf{v}) &= \operatorname{argmin}_{\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{P}} q(\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{v}) \\ \mathbf{E}^{\text{opt}}(\mathbf{v}) &= \mathbf{E}(\mathbf{s}^{\text{opt}}(\mathbf{v}), \mathbf{v}) \\ q^{\text{opt}}(\mathbf{v}) &= q(\mathbf{s}^{\text{opt}}, \mathbf{v}). \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

The total cost  $q(\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{v})$  (defined in Eq. (6)) is the sum of enzyme costs given by EMC functions. Since  $q(\mathbf{s})$  and the metabolite polytope itself are convex, ECM is a convex optimization problem. The optimal enzyme levels depend on external conditions and have to be recalculated after any change in external metabolite levels. There are cases where  $q(\mathbf{s})$  is convex, but not strictly convex, and therefore Eq. (7) will have a continuum of optimal solutions. To enforce a unique solution, one may add strictly convex side objectives that score the log-metabolite levels, e.g., a quadratic function favoring metabolite levels close to some typical concentration vector  $\hat{\mathbf{s}}$ :  $\min_{\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{P}} (q(\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{v}) + \|\mathbf{s} - \hat{\mathbf{s}}\|)$ . Such extra objectives can be justified biologically, e.g. by assuming that intermediate metabolite levels give cells more flexibility to adapt to perturbations. Convexity does not only simplify numerical calculations, but it also shows that the evolutionary optimality problem has a unique solution. In fact, metabolite polytope and cost functions remain convex even under various modifications of the problem. The shape of the feasible set (usually, the metabolite polytope) remains convex if we add constraints on the total metabolite level, on weighted sums of metabolite levels, or on weighted sums of enzyme levels (see SI S5.3). Finally, we can consider the more complicated problem of preemptive enzyme expression, where a fixed enzyme profile and allosteric inhibition must allow a cell to realise different flux distributions under different conditions (see SI S3.5). Also this problem is convex. If a model contains non-enzymatic reactions (or non-enzymatic processes such as metabolite diffusion out of the cell or dilution in growing cells), each such reaction leads to an extra constraint

on the metabolite polytope (for details, see SI S3.6). A known flux in an irreversible diffusion or dilution reaction fixes the concentration of one metabolite. In the presence of irreversible non-enzymatic reactions with mass-action rate laws, the polytope is intersected by a subspace. In both cases, the resulting sub-polytope may be empty, i.e., the given flux distribution will not be realisable.

**Tolerance ranges for nearly optimal solutions** Evolution could tolerate non-optimal enzyme costs; this tolerance depends on population dynamics and can sometimes be quite significant, e.g. in small compartmentalized communities. To compute realistic tolerance ranges for the ECM problem, we start from the optimum (total cost  $q$ ) and choose a tolerable cost  $q^{\text{tol}}$  (e.g., one percent higher than the optimal cost). This defines a tolerable region in  $\mathcal{P}$ :  $\mathcal{P}^{\text{tol}} \equiv \{\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{P} \mid q(\mathbf{s}) \leq q^{\text{tol}}\}$ . A tolerance range for each metabolite is defined by the minimal and maximal values the metabolite can show within  $\mathcal{P}^{\text{tol}}$ . Tolerance ranges for enzyme levels are defined in a similar way. Alternatively, tolerance ranges and nearly optimal solutions can be estimated from the Hessian matrix (see SI S7.3).

**Enzyme-based flux cost function** In FBA (e.g., in FBA variants with flux minimization or molecular crowding), flux cost or enzyme demand are linear functions of the fluxes. ECM yields plausible prefactors for this formula: by rearranging Eq. (6), we can write the enzyme cost as a linear function  $q = \sum_l a_{v_l} \cdot v_l$  with flux burdens  $a_{v_l}(\mathbf{c}) = h_{E_l} \cdot \frac{1}{k_{\text{cat},l}^+} \cdot \frac{1}{\eta_i^{\text{th}}(\mathbf{c})} \cdot \frac{1}{\eta_i^{\text{sat}}(\mathbf{c})} \cdot \frac{1}{\eta_i^{\text{reg}}(\mathbf{c})}$ . The flux burden has a lower bound  $a_{v_l}^{\text{cat}} = h_{E_l} / k_{\text{cat},l}^+$ , denoting the cost per flux under ideal conditions. Ignoring all dependencies on metabolite levels,  $a_{v_l}^{\text{cat}}$  could be used as a cost weight to define flux cost functions for FBA. However, these values are further increased by the inverse enzyme efficiencies. A flux-specific enzyme cost (or, inversely, a flux per enzyme invested) can also be defined for entire pathways. The Pathway Specific Activity [2] is defined as the flux per enzyme mass concentration (with flux in mM/s and enzyme mass concentration in  $\mu\text{g}$  enzyme per gram of cell dry weight) and can be computed by treating enzyme mass as a cost function. Assuming that  $\eta^{\text{enr}} = \eta^{\text{kin}} = 1$  and that cost is expressed in terms of protein mass ( $h_{E_l} = m_l$ ), we obtain the Pathway Specific Activity by dividing the pathway flux  $v_{\text{pw}}$  by  $q$  (see SI S2.3 and S2.3). Using protein masses in Daltons as specific cost weights  $h_{E_l}$ , we obtain a formula for the enzyme mass per flux (for reactions or pathways). The reciprocal value  $A_{\text{pw}} = v_{\text{pw}}/q$  is the pathway-specific activity.

**Workflow for model building and enzyme prediction.** To predict enzyme and metabolite levels in metabolic pathways (Figure S5) we developed an automated workflow. In a consistent model, all parameters must satisfy Wegscheider conditions for equilibrium constants [57] and Haldane relationships between equilibrium constants and rate constants [58]. The kinetic constants used in rate laws should represent *effective* parameters, which may differ from “ideal” parameters, e.g., by crowding effects. However, since measured parameter values are usually incomplete and inconsistent, parameter balancing [38] is used to translate measured kinetic constants into consistent model parameters. Based on a network and given fluxes, the software extracts relevant data from a database (thermodynamic constants, rate constants, fluxes, and protein sizes; metabolite and protein levels for validation), determines a consistent set of model parameters, builds a kinetic model, and optimizes enzyme and metabolite profiles for the EMC function chosen. To assess the effects of parameter variation, parameter sets can be sampled from the posterior distribution, provided by parameter balancing. Sampled parameters lead to different predicted enzyme levels, but the resulting variation in enzyme levels can be explained, to a large extent, as a direct compensation for the varying  $k_{\text{cat}}$  values. The workflow has been implemented in MATLAB and python.

**E. coli model** The model shown in Figure 3 was built automatically from a list of chemical reactions in *E. coli* central metabolism. KEGG reaction identifiers [59] were automatically translated into a kinetic model (for details, see SI S6 and SI Table S4). The cofactors ATP, ADP, phosphate, NADH, NAD<sup>+</sup>, NADPH, and NADP<sup>+</sup> are

Name	Symbol	Unit
Flux	$v_l$	mM/s
Metabolite level	$c_i$	mM
Logarithmic metabolite level	$s_i = \ln(c_i/c_\sigma)$	unitless
Enzyme level	$E_l$	mM
Reaction rate	$v_l(E_l, \mathbf{c}) = E_l \cdot r_l(\mathbf{c})$	mM/s
Catalytic rate	$r_l = v_l/E_l$	1/s
Scaled reactant elasticity	$\mathcal{E}_{li}$	unitless
Gibbs energy of formation (std. chemical potential)	$G_i^{\prime\circ}$	kJ/mol
Reaction Gibbs energy	$\Delta_r G_l^{\prime} = \Delta_r G_l^{\prime\circ} + RT \sum_i n_{il} \ln c_i$	kJ/mol
Driving force	$\Theta_l = -\Delta_r G_l^{\prime}/RT$	unitless
Forward/backward catalytic constant	$k_{\text{cat}}^+, k_{\text{cat}}^-$	1/s
Michaelis-Menten constant	$K_{li}$	mM
Protein mass	$m_l$	Da
Enzyme cost	$h(\mathbf{E}) = \sum_l h_{E_l} E_l$	D
Enzyme burden	$h_{E_l}$	D/mM
Enzyme-induced metabolite cost	$q(\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{v}) = h(\mathbf{E}(\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{v}))$	D
Flux-specific cost	$a_{v_l}$	D/(mM/s)
Baseline flux-specific cost	$a_{v_l}^{\text{cat}}$	D/(mM/s)

Table 2: Mathematical symbols used. The fitness unit Darwin (D) is a proxy for the different fitness units used in cell models. Reaction must be orientated in such a way that all fluxes are positive. To define metabolite log-concentrations, we use the standard concentration  $c_\sigma = 1$  mM.

included in the model. Equilibrium constants were estimated using the component contribution method [41], kinetic constants ( $k_{\text{cat}}^+$  and  $K_M$  values) were obtained from the BRENDA database (after which each value was curated manually), and a complete, globally consistent parameter set was determined by parameter balancing. State-dependent data were obtained from publications using batch fed *E. coli* BW25113 grown on minimal media (M9) with glucose as the carbon source. Our source for metabolic fluxes [44] used  $^{13}\text{C}$  metabolic flux analysis, metabolite concentrations [60] were obtained using LC-MS/SM, and enzyme concentrations [46] using SWATH-MS. For a summary of data provenance, see SI Table S4. During ECM, all metabolite levels were limited to predefined ranges, and the levels of cofactors and some other metabolites were fixed at experimentally known values. To compute tolerances for predicted metabolite and enzyme levels, we defined an acceptable enzyme cost, one percent higher than the minimal value, and determined ranges for metabolite levels that agree with this cost limit. Data, model, and matlab code for ECM can be obtained from [www.metabolic-economics.de/enzyme-cost-minimization/](http://www.metabolic-economics.de/enzyme-cost-minimization/).

# Supplementary information

## S1 Kinetic rate laws

### S1.1 Rate laws for general enzymatic reactions

Reversible rate laws for reactions with multiple substrates (concentrations  $s_i$ ) and products (concentrations  $p_j$ ) have the form

$$v = E \frac{k_{\text{cat}}^+ \prod_i \left(\frac{s_i}{K_i}\right)^{m_i^S} - k_{\text{cat}}^- \prod_i \left(\frac{p_i}{K_i}\right)^{m_i^P}}{D(s_1, s_2, \dots, p_1, p_2, \dots)}. \quad (\text{S1})$$

By default, we assume that an enzyme molecule contains a single catalytic site. If an enzyme is a protein complex with  $N_{\text{sub}}$  subunits and  $N_{\text{cat}}$  catalytic sites, we can use effective values  $k_{\text{cat}}^{+'} = \frac{N_{\text{cat}}}{N_{\text{sub}}} k_{\text{cat}}^+$  referring to single enzyme subunits, whose concentrations  $E$  are recorded in proteomics data. The molecularities  $m_{li}^S$  or  $m_{li}^P$  describe in what numbers reactants participate in the enzyme mechanism. Molecularities can differ from the (nominal) stoichiometric coefficients by a reaction-specific scaling factor  $\gamma$  because the stoichiometric coefficients in the sum formula may be arbitrarily scaled. For example, in a reaction  $2 A + 4 B \rightarrow 2 C$  (stoichiometric coefficients -2, -4, 2) with the rate law  $k_{\text{cat}}^+ [A] [B]^2 - k_{\text{cat}}^- [C]$  (with molecularities 1, 2, 1), this factor would be  $\gamma = 1/2$ . If we assume, as it is usually done, that the exponents in the rate law represent stoichiometric coefficients, the factor  $\gamma_l$  will appear like an effective Hill coefficient. In turn, a reactant with stoichiometric coefficient  $n_{il}$  and an effective Hill coefficient  $\gamma = 2$  will have a molecularity of  $m_{li}^S = 2|n_{il}|$ . For reasons of thermodynamic consistency (existence of a consistent equilibrium state), all substrates and products in a reaction must show the same  $\gamma$  factors [21].

The signs and magnitudes of metabolic fluxes depend on thermodynamic driving forces (see Figure S1). We define the thermodynamic driving force as the negative reaction Gibbs energy  $-\Delta_r G'$ , measured in units of  $RT$ . The symbol  $G'$  denotes transformed Gibbs free energies, suitable variables for systems at given or buffered pH value. To obtain the correct relationship between fluxes and driving forces, the driving forces  $\Theta_l$  must be defined based on molecularities, not on stoichiometric coefficients<sup>1</sup>. According to thermodynamics, all reaction rates must vanish in chemical equilibrium; to ensure this in kinetic models, equilibrium constants and rate constants must satisfy the Haldane relationship [58]

$$K_{\text{eq}} = \frac{\prod_i (s_i^{\text{eq}})^{m_i^S}}{\prod_i (p_i^{\text{eq}})^{m_i^P}} = \frac{k_{\text{cat}}^+ \prod_i (K_i)^{m_i^P}}{k_{\text{cat}}^- \prod_i (K_i)^{m_i^S}}, \quad (\text{S2})$$

where  $s_i$  and  $p_j$  denote substrate and product levels, respectively. Moreover, the equilibrium constants follow from Gibbs energies of formation as  $K_{\text{eq}} = e^{-\Delta_r G^{\circ'}/RT}$ . This implies Wegscheider conditions [57]: the vector of equilibrium constants satisfies  $\ln K_{\text{eq}} = \mathbf{N}_{\text{tot}}^T \boldsymbol{\mu}^{\circ'}$ , with the stoichiometric matrix  $\mathbf{N}_{\text{tot}}$  for all metabolites and the vector  $\boldsymbol{\mu}^{\circ'}$  of transformed Gibbs free energies of formation. Accordingly, the equilibrium constants must satisfy a Wegscheider condition  $\ln K_{\text{eq}} \cdot \mathbf{k} = 0$  for any thermodynamic cycle  $\mathbf{k}$ , i.e., any nullspace vector of  $\mathbf{N}_{\text{tot}}^T$ .

The formula for the denominator  $D$  in Eq. (S1) depends on the enzyme mechanism assumed. A general, bio-

<sup>1</sup>If stoichiometric coefficients and molecularities differ, the Hill-like coefficient  $\gamma_l$  must appear in the definition of driving forces  $\Theta_l = -\frac{1}{RT} \sum_i \gamma_l n_{il} G'_l = -\gamma_l \Delta_r G'_l$ . The difference along a reaction is not defined based on nominal stoichiometric coefficients, but on actual molecularities.




Figure S1: Enzyme efficiency depends on thermodynamics. The thermodynamic driving force  $\Theta = -\Delta G'/RT$  in a reaction determines the ratio between forward and backward fluxes:  $v^+/v^- = e^\Theta$ . If the net flux  $v = 1$  is kept fixed, forward and backward fluxes strongly increase as  $\Theta$  approaches 0 (chemical equilibrium). (a) Forward (blue) and backward (red) flux as functions of the thermodynamic force. In each point, their difference yields the predefined net flux  $v = 1$ . (b) Only a fraction of the forward flux  $v^+$  acts as a net flux, while the rest is canceled by the backward flux (see Figure 1). This fraction varies between 0 (no thermodynamic force, chemical equilibrium) and 1 (high thermodynamic force, strongly driven reaction).

chemically plausible choice is polynomials of the form

$$D(\mathbf{c}) = 1 + \sum_k M_{lk} \prod_i c_i^{m_{lik}} \quad (\text{S3})$$

with positive coefficients  $M_{lk}$  and exponents  $m_{lik}$ . Each sum term (index  $k$ ) represents a binding state of the enzyme. The exponents  $m_{lik}$  encode the numbers of bound reactant molecules and the prefactors encode the binding energies. The sum term 1 represents the unbound enzyme. The highest-order substrate term reads  $\prod_i (s_i/K_i)^{m_i^S}$  and the highest-order product term reads  $\prod_i (p_i/K_i)^{m_i^P}$ . The denominator may also contain additive or multiplicative terms for allosteric activation and inhibition. While the exponents  $m_{lik}$  are usually positive integers, allosteric regulation can imply denominator terms  $K_S/s$ . A special case of Eq. (S3) are rate laws for polymerization reactions [37], which can also be used as simplified rate laws for biomass-producing reactions. In this case, it will be the “template” molecules rather than the enzyme that is scored by a cost. By focusing on simple enzyme mechanisms with few binding states, we obtain general rate laws that are valid for all reaction stoichiometries. Their denominators have simple structures (containing only few sum terms and a few Michaelis-Menten constants as parameters) [21]. Since these rate laws containing fewer denominator terms than more complex rate laws, the rates become higher and enzyme demand and costs tend to be underestimated. The energy-based EMC2 functions are based on rate laws with the denominators

$$\begin{aligned} D^S &= \prod_i (s_i/K_i)^{m_i^S} \\ D^{SP} &= \prod_i (s_i/K_i)^{m_i^S} + \prod_j (p_j/K_j)^{m_j^P}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S4})$$

The mathematical products are called mass-action terms. In the first formula, we assume that substrate levels are high and product levels are low; and in the second one, that both substrate and product levels are high. The



saturation-based EMC3 functions are based on rate laws with the denominators

$$\begin{aligned} D^{1S} &= 1 + \prod_i (s_i/K_i)^{m_i^S} \\ D^{1SP} &= 1 + \prod_i (s_i/K_i)^{m_i^S} + \prod_j (p_j/K_j)^{m_j^P}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S5})$$

These denominators contain only the term 1 and the substrate and product mass-action terms. To justify these rate laws, we assume a strongly cooperative binding between substrates and between products and consider an enzyme mechanism with only three states: enzyme bound with all substrates, enzyme bound with all products, and unbound enzyme. The first formula assumes low product concentrations, and The second formula describes the direct-binding modular (DM) rate law [21]. The direct-binding modular rate law generalizes the reversible MM kinetics. Furthermore, we consider the common modular rate (CM) law [43, 21], a generalized form of reversible MM kinetics with the denominator

$$D^{\text{CM}} = \prod_i (1 + s_i/K_i)^{m_i^S} + \prod_j (1 + p_j/K_j)^{m_j^P} - 1. \quad (\text{S6})$$

In the enzyme mechanism, substrate molecules bind independently, product molecules bind independently, and substrate and product binding exclude each other. Multiplying out the denominator (S6), we obtain many more terms than in the direct-binding modular rate law. Realistic rate laws will contain more denominator terms than the DM rate law, but possibly fewer than the CM rate law. To interpolate between the two extremes, we may take their arithmetic or geometric mean

$$D^{\text{geom}} = \sqrt{D^{\text{DM}} D^{\text{CM}}}, \quad D^{\text{arith}} = \frac{1}{2} D^{\text{DM}} + \frac{1}{2} D^{\text{CM}}. \quad (\text{S7})$$

If the denominator values  $D^{\text{DM}}$  and  $D^{\text{CM}}$  are not too different, the two mean values will be similar<sup>2</sup>. In the second formula (arithmetic mean), the mass-action terms appear as in DM and CM rate laws, and all other terms from the CM law appear with prefactors of  $\frac{1}{2}$ . If we define rate laws by taking a geometric (or arithmetic) mean of rate laws denominators, the corresponding enzyme costs will be given by geometric (or harmonic) mean values of enzyme costs. If an enzyme is allosterically regulated, this can be described by additive or multiplicative regulation terms in the rate law denominator [21]. Additive terms arise from competitive regulation. Multiplicative terms (for non-competitive regulation) can be split from the denominator and become prefactors of the rate law. Typical choices are  $\frac{x}{x+k_X^A}$  for non-competitive activation and  $\frac{k_X^I}{x+k_X^I}$  for non-competitive inhibition, with rate constants  $k^A$  and  $k^I$  and a regulator concentration  $x$  [21]. Thus, in the factorized EMC formulae, allosteric effects can either be listed by a separate efficiency factor or be included in the saturation factor. For instance, the saturation factor for Michaelis-Menten kinetics with non-competitive inhibition can be split into

$$\eta^{\text{sat}} = \frac{s/K_S}{(1 + \frac{x}{K_I})(1 + \frac{s}{K_S} + \frac{p}{K_P})} = \frac{1}{1 + \frac{s}{K_S} + \frac{p}{K_P}} \frac{1}{(1 + x/K_I)} = \eta^{\text{sat}*} \eta^{\text{reg}}. \quad (\text{S8})$$

## S1.2 How the efficiency factors are derived

The general formula S1 covers a wide range of possible rate laws. To demonstrate how it can be factorized into the capacity and efficiency factors, we consider a bimolecular reaction  $A + B \rightleftharpoons P + Q$  and an enzyme with a

<sup>2</sup>If  $a \approx b$ , we can approximate  $\sqrt{ab} = \sqrt{a(a+b-a)} = a\sqrt{1 + \frac{b-a}{a}} \approx a(1 + \frac{1}{2} \frac{b-a}{a}) = \frac{1}{2}[a+b]$ .

common modular (CM) rate law (Equation S6), i.e.

$$\begin{aligned}
v &= E \frac{k_{\text{cat}}^+ \frac{[A][B]}{K_A K_B} - k_{\text{cat}}^- \frac{[P][Q]}{K_P K_Q}}{(1 + \frac{[A]}{K_A})(1 + \frac{[B]}{K_B}) + (1 + \frac{[P]}{K_P})(1 + \frac{[Q]}{K_Q}) - 1} \\
&= E k_{\text{cat}}^+ \frac{\frac{[A][B]}{K_A K_B} - \frac{k_{\text{cat}}^-}{k_{\text{cat}}^+} \frac{[P][Q]}{K_P K_Q}}{1 + \frac{[A]}{K_A} + \frac{[B]}{K_B} + \frac{[A][B]}{K_{AB}} + \frac{[P]}{K_P} + \frac{[Q]}{K_Q} + \frac{[P][Q]}{K_{PQ}}} \\
&= E k_{\text{cat}}^+ \underbrace{(1 - e^{-\Theta})}_{\eta^{\text{enr}}} \underbrace{\frac{\frac{[A][B]}{K_A K_B}}{1 + \frac{[A]}{K_A} + \frac{[B]}{K_B} + \frac{[A][B]}{K_{AB}} + \frac{[P]}{K_P} + \frac{[Q]}{K_Q} + \frac{[P][Q]}{K_{PQ}}}}_{\eta^{\text{sat}}} \tag{S9}
\end{aligned}$$

where for the last step, we used the Haldane relationship  $K_{\text{eq}} = \frac{k_{\text{cat}}^+ K_P K_Q}{k_{\text{cat}}^- K_A K_B}$  and the identity  $e^{-\Theta} = \frac{[P][Q]}{[A][B]}/K_{\text{eq}}$ . This Haldane relationship and the connection between the thermodynamic driving force and the ratio between the numerator terms hold in general:

$$\frac{k_{\text{cat}}^+ \prod_i (\frac{s_i}{K_i})^{m_i^S}}{k_{\text{cat}}^- \prod_i (\frac{p_i}{K_i})^{m_i^P}} = \frac{\prod_i s_i^{m_i^S}}{\prod_i p_i^{m_i^P}} \cdot \frac{k_{\text{cat}}^+ \prod_i K_i^{m_i^P}}{k_{\text{cat}}^- \prod_i K_i^{m_i^S}} = \frac{\prod_i s_i^{m_i^S}}{\prod_i p_i^{m_i^P}} / K_{\text{eq}} = e^{-\Theta}. \tag{S10}$$

Thus we can obtain the general factorized rate law:

$$v = E \frac{k_{\text{cat}}^+ \prod_i (\frac{s_i}{K_i})^{m_i^S} - k_{\text{cat}}^- \prod_i (\frac{p_i}{K_i})^{m_i^P}}{D(s_1, s_2, \dots, p_1, p_2, \dots)} = E k_{\text{cat}}^+ \underbrace{(1 - e^{-\Theta})}_{\eta^{\text{enr}}} \underbrace{\frac{\prod_i (s_i/K_i)^{m_i^S}}{D(s_1, s_2, \dots, p_1, p_2, \dots)}}_{\eta^{\text{sat}} \cdot \eta^{\text{reg}}}. \tag{S11}$$

## S2 Enzyme cost functions

To quantify enzyme cost, we assume it is proportional to the concentration of that enzyme. Potentially, each enzyme level can be weighted by different enzyme-specific costs. Are such cost weights biologically justified? We now discuss the relevance of these costs and show how the linearity assumption, combined with separable rate laws, yields simple factorized enzyme cost functions.

### S2.1 What factors determine the cost per enzyme molecule?

In ECM, we assume that cells realize their metabolic fluxes at a minimal enzyme cost and that this cost is a direct function of the enzyme levels. We further assume that the cost function is linear, i.e.  $h(E_1, E_2, \dots) = \sum_l h_{E_l} E_l$ . The values of the enzyme-specific costs  $h_{E_l}$  depend on the biological context. For instance, cast can be defined by a growth deficit caused by enzyme over-expression. In microbes, such cost values can be measured using standard lab techniques for measuring growth rate. A disadvantage of this approach is the difficulty to disentangle the cost of the specific over-expressed enzyme from other effects that the enzyme could have on the metabolic network at large, most importantly the potential benefit of increasing the flux in the reaction it catalyzes. Theoretical approaches, on the other hand, can be used to isolate enzyme cost from global effects, but may not capture the many possible ways in which growth deficits are caused in reality. Aside from the resources required for production and maintenance, enzymes need to compete with other proteins and macromolecules for the limited space in the cytoplasm or on membranes [61, 62]. The restriction can be related to the volume of the protein, the occupied membrane surface area, and the effect it has on the osmotic pressure (which depends on electro-static interactions with the surrounding water). Therefore, protein cost is a complex function of the copy-number of the enzyme, its physico-chemical parameters (such as molecular weight, 3D structure, hydrophobicity, charge, etc.), and its

production or degradation rate. Furthermore, enzymes can have adverse side effects, e.g., by promiscuous activity [63], which are virtually impossible to predict without extensive knowledge about an organism's full metabolic network and physiology. Since many of these features are unknown for most enzymes, and some of these effects require elaborate 3D models, which are beyond the scope of this work, we try to define a cost function that is simple to calculate, but captures many of these biological aspects. To determine relative cost weights, we may simply assume that enzyme cost is proportional to enzyme mass. Since we only use total cost as an optimization goal, the problem is scale-free and therefore the relative cost weights are enough for ECM. We obtain a linear cost function with specific costs  $h_{E_l} \sim L_l$ , where  $L_l$  is a measure of protein size (e.g., length in amino acid units or mass in Daltons). This may be relevant, in particular, for protein complexes or for lumped reactions representing entire pathways. This formula for protein cost weights can be extended by other factors:

- Degradation rate and protein lifetime** To account for differences in protein degradation, we can assume that enzyme cost is proportional to the enzyme production rate (in units of amino acids or Daltons per second). We define the lifetime of the enzyme as  $\tau_l = (\kappa_l + \lambda)^{-1}$  (where  $\lambda$  is the growth rate  $\kappa_l$  is the degradation rate<sup>3</sup>), and therefore the cost would be  $h_{E_l} \sim L_l/\tau_l$ . When the cell growth rate is much faster than the degradation rate,  $\kappa_l \ll \lambda$ , all enzymes have approximately the same lifetime and therefore the effect of protein degradation would be negligible.
- Individual amino acid costs** Enzymes show different amino acid compositions, and different amino acids require different amounts of energy for their production. If enzyme cost is mainly due to investments in amino acid production, we can quantify the energetic and material costs of individual amino acids [64] and account for them in our choice of enzyme cost weights. We did this in our calculations, but other cost functions, in which amino acid composition is neglected, lead to similar predictions of enzyme levels.
- Enzyme complexes with multiple subunits and catalytic sites** An enzyme may consist of several protein subunits and may contain several catalytic sites. Therefore, we adopt the convention that  $k_{\text{cat}}$  values refer to catalytic sites, while protein levels refer to protein subunits. The number  $N_{\text{sub}}$  of complex subunits and the number  $N_{\text{cat}}$  of catalytic sites per complex must appear in the formulae for reaction rates, enzyme demand, and enzyme cost: we replace in all these formulae the  $k_{\text{cat}}^+$  value (referring to a single catalytic site) by an effective value  $k_{\text{cat}}^{+'} = \frac{N_{\text{cat}}}{N_{\text{sub}}} k_{\text{cat}}^+$  (referring to one subunit).
- Covalent modification** Enzyme activity can be changed by phosphorylation or other posttranslational modifications. So far, we assumed that enzymes exist in one form and that the enzyme level  $E_l$  represents their concentration. For modifiable enzymes, our variable  $E_l$  describes the concentration of enzyme molecules *in the right modification state*, which is only a fraction  $\rho_l < 1$  of the total concentration. Since, the total enzyme concentration is  $1/\rho_l$  times as large as the concentration  $E_l$  appearing in the rate law, the enzyme cost weight  $h_{E_l}$  must be increased by this factor  $1/\rho_l$ .
- Constrained enzyme levels** The enzyme amounts in cells are restricted by physical constraints (e.g. space restrictions on mitochondrial membranes, which limit the number of respiration complexes). In ECM, this could be described by imposing upper limits on sums of enzyme levels in the cell, in cell compartments, or within membranes. As a heuristics, such constraints can also be replaced by cost terms that penalize high levels of these enzymes<sup>4</sup>.
- Lumped reactions** In a model, series of reactions can be represented by lumped reactions. Effective parameters ( $h$  and  $k_{\text{cat}}^+$  values) for lumped reactions can be obtained as described in S7.2.

<sup>3</sup>Protein lifetimes may systematically between types of reactions catalyzed. Enzymes catalyzing oxidation reactions are likely to accumulate damages faster and can be expected to have shorter lifetimes.

<sup>4</sup>To justify such cost terms mathematically, one could first consider a model with constraints on some enzyme fractions. These constraints could be treated by Lagrange multipliers, which lead to effective cost terms in the objective function. In these terms, the Lagrange multipliers appear as if they were enzyme cost weights. Replacing these Lagrange multipliers by constant numbers, we obtain effective linear cost terms which we can add to our cost function.

Function	Denominator	Rate law $r(c)$	Quantity	Formula
EMC0	1	const.		
EMC1	1	$k_{\text{cat}}^+$	Reaction rate	$v = E r$
EMC2s	$D^S = S$	$k_{\text{cat}}^+ \eta^{\text{enr}}$	Enzyme demand	$E = v/r$
EMC2sp	$D^{\text{SP}} = S + P$	$k_{\text{cat}}^+ \frac{\eta^{\text{enr}}}{1 + K_{\text{eq}} e^{-\Theta}}$	Enzyme cost	$q = h E = \frac{h v}{r}$
EMC3s	$D^{1S} = 1 + S$	$k_{\text{cat}}^+ \frac{\eta^{\text{enr}} S}{1 + S}$	Flux-specific cost	$a_v = \frac{q}{v} = \frac{h}{r}$
EMC3sp	$D^{1\text{SP}} = 1 + S + P$	$k_{\text{cat}}^+ \frac{S \eta^{\text{enr}}}{1 + S + P}$		
EMC4cm	$D^{\text{CM}} = S^{\text{CM}} + P^{\text{CM}} - 1$	$k_{\text{cat}}^+ \frac{S \eta^{\text{enr}}}{S + P - 1}$		
EMC4geom	$D^{\text{geom}}$	$k_{\text{cat}}^+ \frac{S \eta^{\text{enr}}}{\sqrt{D^{\text{CM}} D^{1\text{SP}}}}$		
EMC4arith	$D^{\text{arith}}$	$k_{\text{cat}}^+ \frac{S \eta^{\text{enr}}}{\frac{1}{2}(D^{\text{CM}} + D^{1\text{SP}})}$		
EMC4	$D(c)$	$k_{\text{cat}}^+ \frac{S \eta^{\text{enr}}}{D(c)}$		

Table S3: Rate laws and enzyme-based metabolic cost (EMC) functions. First table: EMC functions derived from simplified rate laws. Abbreviations: Forward catalytic constant  $k_{\text{cat}}^+$ . Energy efficiency  $\eta^{\text{enr}} = 1 - e^{-\Theta(c)}$ . Mass-action denominator terms  $S = \prod_i (s_i/K_i)^{m_i^S}$ ,  $P = \prod_j (p_j/K_j)^{m_j^P}$ ; convenience denominator terms  $S^{\text{CM}} = \prod_i (1 + s_i/K_i)^{m_i^S}$ ;  $P^{\text{CM}} = \prod_j (1 + p_j/K_j)^{m_j^P}$ . The denominator  $D(c)$  in the EMC4 function is a polynomial with non-negative coefficients as in Eq. (S3); it can also contain terms describing allosteric regulation. The molecularities  $m^S$  and  $m^P$  represent stoichiometric coefficients, but they can contain reaction-specific Hill coefficients as prefactors. The second table lists some quantities derived from the rate laws.

- **Absolute scaling** Beyond ECM, some applications require an absolute scaling of the cost function, i.e. the cost must be in units that are comparable to other factors that affect fitness, such as the biomass flux or the growth rate. This absolute scaling can be determined based on experimental data, for instance, by matching measured growth deficits for GFP [36]. Alternatively, we can convert the other fitness terms to units of enzyme mass, e.g. by quantifying how the biomass flux generates the amino acids that are eventually used to synthesize the enzymes.
- **Convex non-linear cost functions** Finally, if a nonlinear cost function  $h(\mathbf{E})$  is used, the total cost of a pathway is not simply a sum over the reactions' enzyme costs. Instead, a high cost in one enzyme could increase the cost pressure on other enzymes. Nevertheless, if the cost functions is convex, the total cost remains a convex function on the metabolite polytope, so numerical optimization stays feasible.

## S2.2 Enzyme cost as a function of metabolite levels

The enzyme cost of a given metabolic flux profile can be cast as a function  $q(\ln c)$  on the metabolite polytope. To obtain simple cost functions, we consider the factorized enzyme cost Eq. (6) and approximate some of the terms by constant numbers. Constant values of 1 arise from limiting cases: an infinite driving force leads to an energy factor of 1, and if enzymes are fully substrate-saturated and product concentrations are small ( $a \gg k_a^M$ ,  $b \ll K_{Mb}$ ), the saturation factor can be set to 1. To approximate the true cost function, we can start from the most simple estimate (EMC1) and subsequently reintroduce the different efficiency factors. The enzyme cost functions can be grouped, according to the data required, into five levels (see Tables 1 and S3):

- **EMC0 (“sum of fluxes”)** If no enzyme parameters are known at all, we can assume the same flux-specific cost  $a_v$  for all enzymes. Enzyme levels and enzyme costs are proportional to fluxes across the network:  $E_l \sim q_l \sim v_l$ , and enzyme cost is proportional to the sum of fluxes (where fluxes are positive due to our convention about reaction orientations).
- **EMC1 (“capacity-based”)** In the capacity-based (EMC1) functions, enzymes have individual specific flux costs  $a_{v_l} = h_{E_l}/k_{\text{cat},l}^+$  (based on known  $k_{\text{cat}}^+$  and  $h$  values) and are independent of metabolite levels. This

is equivalent to replacing reaction rates  $v$  by  $v_{\max}$  values, or dropping the efficiency factors in Eq. (6). Alternatively, we can set each factor to a constant, enzyme-specific value.

- **EMC2 (“energy-based”)** The energy-based (EMC2) functions capture the fact that cost increases close to equilibrium. They depend on metabolite levels, but only via the driving forces only, and equilibrium constants need to be known for the calculation. In the EMC2s function, we assume that enzymes are strongly substrate-saturated while product saturation is negligible: the denominator  $D^S$  (see Eq. (S4)) cancels the numerator term, resulting in a constant saturation factor  $\eta^{\text{sat}} = 1$  (i.e., full substrate saturation). The EMC2sp function, another energy-based function, describes enzymes with strong substrate and product saturation (denominator  $D^{\text{SP}}$ ). Here the saturation factor

$$\eta^{\text{sat}} = \frac{\prod_i s_i/K_i}{\prod_i s_i/K_i + \prod_j p_j/K_j} = \frac{1}{1 + \frac{\prod_j p_j/K_j}{\prod_i s_i/K_i}} = \frac{1}{1 + K_{\text{eq}} e^{-\Theta}} \quad (\text{S12})$$

is not a constant, but it depends on the driving force. Since the rate can be computed from driving forces alone, the EMC2sp function is classified as “energy-based”.

- **EMC3 (“saturation-based”)** The saturation-based (EMC3) functions represent rate laws with the denominators  $D^{(1S)}$  and  $D^{(1SP)}$ . These are rate laws that do not depend on metabolite levels, but on their mathematical products, the mass-action terms. To compute them, the  $K_M$  values (more precisely,  $K_M$  values multiplied over all substrates or products) must be known. The EMC3sp function follows from the direct-binding rate law or, for unimolecular reactions, from reversible Michaelis-Menten kinetics. The EMC3s function has a similar form, but contains no product term. It describes enzymes with incomplete substrate saturation, but far from equilibrium ( $\Theta \rightarrow \infty$ ), so the product term can be neglected. The energy factor  $\eta^{\text{enr}}$  can be set to 1, but the factor

$$\eta^{\text{sat}} = \frac{\prod_i (s_i/K_i)^{m_i^S}}{1 + \underbrace{\prod_i (s_i/K_i)^{m_i^S}}_{D^{1S}}} \quad (\text{S13})$$

remains an explicit term in the rate law.

- **EMC4 (“Kinetics-based”)** The kinetics-based cost functions (EMC4) capture all thermodynamically feasible rate laws, including rate laws with allosteric activation or inhibition terms. Their denominators have the form Eq. (S3) and contain the terms from the  $D^{1SP}$  denominator, plus others. Examples are rate laws with  $D^{\text{CM}}$ ,  $D^{\text{geom}}$ , and  $D^{\text{arith}}$  denominators.

Here are some additional remarks.

- To obtain simplified EMC functions, we can apply the following simplifications: (i) neglect individual enzyme cost weights  $h$ ; (ii) neglect individual catalytic constants  $k_{\text{cat}}^+$ ; (iii) set  $\eta^{\text{enr}}$  to a constant value; (iv) set  $\eta^{\text{sat}}$  to a constant value. (iv) If  $\eta^{\text{sat}}$  is not set constant, (iv.a) use/do not use the term 1 in denominator; (iv.b) use/do not use highest-order product term in denominator; (iv.c) with more reactants: use/do not use additional terms; (v) if the enzyme is allosterically regulated: possibly, set regulation term constant. These simplifications can be freely combined. Whether a cost function is classified as EMC0, EMC1, EMC2, EMC3, or EMC4 depends can be determined from its formula.
- Different EMC functions require different types of input data:  $k_{\text{cat}}^+$  values for EMC1; additionally equilibrium constants (or standard reaction Gibbs energies) for EMC2; additionally,  $K_M$  values for EMC3; and possibly, more parameters for EMC4.

- If efficiency factors are set to 1 (and not to smaller constant values), each EMC function is a lower estimate of the following (less simplified) ones. This includes EMC0 function if we use the *largest*  $a_{v_i}^{\text{cat}}$  value from the other functions as a prefactor in the EMC0 function.
- If a rate law contains Hill coefficients, they can be treated as part of the molecularities. The reactants of a reaction must have the same Hill coefficient.
- Given two possible rate laws for the same reaction, we may define new rate laws by taking their geometric or harmonic mean (this is, for instance, how the rate law denominators  $D^{(\text{geom})}$  or  $D^{\text{arith}}$  were defined). In this case, the enzyme demands and costs (for the new rate law) are given by the geometric or arithmetic means from the original rate laws. In particular, the enzyme cost functions related to the denominators  $D^{\text{geom}}$  or  $D^{\text{arith}}$  (called EMC4geom and EMC4arith) represent the geometric (or arithmetic) mean of the original EMC3sp and EMC4cm functions.

### S2.3 Flux-specific enzyme cost and pathway-specific activity

The flux-specific cost  $a_{v_i}$  of an enzyme, in the context of a certain metabolic state, is defined as the enzyme cost per unit flux. At given metabolite levels, and assuming a linear cost function, the flux-specific cost is a constant. At constant metabolite levels, a doubling of the flux will require a doubling of the enzyme level, and thus a doubling of the enzyme cost. The ratio of cost and flux remains constant and is given by Eq. (6). A flux-specific cost can also be defined for pathways or any sets of reactions. Since different reactions may carry different fluxes a pathway (due to non-stationarity, side branches, or splitting of molecules as between upper and lower glycolysis), we choose one flux or production rate as the representative *pathway flux*  $v_{\text{pw}}$  and define the *pathway specific cost* by  $a_v^{\text{pw}} = \frac{q}{v_{\text{pw}}}$ , i.e., the pathway enzyme cost divided by the pathway flux. In practice, the pathway flux should represent a flux that matters for the cell's benefit (e.g., ATP production in a glycolysis model). To compare different pathway models at identical benefits, we could scale their fluxes to the same benefit value. Given fixed metabolite levels at the pathway boundaries<sup>5</sup> the flux-specific cost of a pathway will be constant. If all reactions in a pathway carry identical fluxes, it is given by the sum of the reactions' flux-specific costs. Otherwise, the pathway specific cost will be a weighted sum  $\sum_l a'_{v_l} v'_l$  of the reaction flux-specific costs, with unitless relative fluxes  $v'_l = \frac{v_l}{v_c}$  as weights (in a simple linear chain,  $v'_l = 1$ ).

An enzyme's specific activity is given by the catalyzed flux divided by the enzyme mass (in  $\mu\text{mol}/\text{min}/\text{mg}$  enzyme). Specific activities can also be defined for entire pathways [2]. If we treat enzyme mass (in grams/cell volume) as the cost function  $h(\mathbf{E})$ , the resulting flux-specific cost  $a_v$  (enzyme cost per flux) is exactly the inverse of the specific activity (flux per enzyme mass)<sup>6</sup>. This holds both for single reactions and entire pathways. With enzyme mass used as a cost function, a pathway's specific cost  $a_{\text{pw}} = q/v_{\text{pw}}$  yields the amount of enzyme (in grams/cell volume) divided by the pathway flux (in mM/s) or, in other words, the amount of enzyme (in grams) divided by the pathway flux (in mol/s). Accordingly, the pathway specific activity (in (mol/s)/grams enzyme) is given by

$$A_{\text{pw}} = \frac{v_{\text{pw}}}{q} = a_v^{-1}. \quad (\text{S14})$$

To express this in units of  $\mu\text{mol}/\text{min}/\text{mg}$  enzyme, we multiply by 60000. Since the pathway specific cost is a

<sup>5</sup>In a kinetic model with constant external metabolite levels, an overall scaling of enzyme levels will lead to a proportional scaling of fluxes. With a linear enzyme cost function  $h(E_1, E_2, \dots)$ , this scaling will leave all flux-specific costs unchanged. In reality, a change in enzyme levels is likely to affect metabolite levels outside the pathway, so the theoretical result does not exactly apply.

<sup>6</sup>In this case, an enzyme's cost weight  $h_{E_i}$  will be given by the enzyme's total mass (in grams/cell volume), divided by the concentration (number of enzyme molecules divided by Avogadro constant and cell volume), so  $h_{E_i}$  is just the enzyme's molecular mass in Daltons.

weighted sum of enzyme specific costs

$$a_{\text{pw}} = \sum_l v_l' a_{v_l}, \quad (\text{S15})$$

the pathway specific activity  $A_{\text{pw}}$  (referring to the pathway flux  $v_{\text{pw}}$ ) is the weighted harmonic sum of the enzyme specific activities  $A_l$

$$A_{\text{pw}} = \left[ \sum_l v_l' A_l^{-1} \right]^{-1} \quad (\text{S16})$$

where the  $v_l' = v_l/v_{\text{pw}}$  are scaled (unit-less) fluxes. This formula agrees with the formula given in [2] and allows for non-uniform fluxes along the pathway.

## S3 Enzyme cost minimization

### S3.1 Parameterizing the metabolic states of a kinetic model

The standard practice in kinetic modeling is to set up an ODE system where enzyme levels  $\mathbf{E}$  are given (typically, due to separation of time scales they are assumed to be fixed) and metabolite levels  $\mathbf{c}(t)$  are the free variables which evolve over time. The kinetic model describes the relationship between enzymes and metabolites (via kinetic rate laws), which in turn affect the metabolites.

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\mathbf{c}} &= \mathbf{N}\mathbf{v} \\ \mathbf{v} &= \mathbf{v}(\mathbf{E}, \mathbf{c}). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S17})$$

In order to find a steady state, the ODE is integrated over time until  $\|\dot{\mathbf{c}}\|$  is small enough to be labeled as stationary. Then we can say the system is in steady state and determine the flux and metabolic state  $(\mathbf{c}(\infty), \mathbf{v}(\infty))$ . In many cases, the steady state will depend on the choice of initial conditions  $\mathbf{c}(0)$ . We thus define the set of all steady states as  $\mathcal{S} = \{(\mathbf{c}(\infty), \mathbf{v}(\infty), \mathbf{E})\}_{\mathbf{E}, \mathbf{c}(0)}$ . Using this representation, determining  $\mathcal{S}$  requires an exhaustive scan of all parameters  $\mathbf{E}, \mathbf{c}(0)$ , which can be time-consuming, and virtually impossible for large kinetic networks. Here, we suggest an alternative representation of steady states which is computationally simple, and is especially useful for certain types of optimization problems. Instead of enzyme levels as parameters, we use the steady-state fluxes. Then, for each given steady state, metabolite levels  $\mathbf{c}$  we can derive the enzyme levels, using the inverted kinetic rate laws discussed in the previous sections (essentially, the value of  $\mathbf{E}$  in the EMC function). Therefore, we can redefine the set of steady states as  $\mathcal{S} = \{(\mathbf{c}, \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{E}(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{c}))\}_{\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{c}}$  – where  $\mathbf{c}$  and  $\mathbf{v}$  correspond to the steady state values, like  $\mathbf{c}(\infty)$  and  $\mathbf{v}(\infty)$  in the previous definition. This representation of steady states has a number of practical advantages.

**Proposition 1 Set of metabolic states** Consider a kinetic model with rate laws  $v_l = E_l r_l(\mathbf{c})$ , thermodynamically consistent rate constants (see SI S1.1), a feasible flux profile  $\mathbf{v}$ , and bounds on metabolite levels. For any feasible metabolite profile  $\ln \mathbf{c} \in \mathcal{P}$  there is a unique set of enzyme levels  $E_l$  which realizes  $\mathbf{c}$ . The function  $E_l(\ln \mathbf{c}) = v_l/r_l(\mathbf{c})$  is differentiable on the metabolite polytope.

**Proof:** If a metabolite profile  $\mathbf{c}$  is feasible for our flux profile  $\mathbf{v}$ , the catalytic rates  $r_l(\mathbf{c})$  obtained from the rate laws Eq. (S1) must have the same signs as  $v_l$ , so  $E_l = v_l/r_l(\mathbf{c})$  is positive on the entire metabolite polytope. In particular, we know that  $\ln \mathbf{c} \in \mathcal{P} \rightarrow r_l(\mathbf{c}) \neq 0$ . Since  $r_l(\mathbf{c})$  is differentiable and has a constant sign on the metabolite polytope,  $E_l(\ln \mathbf{c})$  is differentiable on the metabolite polytope.

Here are some additional remarks.

- **Metabolite profiles parameterize the possible states** Proposition 1 guarantees that all thermodynamically feasible metabolite profiles can be realized by steady states of the kinetic model. In other words, the set  $\mathcal{S}$  of metabolic states for a given flux profile  $\mathbf{v}$  can be parameterized by the points of the metabolite polytope. This means that the set of kinetically realizable metabolite profiles in a kinetic model depends on the equilibrium constants, but not on other enzyme-specific parameters.
- **An enzyme profile need not uniquely determine the metabolite profile** In ECM, the same enzyme profile may be realizable by different metabolite profiles; this happens, in particular, if simplified rate laws are used. (i) If a metabolite appears in a model but has no impact on any reaction, its concentration can be freely varied, independently of fluxes or enzyme levels. (ii) With the EMC0 and EMC1 functions, enzyme levels do not depend on metabolite levels. (iii) With EMC2 functions,  $\mathbf{s} = \ln \mathbf{c}$  can be varied along directions in the nullspace of  $\mathbf{N}_{\text{tot}}^\top$  without affecting the driving forces or enzyme cost. These EMC2 functions, on the metabolite polytope, have an invariant subspace (namely the nullspace of  $\mathbf{N}_{\text{tot}}^\top$ ). Under what conditions EMC3 and EMC4 functions (without regularization terms) have unique optima remains an open question.

### S3.2 Enzyme-based metabolic cost functions are convex on the metabolite polytope

The enzyme cost functions Eq. (6) are convex on the metabolite polytope: the cost for a metabolite log-concentration vector, interpolated between two vectors  $\mathbf{s}_a$  and  $\mathbf{s}_b$ , cannot be higher than the interpolated cost:

$$\forall \lambda \in [0, 1] : q(\lambda \mathbf{s}_a + (1 - \lambda) \mathbf{s}_b) \leq \lambda q(\mathbf{s}_a) + (1 - \lambda) q(\mathbf{s}_b). \quad (\text{S18})$$

To show that all enzyme-based metabolic cost functions are convex, we consider the most general rate law with denominator (S3), written in factorized form

$$v = E \cdot k_{\text{cat}}^+ \cdot \eta^{\text{enr}} \cdot \eta^{\text{sat}}, \quad (\text{S19})$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \eta^{\text{enr}} &= 1 - e^{-\Theta} = 1 - \exp\left(\frac{1}{RT} \Delta_r G^{\circ'} + \sum_i n_i \ln c_i\right) \\ \eta^{\text{sat}} &= \prod_i \left(\frac{s_i}{K_i}\right)^{-m_i^s} \left(\sum_k M_k \prod_j c_i^{m_{ik}}\right)^{-1} = \left(\sum_k \alpha_k \prod_j c_i^{a_{ik}}\right)^{-1} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S20})$$

with coefficients  $\alpha_k \in \mathbb{R}_+$  and  $a_{ik} \in \mathbb{R}$ . The regulation factor  $\eta^{\text{reg}}$  need not be explicitly considered because it can be included in the term  $\eta^{\text{sat}}$ . With this rate law, the enzyme cost for a pathway reads

$$q_{\text{pw}} = \sum_l q_l = \sum_l \frac{h_{E_l} v_l}{k_{\text{cat},l}^+} \cdot \frac{1}{\eta_l^{\text{enr}}} \cdot \frac{1}{\eta_l^{\text{sat}}}. \quad (\text{S21})$$

This function is convex on the metabolite polytope. For the proof, the cost function  $h(\mathbf{E})$  need not be linear; if it is nonlinear, it must be convex. For the proof, we start with some general lemmas.

**Lemma 1** *The function  $f(y) = -\ln(1 - e^y)$  is convex in the range  $y < 0$ .*

**Proof S3.1** *The second derivative*

$$\frac{d}{dy^2} f(y) = \frac{e^y}{(1 - e^y)^2}$$



is positive for  $y < 0$ .

**Lemma 2** The function  $f(\mathbf{s}) = \ln \sum_{k=1}^n e^{s_k}$  is convex.

**Proof S3.2**

$$\nabla^2 f(\mathbf{s}) = \frac{\text{Dg}(\mathbf{c})(\mathbf{1}^\top \mathbf{c}) - \mathbf{c} \mathbf{c}^\top}{(\mathbf{1}^\top \mathbf{c})^2} \quad (\text{where } c_i = e^{s_i})$$

$$\forall \mathbf{u}: \mathbf{u}^\top \nabla^2 f(\mathbf{s}) \mathbf{u} = \frac{(\sum_i c_i u_i^2)(\sum_i c_i) - (\sum_i u_i c_i)^2}{(\sum_i c_i)^2} \geq 0$$

since  $(\sum_i u_i c_i)^2 \leq (\sum_i c_i u_i^2)(\sum_i c_i)$  from the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality. Therefore, the Hessian  $\nabla^2 f(\mathbf{s})$  is positive semi-definite, which proves that  $f(\mathbf{s})$  is convex.

**Lemma 3** For any number  $\nu \in \mathbb{R}_+$  and vector  $\mathbf{n} \in \mathbb{R}^m$ , the function  $-\ln(1 - \nu e^{\mathbf{n} \cdot \mathbf{s}})$  is convex over  $\{\mathbf{s} \in \mathbb{R}^m \mid \nu e^{\mathbf{n} \cdot \mathbf{s}} < 1\}$ .

**Proof S3.3** This function is a composition of  $f = -\ln(1 - e^y)$  from Lemma 1 with the affine transformation  $y = \mathbf{n} \cdot \mathbf{s} + \ln \nu$ , an operation which preserves convexity.

**Lemma 4** For any matrix  $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$  and vectors  $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}_+^n$ , the following function is convex over  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^m$ :

$$\ln \left( \sum_{k=1}^n e^{\mathbf{a}_k \cdot \mathbf{s} + b_k} \right) \quad (\text{S22})$$

where  $\mathbf{a}_i$  is the  $i$ th row of  $\mathbf{A}$ .

**Proof S3.4** This function is a composition of  $f = \ln \sum_{i=1}^n e^{s_i}$  from Lemma 2 with the affine transformation  $s_i = \mathbf{a}_i \cdot \mathbf{s} + b_i$ , an operation which preserves convexity.

Based on these lemmas, we can now prove the convexity of enzyme cost functions.

**Lemma 5** Assume that all enzyme-catalysed reactions in a model behave according to rate laws of the type

$$v = E \cdot k_{\text{cat}}^+ \cdot \eta^{\text{enr}} \cdot \eta^{\text{sat}}, \quad (\text{S23})$$

with  $\eta^{\text{enr}}$  and  $\eta^{\text{sat}}$  given by Eq. (S20), with coefficients  $\alpha_k \in \mathbb{R}_+$  and  $a_{ik} \in \mathbb{R}$ . Assume that the enzyme cost function for enzymatic reaction  $l$  reads

$$q_l = \frac{h_{E_l} v_l}{E_l} = \frac{h_{E_l} v_l}{k_{\text{cat},l}^+} \cdot \frac{1}{\eta_l^{\text{enr}}} \cdot \frac{1}{\eta_l^{\text{sat}}}. \quad (\text{S24})$$

Then the total enzyme cost  $q = \sum_l q_l$ , as a function of logarithmic metabolite concentrations ( $\mathbf{s} = \ln \mathbf{c}$ ), is convex.

**Proof S3.5** To simplify the efficiency factors, we can use the abbreviations  $s_i \equiv \ln c_i$ ,  $\nu \equiv \exp(\Delta_r G^\circ / RT)$ , and  $b_k = \ln \alpha_k$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \eta^{\text{enr}} &= 1 - \nu e^{-\mathbf{n} \cdot \mathbf{s}} \\ \eta^{\text{sat}} &= \left( \sum_{k=1}^n e^{\mathbf{a}_k \cdot \mathbf{s} + b_k} \right)^{-1}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S25})$$




Figure S2: The optimal metabolic state depends on the catalytic constants. (a) Two-reaction pathway with external concentrations  $x = 1$  and  $y = 0.1$ . The enzyme demand depends on the concentration  $a$  of intermediate metabolite A. (b) Enzyme demand as a function of  $a$ , for a desired flux  $v = 1$  (a.u.) and assuming reversible Michaelis-Menten rate laws (all parameters set to 1). Close to chemical equilibrium in reaction 1 (right border) or reaction 2 (left border), enzyme demand diverges. The optimum metabolite concentration is marked by a dot. (c) Enzyme demand depends on kinetic constants  $k_{\text{cat}}^+$ . Results with varying  $k_{\text{cat}}^+$  values in reaction 1 (reference value  $k_{\text{cat}}^+ = 1 \text{ s}^{-1}$ ) are shown. Higher  $k_{\text{cat}}^+$  values decrease the enzyme demand in reaction 1, shifting the optimum point towards higher values of  $a$ . (d) Optimal metabolite and enzyme levels shown as functions of  $k_{\text{cat}}^+$ .

If we look at the natural logarithm of  $q_l$ ,

$$\ln q_l = \ln \left( \frac{h_{E_l} v_l}{k_{\text{cat},l}^+} \right) - \ln \eta_l^{\text{enr}} - \ln \eta_l^{\text{sat}}, \quad (\text{S26})$$

we see that each of the three terms in the sum is convex in  $s$ . The first term is constant with respect to the metabolite concentrations and therefore trivially convex. The energetic term,  $-\ln \eta^{\text{th}} = -\ln(1 - \nu e^{-\mathbf{n} \cdot \mathbf{s}})$ , is convex according to Lemma 3. The saturation factor,  $-\ln \eta^{\text{sat}} = \ln \left( \sum_{k=1}^n e^{\mathbf{a}_k \cdot \mathbf{s} + b_k} \right)$ , is convex according to Lemma 4. We conclude that  $q_l$  is convex too, since it is a composition of a convex function ( $e^x$ ) with another convex function ( $\ln q_l$ ). Finally, the total enzyme cost ( $q$ ) is convex since it is a sum of convex functions:

$$q = \sum_l q_l(\mathbf{s}). \quad (\text{S27})$$

### S3.3 The ECM problem remains convex under metabolite and enzyme constraints

In ECM, we may introduce an upper bound on the sum of all (non-logarithmic) metabolite levels as an extra constraint. Unlike our original metabolite polytope, the resulting admissible region will have a curved surface. However, since the sum of metabolite levels is convex on the metabolite polytope, the new constraint leads to a convex region, and the ECM problem remains convex. Another possible constraint comes from predefined concentrations of conserved moieties. A fixed concentration  $[\text{ATP}] + [\text{ADP}]$ , for example, would define a nonlinear constraint on the metabolite polytope. However, the inequality constraint  $[\text{ATP}] + [\text{ADP}] \leq \text{const.}$  would lead to a convex feasible region. Similarly, we may postulate that the sum of enzyme levels, or some weighted sums of enzyme levels (e.g., for enzymes occupying a certain membrane) are bounded from above. Since these sums are convex functions on the metabolite polytope, a bound on these sums will define a convex set, and again, the optimality problem remains convex.

### S3.4 Optimal metabolic states depend on model parameters.

How do optimal metabolite and enzyme profiles depend on kinetic parameters? The metabolite profile reflects a compromise between requirements in different reactions and depends on many model details. Changes in external

concentrations or equilibrium constants will shift the boundaries of the metabolite polytope, and changes in  $k_{\text{cat}}$  values, enzyme cost weights  $h_{E_l}$ , or desired fluxes  $v_l$  will scale the cost of individual enzymes and shift the optimum point (see Figure 2 (f)). Figure S2 shows this for a varying  $k_{\text{cat}}$  value. We consider a two-reaction pathway with parameters set to 1 (arbitrary units). We note that a higher intermediate level  $a$  decreases the force in reaction 1 (i.e., increases its enzyme demand) and increases the force in reaction 2 (i.e., decreases its enzyme demand). With the parameters chosen, the total enzyme demand becomes minimal when both reactions show the same driving force: this is the state that would also be predicted by the MDF method (which focuses on driving forces instead of enzyme costs [15]). If we increase the  $k_{\text{cat}}$  value in reaction 1, the cost of enzyme 1 will have a smaller impact on the overall cost, and the optimal concentration  $a$  is shifted to higher values. Since the cost of enzyme 2 becomes more dominant, energy efficiency in this reaction is increased on the expense of reaction 1. A variation of enzyme cost weights  $h_{E_l}$  or fluxes  $v_l$  will have similar effects as variations of  $1/k_{\text{cat},l}^+$ .

### S3.5 Preemptive enzyme expression as a convex optimality problem

Cells have to deal with varying environments which require different fluxes and enzyme levels. Since switching takes time and the resulting maladaptation can be costly, a possible strategy is to anticipate all possible (or likely) situations and to express enzymes preemptively. In a simple strategy, the cell could express all enzymes at a constant level and inhibit some of them in each situation to realise a favourable state. The choice of optimal preemptive enzyme levels can be formulated as an optimality problem, which turns out to be convex. We assume a set of possible situations  $\sigma$ , each characterised by different conditions (external metabolite concentration vector  $\mathbf{c}^{\text{ext},\sigma}$  and other kinetics-relevant parameters  $\mathbf{p}^\sigma$ ) and a necessary flow  $\mathbf{v}^\sigma$ . For simplicity, we assume that each reaction has a fixed flux direction across all conditions. Each condition leads to a different metabolite polytope  $\mathcal{P}_s^\sigma$  and to a different specific rate function  $r^\sigma(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{s})$ . A preemptive adaptation strategy is a tuple  $\{\mathbf{s}^\sigma\}$  of metabolite profiles for the different situations, each located in its metabolite polytope  $\mathbf{s}^\sigma \in \mathcal{P}_s^\sigma$ . The corresponding *required enzyme activities* comprise the enzyme profiles required in the different situations:

$$E_l^\sigma(\mathbf{s}^\sigma) = \frac{v_l^\sigma}{r_l^\sigma(\mathbf{s}^\sigma)} \quad (\text{S28})$$

We note that each of the  $E_l^\sigma(\mathbf{s}^\sigma)$  is a convex function on the corresponding metabolite polytope  $\mathcal{P}_s^\sigma$ . To define the overall cost of the strategy, we determine, for each enzyme, the maximal level that it needs to show across situations (for all other situations, we assume that the enzyme activity will be reduced allosterically, without reducing the actual enzyme cost). Thus,

$$q^{\text{strategy}}(\{\mathbf{s}^\sigma\}) = \sum_l \max_\sigma E_l^\sigma(\mathbf{s}^\sigma). \quad (\text{S29})$$

We now show that this cost is a convex function on the product polytope  $\prod_\sigma \mathcal{P}_s^\sigma$ . First of all, the cost is convex if for each reaction  $l$ , the cost

$$q_l^{\text{strategy}}(\{\mathbf{s}^\sigma\}) = \max_\sigma E_l^\sigma(\mathbf{s}^\sigma) \quad (\text{S30})$$

related to this reaction is convex. This is what we show now. From ECM, we know that  $E_l^\sigma(\mathbf{s}^\sigma)$  is convex on  $\mathcal{P}_s^\sigma$ , so

$$E_l^\sigma([1 - \lambda] \mathbf{s}_A^\sigma + \lambda \mathbf{s}_B^\sigma) \leq [1 - \lambda] E_l^\sigma(\mathbf{s}_A^\sigma) + \lambda E_l^\sigma(\mathbf{s}_B^\sigma). \quad (\text{S31})$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
q_i^{\text{strategy}}([1 - \lambda] \{s_A^\sigma\} + \lambda \{s_B^\sigma\}) &= \max_\sigma E_i^\sigma([1 - \lambda] s_A^\sigma + \lambda s_B^\sigma) \\
&\leq \max_\sigma ([1 - \lambda] E_i^\sigma(s_A^\sigma) + \lambda E_i^\sigma(s_B^\sigma)) \\
&\leq [1 - \lambda] \max_\sigma (E_i^\sigma(s_A^\sigma)) + \lambda \max_\sigma (E_i^\sigma(s_B^\sigma)) \\
&= [1 - \lambda] q_i^{\text{strategy}}(\{s_A^\sigma\}) + \lambda q_i^{\text{strategy}}(\{s_B^\sigma\}) \tag{S32}
\end{aligned}$$

This shows that  $q_i^{\text{strategy}}(\{s^\sigma\})$  is a convex function. The first inequality holds because  $E_i^\sigma(s^\sigma)$  is convex in  $s^\sigma$ . the second inequality holds because the maximum function  $\max(a_1, a_2, a_3, \dots)$  is convex in its arguments.

### S3.6 Non-enzymatic reactions

So far, we generally assumed that all reactions in a model are enzyme-catalysed. In reality, some chemical reactions are fast enough even without a catalyst, as is also the case for membrane diffusion (e.g., for small molecules like  $O_2$  and  $CO_2$ ). These processes are often counter-productive, such as spontaneous degradation of complex compounds or leakage efflux of useful metabolites. Furthermore, since many models of growing cells use metabolite concentrations (not absolute amount) as variables, the increase of cell volume dilutes these concentrations and is thus equivalent to a global degradation rate, which might be significant (e.g. in fast growing bacteria). These non-enzymatic processes could have a large impact on the metabolic flows or, in the perspective taken here, on how costly certain flows will be. Thus in general, our flows contain, aside from enzymatic reactions, a number of non-enzymatic reactions degrading or converting metabolites, most probably with mass-action rate laws. This radically changes things: in ECM, effectively, non-enzymatic reactions put additional constraints on metabolite concentrations, which confine the metabolite polytope to a subspace, and may make the polytope become empty.

**In ECM, non-enzymatic reactions lead to constraints on the metabolite polytope, but leave the optimality problem convex** Consider an ECM problem with non-enzymatic reactions. The rate laws  $v_j^{\text{non}} = r_j(c)$  have the general form of reversible reactions (with thermodynamic numerator, and some concentration-dependent denominator), such that the functions  $1/r_j(s)$  will be convex on the metabolite polytope. In ECM, with given fluxes, the metabolite levels must be such that the flux is realised. The non-enzymatic reactions are not scored by enzyme costs, but they create (potentially nonlinear) equality constraints on the metabolite polytope. In the simple case of *irreversible mass action laws*, we obtain a linear equality constraint on the metabolite polytope, that is, the polytope is cut by a plane, and all solutions must lie in the resulting subspace. Obviously, this leaves the optimization problem convex.

### S3.7 The enzyme cost profile obtained by ECM is a linear combination of metabolic control profiles

In kinetic models of metabolic pathways, a flux maximization at a fixed total enzyme level will lead to a state in which enzyme levels and flux control coefficients are proportional [53]. Treating metabolic pathways by ECM, we obtain a similar, yet more general relationship between enzyme costs and metabolic control coefficients. The cost of an enzyme is proportional to a linear combination of metabolic control coefficients, and the control coefficients appearing in this linear combination refer to (i) possible stationary flux modes in the network and (ii) concentrations of internal metabolites that are either kept fixed or hit a bound in ECM.

**Proposition 2 (Enzyme cost and control coefficients)** *In kinetic models with metabolic states obtained by*




Figure S3: Estimates of enzyme cost, computed from driving forces. The schemes show different possible cost functions for a three-reaction pathway (left; same as in Figure 2). (a) Lowest driving force  $\Theta^{\min} = \min_l \Theta_l$  along the pathway (colors from small (dark) to large (bright)). The contour lines can be used to define stricter constraints on metabolite profiles (see text). In the maximum point, all reactions have equal driving forces; this is the state that would follow from MDF optimization. (b) The highest inverse driving force in the pathway, ( $\max_l \Theta_l^{-1}$ ), shows the same type of contour lines and the same optimum point (logarithmic color scale, from small (blue) to large (red)). (c) The sum  $\sum_l \Theta_l^{-1}$  of inverse driving forces along the pathway. (d) The sum  $\sum_l [1 - e^{-\Theta_l}]^{-1}$  is an EMC2s function with all parameters set to 1. The function (b) is always lower than (c), (c) is lower than (d), and (d) is lower than an EMC3 function with parameters set to 1 (the one shown in Figure 2). All these functions have different optimum points.

enzyme cost minimization, the profile of enzyme cost  $h_{E_i} E_i$  is a linear combination (proof see section S7.4)

$$h_{E_i} E_i = \sum_{a \in \text{stat}} \alpha_a C_i^{j_a} + \sum_{b \in \text{bnd}} \beta_b C_i^{s_b}$$

of flux control coefficients (for the independent stationary fluxes  $j_a^{\text{stat}}$ ) and of metabolite control coefficients (for internal metabolites  $s_b^{\text{bnd}}$  that hit upper or lower bounds). The coefficients  $\beta_i$  assume values  $\beta_i = 0$  when a metabolite hits none of the bounds,  $\beta_i > 0$  when it hits the lower bound, and  $\beta_i < 0$  when it hits the upper bound. In particular, if a network allows for a single stationary flux mode only, the enzyme costs show a proportionality

$$h_{E_i} E_i \propto C_i^J + \sum_{b \in \text{bnd}} \beta'_b C_i^{s_b}. \quad (\text{S33})$$

In the kinetic model, enzymes have no control over external metabolites. Thus, if all fixed metabolites (in ECM) are considered external (in the kinetic model), and if none of the internal metabolites (in the kinetic model) hits a bound (in ECM), the concentration control coefficients do not appear in the sum, then enzyme costs are directly proportional to flux control coefficients

$$h_{E_i} E_i \propto C_i^J. \quad (\text{S34})$$

Assuming equal cost weights for all enzymes, this yields a proportionality between enzyme levels and flux control coefficients as previously found in [53].

## S4 Energy-based cost functions and limits on driving forces

By studying the infeasible zones along polytope faces, we can derive tighter constraints on driving forces. The enzyme cost minimum can be inside the metabolite polytope or on a P-face (see Figure Figure 2 (f)). Since enzyme costs rise fast near E-faces of the polytope, the optimum point will not be located in those regions, and it can be practical to exclude these regions from the metabolite polytope. This simply means that we introduce




Figure S4: Two-reaction pathway with external concentrations  $x = 1$  and  $y = 0.1$  (same model as in Figure S2). The driving forces depend on the concentration  $a$  of intermediate metabolite A. (a) Driving forces as functions of  $a$  (note the logarithmic scale). (b) The inverse driving forces  $1/\Theta_l$  and their sum are convex functions of  $\log a$ . As shown in Figure S3, scaled inverse driving forces can be used as lower estimates of enzyme cost. (c) Enzyme demands for desired flux  $v = 1$ , assuming reversible Michaelis-Menten rate laws (all parameters set to 1). Close to chemical equilibrium in reaction 1 (right border) or reaction 2 (left border), the enzyme investment diverges. The optimum concentration is marked by a dot.

positive lower bounds on all driving forces. However, when should a driving force count as small? To define a threshold, we limit the enzyme cost in each reaction by an upper bound  $q^{\max}$ , e.g. five percent of the total cost of the proteome. We use the general EMC equation (Eq. 6) to obtain a lower bound for driving forces ( $\Theta_l$ ), by remembering that  $\eta^{\text{enr}} < 1$  and  $\eta^{\text{reg}} < 1$ :

$$\frac{h_{E_l} v_l}{k_{\text{cat},l}^+ q^{\max}} < \frac{h_{E_l} v_l}{k_{\text{cat},l}^+ q_l} = \eta^{\text{enr}} \eta^{\text{sat}} \eta^{\text{reg}} < \eta^{\text{enr}} = 1 - e^{-\Theta_l} < \Theta_l, \quad (\text{S35})$$

where the last step uses the fact that  $1 - e^x < x$  for  $x > 0$ . The value varies between reactions (derivation in SI S7.1) and depends on fluxes,  $k_{\text{cat}}$  values, and enzyme cost weights  $h_E$  (where protein mass can be used as a proxy). With the constraint (S35), we obtain a smaller metabolite polytope in which the costly regions close to the previous E-faces are excluded. The same constraints can also be used in thermodynamics-based FBA. Usually, thermodynamics-based FBA requires that fluxes and driving forces have the same sign (e.g. [8, 14, 23]), but fluxes are allowed to be driven by infinitesimal forces. With our stricter (and more realistic) constraint, an FBA model would require, instead, that forces must be large enough to realize fluxes at plausible enzyme costs.

Other metabolite constraints, which ensure sufficient substrate levels, can be derived similarly. By putting an upper bound on the enzyme cost, we obtain a lower bound on the saturation efficiency  $\eta^{\text{sat}}$ , and thus on the substrate levels. Consider, for instance, a reversible MM rate law for a reaction  $S \rightleftharpoons P$  in the factorized form (3). Noting that  $\eta^{\text{enr}} < 1$  and  $\eta^{\text{reg}} < 1$ , we obtain a lower bound on enzyme cost:

$$\frac{h_{E_l} v_l}{k_{\text{cat},l}^+ q^{\max}} < \eta^{\text{enr}} \eta^{\text{sat}} \eta^{\text{reg}} < \eta^{\text{sat}} = \frac{s/K_S}{1 + s/K_S + p/K_P} < \frac{s}{K_S}. \quad (\text{S36})$$

For multi-substrate reactions, we obtain linear inequality constraints in log-concentration space. Using the EMC3s function, we obtain the cost estimate

$$q > q_l^{\min} = \frac{h v}{k_{\text{cat}}^+ \eta^{\text{sat}}} > \frac{h v}{k_{\text{cat}}^+} \frac{1 + \prod_i (s_i/K_i)^{m_i}}{\prod_i (s_i/K_i)^{m_i}} > \frac{h v}{k_{\text{cat}}^+} \prod_i (K_i/s_i)^{m_i}, \quad (\text{S37})$$

where  $s_i$  denotes substrate concentrations and  $m_i$  denotes substrate molecularities. With the upper bound




Figure S5: Data integration in the ECM-based modelling workflow. The kinetics phase (data collection and parameter balancing) is followed by the optimization phase (ECM and validation of results).

$q < q^{\max}$ , we obtain the constraint

$$\begin{aligned} \prod_i s_i^{m_i} &> \frac{h v \prod_i (K_i)^{m_i}}{k_{\text{cat}}^+ q^{\max}} \\ \Rightarrow \sum_i m_i \ln s_i &> \ln \frac{h v \prod_i (K_i)^{m_i}}{k_{\text{cat}}^+ q^{\max}}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S38})$$

Bounds for allosteric regulators (lower bounds for activators, upper bounds for inhibitors) are derived in a similar way.

**Lower estimates of flux costs; an extension of the MDF strategy** The total enzyme cost of a pathway,  $q(\mathbf{s})$ , can be a complicated function of the log-metabolite levels. However, simple functions can be used as lower bounds (see Figures S3 and S4). First, in a pathway with  $N$  reactions, the total cost is always bounded by  $N \min_l q_l(\mathbf{s})$  and  $N \max_l q_l(\mathbf{s})$ , i.e.,  $N$  times the lowest or the highest enzyme cost in the pathway. Second, the simplified EMC functions yield lower estimates of the cost. By combining these arguments, we can justify the Max-min Driving Force strategy [15]. The MDF strategy is a heuristics for predicting the concentrations and driving forces in a pathway. It postulates that the smallest driving force in a pathway should be as large as possible. The MDF criterion is equivalent to minimizing  $\max_l [1 - e^{-\Theta_l}]^{-1}$ , which is a lower bound on the EMC2s function  $\sum_l [1 - e^{-\Theta_l}]^{-1}$  with all constants set to 1. As shown in Fig. S3 (a) and (b), the MDF optimum is distant from the polytope E-faces and close to the minimum point of the EMC2 function. Thus, the MDF strategy avoids excessive enzyme costs that would occur at the polytope surface. As in Eq. (S35), one could devise a variant of MDF in which driving forces are weighted by the prefactors  $\frac{k_{\text{cat},l}^+}{h_{E_l} v_l}$ .

## S5 Workflow for model building and metabolic optimization

### S5.1 Workflow description

Our algorithm for enzyme cost minimization has two main phases. In the kinetics phase, we collect and adjust the model parameters and construct a model with energetically consistent fluxes (exclusion of infeasible cycles) and rate constants (satisfying Haldane relationships and Wegscheider conditions). To determine consistent model parameters, the collected rate constants and equilibrium constants are adjusted and completed by parameter balancing.

1. Collect thermodynamic and kinetic data: standard chemical potentials  $\mu^\circ$ , equilibrium constants  $K_{\text{eq}}$ , Michaelis-Menten constants  $K_M$ , forward and reverse catalytic constants  $k_{\text{cat}}^+$  and  $k_{\text{cat}}^-$ .
2. Set some of these quantities to fixed values (if desired).
3. Run parameter balancing (with priors, pseudo values, and upper and lower bounds) to obtain a complete, consistent set of rate constants.

In the optimization phase, the desired pathway flux is realized by optimal enzyme and metabolite profiles.

1. Set up the kinetic model (based on the given network, flux profile  $\mathbf{v}$ , and model parameters). Redefine the reaction directions such that fluxes are positive, and update all parameters.
2. Choose the bounds for metabolite concentrations (tight bounds or fixed values for metabolites with fixed concentrations, lower and upper bounds for the others).
3. Determine a feasible metabolite profile  $\mathbf{s} = \ln \mathbf{c}$  (a profile within the metabolite polytope) as a starting point for numerical optimization. We consider three alternatives: (i) Use linear programming to construct a set of extreme points in the polytope (with maximal and minimal metabolite levels  $s_i$ ); the center of mass of these points is then taken as the starting point. (ii) Use the point in the polytope that is closest to the center of the predefined metabolite bounds (solution of a quadratic programming problem) as the starting point. (iii) Use the solution of the MDF problem (linear programming problem) as the starting point.
4. Choose an EMC function and minimize it numerically with respect to  $\mathbf{s}$  under the constraints defining the metabolite polytope.
5. Compute the corresponding enzyme levels and cost.
6. Based on the optimal enzyme cost, define a maximal tolerable cost (e.g., one percent higher than the optimal total cost) and compute individual tolerances for metabolite and enzyme levels as described in Methods.
7. Validate the predicted enzyme and metabolite levels with experimental data.

In theory, a convex optimization should converge without problems. As a check, we can repeat the calculation with different starting points.

### S5.2 Parameter balancing yields consistent rate constants

For our kinetic models, we need consistent sets of rate constants ( $k_{\text{cat}}^+$ ,  $K_{\text{eq}}$ , and  $K_M$  values) satisfying Wegscheider conditions and Haldane relationships (see SI S1.1). Measured parameter values may be incomplete and



contradictory. Using parameter balancing [38], we can translate such values into complete, consistent, and plausible parameters for a given model. Plausible parameter ranges can be defined by prior distributions for parameter types (e.g., mean values and a standard deviation for logarithmic  $K_M$  values in general). Parameter balancing works as follows. We collect all quantities that appear in the data or in the model ( $\ln k_{\text{cat}}^+$ ,  $\ln k_{\text{cat}}^-$ ,  $\ln K_{\text{eq}}$ ,  $\ln K_M$ ,  $\Delta_r G^{\circ'}$ ,  $\mu^\circ$ ) and merge them into a vector  $\mathbf{y}$ . These quantities must satisfy Wegscheider conditions and Haldane relationships, which defines linear equality constraints between them. Accordingly, to satisfy the constraints in a safe way, we write all these quantities as linear combinations of independent parameters ( $\ln k^V$ ,  $\ln K_M$ , and  $\mu^\circ$  values), with the definition  $k^V = \sqrt{k_{\text{cat}}^+ k_{\text{cat}}^-}$ . The independent parameters, which are collected in a vector  $\mathbf{s}$ , can be varied without violating any constraints. The linear dependence between the complete and the independent parameter sets can be written as  $\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{R}\mathbf{s}$  with a matrix  $\mathbf{R}$  derived from the model structure. Using this equation as a linear regression model, we can convert an experimentally known vector  $\mathbf{y}^{\text{data}}$  (which may be incomplete) into a best estimate of the underlying vector  $\mathbf{s}$ . Using the estimate  $\mathbf{s}$ , we again apply  $\mathbf{R}$  to obtain a completed, consistent version of  $\mathbf{y}$ . Since this regression problem is usually underdetermined, we employ Bayesian estimation. Priors allow us to obtain plausible estimates even from sparse data. Accordingly, the result is not simply a point estimate of  $\mathbf{y}$ , but a multivariate Gaussian posterior distribution for possible parameter vectors  $\mathbf{y}$ . A best estimate is given by the center of the distribution; from the covariance matrix, we obtain uncertainties of individual model parameters as well as the correlations between them. Parameter balancing can handle data of different amounts or quality. If comprehensive data are available, they will just be adjusted to satisfy the constraints; missing or uncertain data values will be completed with plausible values. MATLAB code for parameter balancing and hyperparameters specifying the prior distributions are provided on github and [www.metabolic-economics.de/enzyme-cost-minimization/](http://www.metabolic-economics.de/enzyme-cost-minimization/).

### S5.3 Possible modifications of the workflow

The workflow can be extended in a number of ways:

- **External/internal and fixed/variable metabolites.** In kinetic models, we distinguish between *internal* metabolites, for which a mass balance must be satisfied within the model, and *external* metabolites, for which no mass balance is required (possibly assuming that other reactions, outside the model, will fix the mass balance). In ECM, we distinguish between fixed metabolites (whose concentration is predefined) and variable metabolites (whose concentration is determined during ECM). It is important to note that the two distinctions need not coincide. Nevertheless, metabolites at the pathway boundaries (such as initial substrates, final products, and cofactors, which also participate in other pathways) are usually the ones that will be both external (in kinetic models) and fixed (in ECM).
- **Fluxes need not be stationary.** The flux distribution used in ECM need not be stationary (in the sense that the variable metabolites satisfy mass balances). Remember that variable metabolites and internal metabolites are not the same! Of course, stationarity is a sensible assumption for whole-metabolism models on a certain timescale. However, fluxes that look stationary on the entire metabolic network may not look stationary on an individual pathway model (because there may be side reactions that fix the mass balances, but do not appear in the model).
- **Inactive reactions.** Inactive reactions (with a reaction flux  $v_l = 0$ ) do not entail any energetic constraints or enzyme costs and can therefore be ignored. In contrast, if a driving force is known to vanish, this should be used as a constraint on the metabolite levels.
- **Non-enzymatic reactions.** If non-enzymatic reactions (typically with mass-action rate laws) are included in the optimality problem, they contribute to the energetic constraints, but not to the enzyme cost function.

- **Spatial structure.** ECM applies to compartment models, in which metabolites can have different concentrations in different compartments. Other spatial effects, such as substrate channeling, are ignored. To account for substrate channeling, the increased substrate concentration at enzymes' catalytic sites could be modelled, approximately, by using effective rate constants.
- **Constraints on the sum of metabolite levels or sums of enzyme levels** In addition to our bounds on individual metabolite levels, we can also set a bound on the total (non-logarithmic) metabolite concentration in the cell [23]. The resulting ECM problem remains convex (see section S3.3). Alternatively, one could penalize large total concentrations by subtracting a concave function  $R(\sum_i c_i)$  from the enzyme cost; in log-concentration space, this would yield a convex cost term. The same holds for constraints on the sums of some enzyme levels.
- **Enzyme demand and cost per flux.** Under the assumptions made (linear enzyme cost function; fixed external metabolite levels in kinetic model), enzyme demand and cost scale proportionally with the pathway fluxes. This holds for all EMC functions, but not for the MDF score [15], which remains constant under a proportional scaling of pathway fluxes<sup>7</sup>.
- **Constraints on concentrations** Constraints on metabolite levels can be justified as follows. Upper bounds may reflect the fact that space in cells is limited, and physiological concentration ranges for certain compounds may be known from experience. Some metabolites may have high or low levels for specific reasons: for instance, yeast cells (and also Dunaliella algae) use high glycerol concentrations to balance high external salinity; other metabolites may be toxic in higher concentrations. Lower bounds are important when using the EMC2 functions, because these functions favor low product levels while lacking the saturation factor, which prevents very low substrate levels.
- **Values and uncertainties of rate constants** Different EMC functions require different types of rate constants for their calculation. All functions require forward catalytic constants  $k_+^c$ ; EMC2 and higher functions require equilibrium constants, EMC3 or higher functions require Michaelis-Menten constants. Many rate constants are unknown and need to be estimated. To determine the rate constants for our calculations, we collect known kinetic data and convert them into complete, consistent parameter sets by parameter balancing [38, 39]. Parameter balancing yields a joint distribution of all model parameters describing their individual uncertainties and correlations. A consistent, most likely set of parameters follows from the median values of the marginal distributions. By sampling parameters from their joint distribution, we can obtain an ensemble of model variants with different consistent parameter sets. By running ECM for many such model variants, we can study how uncertainties in the rate constants affect the end result.
- **Sampling of nearly optimal solutions** Deviations from the optimum metabolite profile lead to a fitness loss. For small Gaussian random deviations, the average loss by can be computed by  $\text{Tr}(\text{cov}(\mathbf{s})^{-1}) \mathbf{H}_q$ , where  $\mathbf{s} = \ln \mathbf{c}$ ,  $\text{cov}(\mathbf{s})$  is the covariance matrix of metabolite log-concentrations, and  $\mathbf{H}_q$  is the Hessian matrix of the (non-logarithmic) cost function  $q(\mathbf{s})$  in the optimum point. To estimate the metabolite covariance matrix, we make an assumption inspired by statistical thermodynamics: we postulate that the relative probabilities of two metabolite vectors is given by  $\frac{\text{prob}(\mathbf{s}_1)}{\text{prob}(\mathbf{s}_2)} = e^{-(q(\mathbf{s}_1) - q(\mathbf{s}_2))/q_0}$ , where  $q_0$  defines a scale of tolerable fitness deviations. The metabolite covariance matrix follows directly as  $\mathbf{C} = q_0 \mathbf{H}_q^{-1}$ . For the energy-based EMC2s function, the Hessian matrix in the optimum point can be computed analytically at least.
- **Tolerable deviations of metabolite and enzyme levels** Tolerance ranges of metabolite or enzyme levels can be obtained by minimizing or maximizing these levels under the constraints used in ECM, plus the

<sup>7</sup>The linear scaling of enzyme levels holds only if all fluxes are scaled proportionally. In branched pathways, a non-proportional scaling would change the flux branching ratios. The resulting changes in the optimal concentrations at the branch points would change the enzyme cost in complicated ways.

Data type	Unit	Provenance	Reference
Reaction Gibbs energies	kJ/mol	Component contribution	[41]
Catalytic constants ( $k_{\text{cat}}$ )	1/s	BRENDA	[45]
Michaelis-Mention constants ( $K_M$ )	mM	BRENDA	[45]
Fluxes	mM/s	van Rijsewijk <i>et al.</i> <sup>a</sup>	[44]
Metabolite levels <sup>b</sup>	mM	Gerosa <i>et al.</i> <sup>a</sup>	[60]
Enzyme levels <sup>b</sup>	mM	Schmidt <i>et al.</i> <sup>a</sup>	[46]
Protein lengths	AAs	<a href="http://www.uniprot.org">www.uniprot.org</a>	

Table S4: Data used in construction of *E. coli* model by ECM. Processed data can be found at [www.metabolic-economics.de/enzyme-cost-minimization/](http://www.metabolic-economics.de/enzyme-cost-minimization/). Units refer to preprocessed data. <sup>a</sup> Specific data corresponding to wild-type *E. coli* BW25113, grown in batch culture on minimal media (M9) and glucose. <sup>b</sup> Data used for validation only.

constraint that the cost must remain below some predefined upper bound. To speed up the calculation, an approximation based on the Hessian matrix of the logarithmic cost function can be used (see SI S7.3). Alternatively, we could sample metabolite profiles with enzyme costs close to the optimum. Using the Metropolis-Hastings algorithm, we could obtain an ensemble of metabolite and enzyme profiles, where less costly states appear with higher probabilities (see SI S5.1).

- **Lumped reactions** To simplify models, pathways can be lumped into single reactions (for parameter choices, see SI S7.2). The lumping of reactions resembles the way in which ECM, altogether, attributes enzyme costs or specific activities to entire pathways.

## S6 Model of central metabolism in *E. coli*

Our central metabolism model was built from a list of chemical reactions as given by KEGG; compounds and reactions are denoted by KEGG identifiers, and genes are denoted mostly by their common names in *E. coli*. All data sources are listed in Table S4, and models and data are provided at [www.metabolic-economics.de/enzyme-cost-minimization/](http://www.metabolic-economics.de/enzyme-cost-minimization/). The enzyme cost function accounts for protein composition, giving different costs to different amino acids. However, models with equal cost weights for all proteins, or with size-dependent protein costs yielded similar results (results are provided on the website). Figure S6 shows the correlations between predicted and measured metabolite levels, corresponding to the enzyme predictions in Figure 3. More details can be found on [www.metabolic-economics.de/enzyme-cost-minimization/](http://www.metabolic-economics.de/enzyme-cost-minimization/).

## S7 Proofs and derivations

### S7.1 Lower bounds on driving forces, Eq. (S35)

Assuming that the cost for an individual enzyme cannot exceed a certain limit  $q_l < q^{\text{max}}$ , we obtain Eq. (S35) in section S4 as a lower bound on the driving forces:  $\Theta_l > \frac{h_{E_l} v_l}{k_{\text{cat},l}^+ q^{\text{max}}}$ . Noting that  $\Theta = -\Delta_r G' / RT$ , we get that the reaction Gibbs energies are bounded by

$$\Delta_r G'_l < -RT \frac{h_{E_l} v_l}{q^{\text{max}} k_{\text{cat},l}^+}. \quad (\text{S39})$$




Figure S6: Metabolite levels predicted by enzymatic metabolic cost minimization. As in Figure 3 for enzyme predictions, vertical bars denote tolerance ranges. Horizontal lines represent uncertainties in measured data. Predictions are based on fluxes from [44],  $k_{cat}^+$  and  $K_M$  values from BRENDA [45], and validated with metabolite concentrations from [60].

## S7.2 Parameters for lumped reactions

A lumped reaction describes a series of reactions as if they were catalyzed by a single enzyme. The kinetic parameters should agree with the original catalytic constants  $k_{cat,l}^+$ , enzyme levels  $E_l$ , and enzyme cost weights  $h_{E_l}$  of the individual reactions and yield the right pathway flux  $v = E k_{cat}^+$  and the right enzyme cost  $q = h E$ , but this still leaves some freedom of choice. On the one hand, we may assume that our hypothetical lumped enzyme resembles a normal enzyme in its kinetics and concentration. This can be realized in different ways:

- Set  $k_{cat} = \langle k_{cat,l}^+ \rangle_{geom}$ . To satisfy  $v = v_l = k_{cat,l}^+ E_l = \langle k_{cat,l}^+ E_l \rangle_{geom} = \langle k_{cat} \rangle_{geom} \langle E_l \rangle_{geom}$ , we must set  $E = \langle E_l \rangle_{geom}$ .
- Set  $k_{cat} = \langle k_{cat,l}^+ \rangle_{arith}$ . To satisfy  $v = \langle k_{cat,l}^+ E_l \rangle_{arith} = \langle k_{cat} \rangle_{arith} \langle \frac{k_{cat,l}^+}{k_{cat}} E_l \rangle_{arith}$ , we must set  $E = \langle \frac{k_{cat,l}^+}{k_{cat}} E_l \rangle_{arith}$ .
- Set  $E = \langle E_l \rangle_{arith}$ . Again, we must set  $k_{cat} = \langle \frac{E_l}{E} k_{cat,l}^+ \rangle_{arith}$ .

In all three cases, the identity  $h E = \sum_l h_{E_l} E_l$  leads to the formula  $h = \sum_l h_{E_l} \frac{E_l}{E}$  for specific cost. Since a lumped enzyme represents several real enzymes, it will appear more costly or “larger”. On the other hand, we can assume that the concentration of the lumped enzyme is given by the sum of original enzyme concentrations; this implies smaller effective  $k_{cat}$  values. To obtain the parameters, we can use the previous formulae and replace  $E \rightarrow n E$ ,  $h \rightarrow h/n$ , and  $k_{cat} \rightarrow k_{cat}/n$ .

### S7.3 Tolerance intervals around the minimum point of a strictly convex function

Consider a strictly convex function  $f(\mathbf{s})$  with a global minimum  $\mathbf{s}^*$ . Due to strict convexity, the Hessian  $\mathbf{H}(\mathbf{s})$  is a positive definite matrix. To calculate tolerance intervals around the minimum point, we choose the tolerance threshold  $\tau$  (e.g. 1% of the minimum value) and define the tolerance subspace:

$$S_{\text{tol}} \equiv \{\mathbf{s} \mid f(\mathbf{s}) < f(\mathbf{s}^*) + \tau\}. \quad (\text{S40})$$

To get an explicit formula for  $S_{\text{tol}}$ , we first approximate  $f$  around its minimum point by a Taylor expansion:

$$f(\mathbf{s}^* + \boldsymbol{\xi}) = f(\mathbf{s}^*) + \nabla f(\mathbf{s}^*)^\top \boldsymbol{\xi} + \frac{1}{2} \cdot \boldsymbol{\xi}^\top \mathbf{H}(\mathbf{s}^*) \boldsymbol{\xi} + \dots \quad (\text{S41})$$

In the minimal point,  $\nabla f(\mathbf{s}^*) = 0$  holds and we drop the extra terms in the Taylor expansion to get

$$f(\mathbf{s}^* + \boldsymbol{\xi}) = f(\mathbf{s}^*) + \frac{1}{2} \cdot \boldsymbol{\xi}^\top \mathbf{H} \boldsymbol{\xi} \quad (\text{S42})$$

(for convenience, we use  $\mathbf{H}$  to refer to the Hessian at the optimum). Therefore, the tolerance region can be approximated by:

$$S_{\text{tol}} \approx E_{\text{tol}} \equiv \{\mathbf{s}^* + \boldsymbol{\xi} \mid 2\tau > \boldsymbol{\xi}^\top \mathbf{H} \boldsymbol{\xi}\} \quad (\text{S43})$$

**Lemma 6** *If we define the ellipsoid  $E \equiv \{\mathbf{H}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{y} \mid \mathbf{y}^\top \mathbf{y} < 1\}$ , then*

$$E_{\text{tol}} = \mathbf{s}^* + \sqrt{2\tau} \cdot E$$

**Proof S7.1** *Since  $\mathbf{H}$  is symmetric and positive definite, it is invertible and thus  $\mathbf{H}^{-\frac{1}{2}}$  is a unique symmetric matrix. Any  $\mathbf{s} \in \mathbf{s}^* + \sqrt{2\tau} \cdot E$  can be written as  $\mathbf{s} = \mathbf{s}^* + \boldsymbol{\xi}$ , where  $\boldsymbol{\xi} = \sqrt{2\tau} \cdot \mathbf{H}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{y}$  and  $\mathbf{y}^\top \mathbf{y} < 1$ , therefore*

$$\boldsymbol{\xi}^\top \mathbf{H} \boldsymbol{\xi} = \sqrt{2\tau} \cdot \mathbf{y}^\top \mathbf{H}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{H} \mathbf{H}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{y} \cdot \sqrt{2\tau} = 2\tau \cdot \mathbf{y}^\top \mathbf{y} < 2\tau. \quad (\text{S44})$$

*The reverse direction follows trivially.  $\square$*

**Corollary S7.2** *An ellipsoid is not always a convenient shape for describing the tolerance intervals because there is dependence between the different dimensions. For some application, it is sufficient to consider the bounding box of  $E$ , which is given by  $B \equiv \{\mathbf{D} \mathbf{y} \mid \mathbf{y} \in [-1, 1]^n\}$ , where  $\mathbf{D}$  is a matrix containing only the diagonal values in  $\mathbf{H}^{-\frac{1}{2}}$  (i.e.  $\mathbf{D}_{ii} = \sqrt{(\mathbf{H}^{-1})_{ii}}$ ). Then we can approximate  $S_{\text{tol}}$  by*

$$S_{\text{tol}} \approx \mathbf{s}^* + \sqrt{2\tau} \cdot B \quad (\text{S45})$$

*Therefore, for a single dimension  $i$  the tolerance interval will be described by*

$$x_i^* \pm \sqrt{2\tau (\mathbf{H}^{-1})_{ii}} \quad (\text{S46})$$

### S7.4 Enzyme costs reflects metabolic control (proposition 2)

Consider the ECM problem

$$\text{Minimize } h(\mathbf{E}) \quad \text{subject to } \mathbf{j}_{\text{stat}}(\mathbf{E}) = \mathbf{v}_{\text{stat}}, \mathbf{S}_{\text{bound}}(\mathbf{E}) = \mathbf{c}_{\text{bound}},$$

where “stat” refers to independent stationary fluxes (with running index  $a$ ) and “bound” refers to metabolites that hit a bound in the ECM solution considered (index  $b$ ). With Lagrange multipliers  $\lambda_a$  and  $\mu_b$  for the two sorts

of constraints, the optimality condition reads

$$0 = \frac{\partial h}{\partial E_l} + \sum_{a \in \text{stat}} \lambda_a \frac{\partial j_a}{\partial E_l} + \sum_{b \in \text{bnd}} \mu_b \frac{\partial s_b}{\partial E_l}.$$

After defining the enzyme cost slopes  $h'_{E_l} = \frac{\partial h}{\partial E_l}$  and multiplying the equation by  $E_l$ , we obtain

$$0 = h'_{E_l} E_l + \sum_{a \in \text{stat}} \lambda_a \frac{\partial j_a}{\partial E_l} E_l + \sum_{b \in \text{bnd}} \mu_b \frac{\partial s_b}{\partial E_l} E_l.$$

We can now rewrite this in terms of control coefficients. The control coefficients between enzymes and independent stationary fluxes are defined by  $C_l^{j_a} = \frac{E_l}{j_a} \frac{\partial j_a}{\partial E_l}$ , and those between enzymes and constrained metabolites are defined by  $C_l^{s_b} = \frac{E_l}{s_b} \frac{\partial s_b}{\partial E_l}$ . Inserting this, we obtain

$$0 = h'_{E_l} E_l + \sum_{a \in \text{stat}} -\alpha_a C_l^{j_a} + \sum_{b \in \text{bnd}} -\beta_b C_l^{s_b},$$

where we have defined  $\alpha_a = -\lambda_a j_a$  and  $\beta_b = -\mu_b s_b$ , and thus

$$h'_{E_l} E_l = \sum_{a \in \text{stat}} \alpha_a C_l^{j_a} + \sum_{b \in \text{bnd}} \beta_b C_l^{s_b}.$$

These relations hold for general non-linear cost function. In the case of linear cost functions  $h(\mathbf{E}) = \sum_l h_{E_l} E_l$  (as usually assumed in ECM), the enzyme cost slopes  $h'_{E_l}$  are directly given by the cost weights  $h_{E_l}$ .

## S8 Mathematical symbols

Rate laws	Symbol	Units
Flux	$v_l$	mM/s
Metabolite level	$c_i$	mM
Enzyme level	$E_l$	mM
Rate law	$v_l(E_l, \mathbf{c}) = E_l \cdot r_l(\mathbf{c})$	mM/s
Catalytic rate	$r_l = v_l/E_l$	1/s
Gibbs energy of formation (standard chem. pot.)	$G_i^{\circ}$	kJ/mol
Reaction Gibbs energy	$\Delta_r G_l' = \Delta_r G_l^{\circ} + RT \sum_i n_{il} \ln c_i$	kJ/mol
Thermodynamic driving force	$\Theta_l = -\Delta_r G_l'/RT$	unitless
Kinetic models		
Forward/backward catalytic constant	$k_{\text{cat}}^+, k_{\text{cat}}^-$	1/s
Michaelis-Menten constant	$K_{li}$	mM
Hill-like coefficient	$\gamma_l$	unitless
Molecularity for substrate (S) or product (P)	$m_{li}^S, m_{li}^P$	unitless
Regulation coefficient (activator A or inhibitor I)	$m_{li}^A, m_{li}^I$	unitless
Scaled reactant elasticity	$\mathcal{E}_{li} = \frac{c_i}{v_l} \frac{\partial v_l}{\partial c_i}$	unitless
Scaled flux control coefficient	$\mathcal{C}_l^{ja}$	unitless
Scaled concentration control coefficient	$\mathcal{C}_l^{sb}$	unitless
Enzyme costs		
Enzyme cost	$h_l(E_l) = h_{E_l} E_l$	D
Enzyme cost weight	$h_{E_l}$	D/mM
Protein mass	$m_l$	Da
Enzyme-based metabolic cost	$q(\mathbf{s}) = \sum_l q_l(\mathbf{s}) = \sum_l h_{E_l} E_l(\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{v})$	D
Hessian matrix of enzyme-based metabolic cost	$\mathbf{H}_q$	D
Flux-specific cost	$a_{v_l} = q_l/v_l = h_{E_l}/r_l$	D/(mM/s)
Baseline flux cost	$a_{v_l}^{\text{cat}}$	D/(mM/s)
Metabolic pathways		
Pathway flux (flux in representative reaction)	$v_{\text{pw}}$	mM/s
Scaled flux	$v_l' = v_l/v_{\text{pw}}$	unitless
Flux-specific cost	$a_v^{\text{pw}} = \sum_l h_{E_l} E_l/v_{\text{pw}} = \sum_l v_l' a_{v_l}$	D s/mM

Table S5: Mathematical symbols used in ECM. Darwin (D) is a hypothetical fitness unit replacing the possible fitness units in different models. Reaction orientations are defined in such a way that fluxes are positive. Fluxes are given in units of concentration per time, but could also be given as amounts per time (e.g., mol/s); the latter choice is more practical for models with transport reactions.