

# Compiling Combinatorial Genetic Circuits with Semantic Inference

William Waites, Goksel Misirli, Matteo Cavaliere,  
Vincent Danos, Anil Wipat

November 7, 2018

## Abstract

A central strategy of synthetic biology is to understand the basic processes of living creatures through engineering organisms using the same building blocks. Biological machines described in terms of parts can be studied by computer simulation in any of several languages or robotically assembled *in vitro*. In this paper we present a language, the Genetic Circuit Description Language (GCDL) and a compiler, the Genetic Circuit Compiler (GCC). This language describes genetic circuits at a level of granularity appropriate both for automated assembly in the laboratory and deriving simulation code. The GCDL follows Semantic Web practice and the compiler makes novel use of the logical inference facilities that are therefore available. We present the GCDL and compiler structure as a study of a tool for generating  $\kappa$ -language simulations from semantic descriptions of genetic circuits.

## 1 Introduction

Synthetic biology extends classical genetic engineering with concepts of modularity, standardisation, and abstraction drawn largely from computer engineering. The goal is ambitious: to design complex biological systems, perhaps entire genomes, from first principles (Baldwin, 2012). This enterprise has met with some success such as the microbial production of drug synthesis (Galanie et al., 2015; Paddon et al., 2013), new biofuels production (Ferry et al., 2012) and alternative approaches to disease treatment (Ruder et al., 2011). However, most applications are still small and mostly designed manually.

There are several obstacles to designing more complex circuits. The design space of potential circuits is very large. Even when a design is chosen, there is large *a priori* uncertainty about what its behaviour will be. In many cases the available information about molecular interactions in a cell is incomplete. A secondary obstacle is that designs can be brittle and very sensitive to the host environment in which they execute. In this context computational techniques

become important for identifying biologically feasible solutions to problems of biological system synthesis.

In this paper we present a contribution to the computational infrastructure for synthetic biology, as a language for describing genetic circuits, called the Genetic Circuit Description Language (GCDL), and a compiler for translating them into programs, shown in Figure 1. The GCDL is an RDF (Cyganiak et al., 2014) vocabulary which facilitates gathering and collation of information about the constituent parts of a genetic circuit (Neal et al., 2014). We use a strategy of contextual reasoning to obtain succinct input and flexible output. The output programs can be specialised to various languages, such as the KaSim flavour of  $\kappa$  (Danos et al., 2007; Krivine and Feret, 2017), BioNetGen’s BioNetGen Language (BNGL) (Blinov et al., 2004; Harris et al., 2016), other representations such as Synthetic Biology Open Language (SBOL) (Galdzicki et al., 2014) or indeed whichever form is required by robotic laboratory equipment that assembles circuits *in vitro*. This output flexibility is accomplished using *templates* that use facts derived by inference rules (Berners-Lee, 2005) from the input model; input terms have meaning defined in terms of inference rules.

There are several reasons to automate the construction of simulation programs for complex genetic circuits over and above the huge design space and associated uncertainties. Writing these programs by hand is time-consuming and error prone, and there are very few tools available for verification and debugging them. Descriptions of models in terms of simulation code are necessarily tightly coupled to the interpreter of the simulation program’s language. This means that using a different interpreter or even different hardware is not possible.

We solve these problems by providing a high-level, modular, implementation-independent language for describing gene circuits. Code generation from this high-level description to a low-level language for simulation greatly reduces the scope for error in coding simulations. Because the language is implementation-independent it is not tightly coupled to any particular interpreter or hardware. In this way GCDL facilitates *evergreen models*, models that are specified sufficiently well to be unambiguous but not so specifically that they can only be executed or constructed in one software package or environment.

The design of the compiler is general, and not limited to the present context




Figure 1: High-level data flow through the compiler. The compiler for synthetic gene circuits takes a model description written in GCDL and, using language-appropriate appropriate templates, creates code for simulation and laboratory assembly. We have implemented templates for annotated- $\kappa$  for the KaSim software, and envision similar for the BNGL as well as SBOL.

of genetic circuits. The design shown schematically in Figure 2. Domain specific languages and examples of compilers processing these languages have previously been shown (Beal et al., 2011; Cai et al., 2011; Hallinan et al., 2014; Pedersen and Phillips, 2009). These languages are designed to allow for simulations using a particular methodology such as solving systems of ordinary differential equations or using Monte-Carlo simulation. Unlike previous approaches, we emphasise the use of abstraction to facilitate *retargeting* or production of output suitable for different simulation environments and techniques as well as automated circuit assembly in the laboratory from a single description. Compiler targets are implemented using conditional inference, essentially defining the semantics of the terms used in the description of the circuit in a way that is determined by the desired output type.

Even in a given target environment there are choices to be made about what level of detail to treat a given phenomenon that depends on the question of biological interest. Degradation of protein chains, for example, can be modelled as a rule that simply destroys proteins at rate  $k$ ,  $P() \xrightarrow{k} \emptyset$ . It can also be modelled as a much larger set of rules to simulate the action of a protease molecule attaching to the polymer and moving along it, disassembling each constituent protein in turn. If the difference between these representations is large enough and relevant enough to justify the extra computation involved with a larger rule-set, compiler output can be instructed to use different *templates*. In this way simulations can be tuned to focus the questions of biological interest, abstractions chosen such that more detailed modelling is done where necessary and relevant, and those parts that are uninteresting can simply be appropriately approximated.

We now proceed as follows. In Section 2 we give an overview of those aspects of synthetic biology and genetic engineering that are necessary to contextualise our work. Next, in Section 3, we explain the representation of this kind of genetic circuit model in GCDL, this is the main input to the compiler. In order to understand the de-




Figure 2: Detailed data flow through the compiler. This illustrates the use of inference to expand the GCDL model to derive consequent information appropriate to producing the next stage of output in the specific target language.

sired output of the compiler, in Section 4 we show how these constructs are represented as rule-based code for the  $\kappa$  language simulator, KaSim. There follows a discussion in Section 5 of how the compiler infers the executable model from the input description. Finally, in Section 6 we sketch a possible technique to answer the question of how to obtain a genetic circuit from a given desired functional specification that uses these tools.

## 2 Background

Let us begin from first principles. The Central Dogma of Molecular Biology has it that genetic information flows, through chemical reactions, from nucleic acids to proteins (Crick, 1970). Under normal circumstances, such as those that we are concerned with here, information is transferred from a DNA sequence to a corresponding RNA sequence by the action of an RNA polymerase molecule, and thence to a protein through the action of a ribosome molecule.

A genome is fundamentally a long chain, or polymer, made up of pairs of nucleotide monomers, of which there are four (adenine, cytosine, guanine, and thymine). It is productive, however, to consider groupings of nucleotides according to their function. If the entire genome is a sequence of sentences, and the amino acids are letters, then by analogy, a *biological part* is a word. Continuing the analogy, just as words come in several classes, or parts of speech, so do biological parts: promoters, coding sequences, binding sites, terminators. Furthermore just as a sentence may be well formed or ungrammatical according to what kinds of words come in what order, the same is also true of a genome (Pedersen and Phillips, 2009) — particularly the kind of synthetic genome that one might wish to construct.




Figure 3: An example genetic circuit: the Elowitz repressilator. It is a negative feedback oscillator. The circuit itself is arranged linearly and protein-operator interactions are represented by arrows and dotted lines.

To understand the basic features of this grammar, and the functioning of a genetic circuit, consider an example both simple and famous, the Elowitz repressilator (Elowitz and Leibler, 2000), shown in Figure 3. It consists of three

sentences. A sentence begins with a binding site for a transcription factor and a promoter — together, an operator. If the conditions of the binding site are satisfied, by being bound or not by some specific protein, then the promoter is activated. If the promoter is active, an RNA polymerase may bind it, from which it will slide across and transcribe a binding site for a ribosome and coding sequence that will result eventually in the production of a particular protein. Finally a terminator ends the transcription process and the ribosome falls off.

In the case of this circuit, each operator is active by default. Each sentence in turn will produce a protein that will bind to the next operator, deactivating it. As the proteins eventually degrade (not shown), the operators reactivate. This interaction sets up an oscillation that can be observed by measuring the concentrations of the three proteins. Also not shown here is the intermediary stage — the output of transcription is RNA, and it is the translation of RNA that actually produces the proteins.

## 2.1 Rule-based Modelling of Genetic Processes

It might seem that the processes of transcription and translation, and the interactions of proteins with operators could be represented by reactions. After all, these are chemicals, and certain input chemicals (nucleic acids, enzymes like RNA polymerase and ribosomes, and proteins) interact and produce other, new chemicals (more proteins). It turns out that this approach does not scale well.

It is easy to see why. Suppose the input to the process is a large DNA module, the entire genome, together with a starting population of RNA polymerase and ribosomes. The first interaction might be an RNA polymerase binding somewhere on the DNA. In the example above, there are three different places that this can happen which result in six possible different output molecules of the DNA carrying a bound RNA polymerase. That is only the first step, now the RNA polymerase must move to the right and begin transcription. This next step now requires six different reactions to describe it, one for each flavour of RNAP-bound DNA.

To solve this problem of needing combinatorially many reactions to describe essentially the same process, a generalisation of reactions called *rules* are used (Danos et al., 2008; Danos and Laneve, 2004; Hlavacek et al., 2003). In this representation, *agents* correspond to reagents and they can have slots or *sites* that can be bound, or not. They can also have internal state. Unlike reactions which have no preconditions apart from the presence of the reagents, with rules, a configuration of the sites — bound in a particular way, bound in some way, unbound, or unspecified — is a precondition for the application of the rule. A rule may re-arrange the bonds, creating or destroying them, without the need to invent new agents in order to represent different configurations of a given set of molecules.

The reader should note that the word *rule* is used in two distinct senses in this article. The first is as we have just described. The second is in the sense of *inference rule* as used in logic and in particular the way in which we deduce executable rule-based models from their declarative representations in RDF.

## 2.2 The $\kappa$ Language

To briefly illustrate the essentials of rule-based modelling we will use the language of the Kappa simulation software, KaSim (Krivine and Feret, 2017). An agent declaration and rule expressing the formation of a polymer might look like,

```
1 %agent: A(d,u)
3 'binding' A(u), A(d) -> A(u!1), A(d!1) @k
```

We can gloss this as an agent with two sites, *u* and *d* for upstream and downstream, and a rule. The rule concerns two agent patterns one of which has an unbound upstream site, and the other an unbound downstream site, and the action of the rule is to bind them, the notation *!1* denoting the bond. This process happens at some rate, with the rule applied *k* times per unit time on average.

The state of the other site of each agent is left unspecified, so implicit in this rule is the possibility that either or both the agents may already be bound to others and so part of arbitrarily long chains. In other words this expression covers not only two monomers joining together but an *n*-mer and an *m*-mer for arbitrary *n* and *m*. This is the essence of the expressive advantage that rule-based modelling provides. To express a similar concept using a reaction network would in fact require infinitely many reagents for every possible *n* (and *m*) and infinitely many reactions for every possible combination.

## 2.3 The $\kappa$ BioBrick Framework

In order to apply the general rule-based modelling approach to the specific question of modelling genetic circuits, we adopt the methodology of the Kappa BioBricks Framework (KBBF) (Wilson-Kanamori et al., 2015). This framework provides a set of rules that describe the transcription and translation of DNA parts and a modeller provides rules for the interactions of gene products.

KBBF focused on the composition of DNA-based parts without enforcing rules about the interactions involving gene products such as proteins. Composition of the parts into complex circuits was only manually demonstrated; the decision to choose and group rule sets to model individual parts was left entirely to the modeller.

## 2.4 Biological Parts and Annotation

For efficiency, and economy of representation, a computational model should include minimum information necessary for simulation. However, in order to use these models in an automated design process, additional metadata, or annotations, about the meaning of different modelling entities is needed (Neal et al., 2014).

One might wish to draw specific parts from a database such as the Virtual Parts Repository (Misirli et al., 2014). These models are annotated with machine-readable metadata to facilitate their combination into larger models and thereby rendering large parts of the design space for biological systems amenable to automation. Furthermore, Myers and his colleagues have used annotations to derive simulatable models from descriptions of genetic circuits (Roehner et al., 2015) and vice versa (Nguyen et al., 2016). These previous works use reaction-based models represented in the Systems Biology Markup Language (SBML) (Hucka et al., 2003) and so inherit the poor scaling properties of that method.

Annotation in this setting means machine-readable descriptions of entities of biological interest. This is done with statements, triples of the form (subject, predicate, object) according to Semantic Web standards (Cyganiak et al., 2014; van Harmelen and McGuinness, 2004). Entities are identified with Universal Resource Identifiers (URIs) (Masinter et al., 2005). This provides the dual benefit of globally unique identifiers for entities and a built-in mechanism for retrieving more information about them providing that some care is taken to publish data according to best practises (Hyland et al., 2014; Sauermaun et al., 2011). Large bodies of such information about biologically relevant information are published on the Web (Ashburner et al., 2000; Consortium and others, 2008) and the use of Semantic Web standards for annotating our models allows us to refer, to say that an entity in a model description corresponds to a real world protein, or gene sequence or the like.

The Semantic Web also affords us a technical advantage: inference rules. These can be either explicit as in Notation3 (Berners-Lee and Connolly, 2011; Berners-Lee et al., 2008) or implicit as in OWL Description Logics (Brickley and Guha, 2014; Horrocks, 2005). In either case this facility makes it possible, given a set of statements, to derive new statements according to rules. We use this to improve the ergonomics of our high-level language: while the compiler itself will make use, internally, of a large amount of information, we do not expect the user to supply it all in painstaking detail. Rather we allow the user to specify the minimum possible and provide rules to derive the necessary detail. This gives both economy of representation for the high-level model description and flexibility for the different implementations.

### 3 A Language for Synthetic Gene Circuits

To facilitate the *in silico* evaluation of potential synthetic gene circuits, a library of descriptions of genetic parts, together with their modular models is suggested in (Cooling et al., 2010; Misirli et al., 2014). These parts are intended to be large enough to have a particular meaning or function (i.e. larger than individual base pairs) but not so large that they lack the flexibility to be easily recombined (i.e. entire genes). Thus we are concerned with coding sequences for particular proteins, promoters that, when activated, start the transcription process, operators that activate or suppress promoters according to whether

they are bound or not by a given protein, and a small number of other objects. A sequence of these objects is a genetic circuit, and our goal is to have a good language for describing such sequences.

### 3.1 Desired Language Features

Our desiderata for a high-level representation of a genetic circuit are as follows,

1. sufficiency, there should be enough information to derive executable code for the circuit,
2. identifiability, it should be possible to determine to which biological entities (DNA sequences, proteins) the representation refers,
3. extensibility, it should be straightforward to add information or constructs that are not presently foreseen,
4. generality, there should be no requirement that information about biological parts comes from any particular set or source, and
5. concision, there should be a minimum of extraneous detail or syntax.

The third and fourth are readily accomplished by using RDF as the underlying data model. The *open world* presumption (Drummond and Shearer, 2006) means that adding information as necessary is straightforward. The use of URIs (Masinter et al., 2005) which can be dereferenced to obtain the required information means that information from different web-accessible databases can be obtained, mixed and matched as desired. The second desideratum is assisted by the use of URIs, albeit with some well-known caveats (Halpin et al., 2010).

The first and last of the desired features are, therefore, primarily what concerns us in this paper. To begin with, we suggest (but do not require) the use of Turtle (Prud’hommeaux and Carothers, 2014) or indeed Notation3 (Berners-Lee, 2005) as the concrete surface syntax for writing models. This goes some way towards a representation that is intelligible by humans. Even then, we aim to minimise what needs to be written and we do this using inference rules — if a needed fact can be derived from the model under the provided rule-set, it is unnecessary to write it explicitly in the model. Indeed it may even be undesirable to do so since it is a possible source of errors such as being correct in the context of some output types and incorrect in others. So, we aim for a minimal, yet complete under the inference rules, description of the model.

### 3.2 Model Description

To illustrate the syntax of the high-level language, we return to the Elowitz repressilator of Figure 3. Figure 4 shows a description of this circuit in the GCDL. It is written in Turtle and identified as a model using terms from the Rule-Based Model Ontology (RBMO) that we previously defined (Misirli et al., 2015). Some bibliographic metadata is included, using the standard



```

2  ## Model declaration
3  :m a rbmo:Model;
4  ## bibliographic metadata
5  dct:title "The Elowitz repressilator constructed from BioBrick
6  parts";
7  dct:description "Representation of the Elowitz repressilator
8  given in the Kappa BioBricks Framework book chapter";
9  rdfs:seeAlso <http://link.springer.com/protocol/10.1007/978
10 -1-4939-1878-2_6>;
11 gcc:prefix <http://id.inf.ed.ac.uk/rbm/examples/repressilator#>
12 ;
13 ## include the host environment
14 gcc:include <.../host.ka>;
15 ## initialisations
16 gcc:init
17 [ rbmo:agent :RNAP; gcc:value 700 ],
18 [ rbmo:agent :Ribosome; gcc:value 1000 ];
19 ## The circuit itself, a list of parts
20 gcc:linear (
    :R0040o :R0040p :B0034a :C0051 :B0011a
    :R0051o :R0051p :B0034b :C0012 :B0011b
    :R0010o :R0010p :B0034c :C0040 :B0011c
  ).

```

Figure 4: Example model for a synthetic gene circuit, Elowitz' repressilator.

Dublin Core (Kunze and Baker, 2007) vocabulary, as well as a generic pointer (`rdfs:seeAlso`) to a publication about this model.

New terms introduced in this paper have the prefix `gcc` which can be read as the “Genetic Circuit Compiler” vocabulary. The term `gcc:prefix` is necessary in every model, it instructs the compiler that any entities that it creates should be created under the given prefix. Ultimately annotated rules will be generated for the low-level representation and the annotated entities require names. To give them names, a namespace is required and this is how it is provided.

Next there is a `gcc:include` statement. This is a facility for including extra information in the low-level language. Extra information typically means rules for protein-protein interactions which are beyond the scope of the current work and as such it is simply supplied as a program fragment in the output language. This corresponds roughly to dropping to assembly or machine language to perform a specialised task when programming a computer in a high-level language like C.

There follows initialisation for specific variables. In this case these are the copy numbers for RNA polymerase molecules and ribosomes. These are denoted using `rbmo:agent` because of our choice to support rule-based modelling for greater generality than reaction-based methods.

Finally, the circuit itself is specified. The argument, or object is an `rdf:List` which simply contains identifiers for the parts, in order.

The circuit itself is now defined. However at this juncture, we simply have a list of parts without having specified what they are. To obtain a working model, we need more.

### 3.3 A Part Description

A simple example of a part description is shown in Figure 5. This is a coding sequence, as is clear from the type annotation on the part. It codes for a particular protein, specified with `gcc:protein`. This term is specific to proteins because under normal circumstances other kinds of part do not code for proteins. The protein itself is also described, mainly so that it can be given a label, which is done using the term `skos:prefLabel` from the Simple Knowledge Organization System (SKOS) (Miles et al., 2005) vocabulary. This detail is important. Because the output language will not typically permit the use of URIs as identifiers, the preferred label is used as the identifier for the protein in the output representation. This same is true of the value given for `gcc:part`. That term implies the corresponding `skos:prefLabel` by means of inference rules supplied with the `gcc` vocabulary.

Importantly, and following the practice in our previous paper on rule annotation (Misirli et al., 2015), a weak identity assertion is made with identifiers in external databases for the parts. This uses `bqbiol:is` instead of `owl:sameAs` because the strong Leibniz identity semantics of the latter can yield unwanted inferences when terms are not used perfectly rigorously (Halpin et al., 2010). This weaker identify assertion permits the identification of the `:P0010` in the example with the identifier for the protein in the well-known UniProt (Consortium

```

1  :P0010 a gcc:Protein;
   bqbiol:is uniprot:P03023;
3  skos:prefLabel "P0010";
   rdfs:label "LacI".
5
6  :C0012 a gcc:CodingSequence;
7  gcc:label "Coding sequence for LacI";
   gcc:part "C0012";
9  gcc:protein :P0010.

```

Figure 5: A coding sequence part description from the repressilator model. Notice how the coding sequence is linked to the protein that it codes for.

and others, 2008) database.

A part will typically have associated rate data. These rates characterise the interaction of the part with RNA polymerase and the production of the corresponding RNA and the RNA’s interaction with a ribosome to produce proteins. This information comes primarily from experiment and is the main reason why it is important to have accessible databases or repositories of part specifications. In this case, no rates are explicitly specified here, so they will take on default values.

### 3.4 A More Complex Part Description

A more involved example demonstrating how an operator-promoter combination is encoded is shown in Figure 6. Here we have an operator with the rates for binding and unbinding of the transcription factor specified explicitly. If the operator is bound by the transcription factor, the neighbouring promoter is repressed — an RNA polymerase will not be able to bind. By contrast if the operator is unbound, the promoter will accept binding of RNA polymerase easily and frequently.

The transcription factor itself is specified by using `gcc:transcriptionFactor` to refer to the protein that will turn the operator on or off. Like `gcc:protein` for coding sequences, the term is unique to operators.

The promoter itself comes next and it is the most complex part to specify. Because the rate for binding of RNA polymerase depends on the state of the operator, two rates must be specified. States of the nearby parts are specified using the `rbmo` vocabulary which makes available the full range of expressiveness for rule-based output languages. For generality, a list of parts, upstream or downstream on the DNA strand may be specified along with their states. This enables a promoter to be controlled by two or more operators. The rate itself in this case is given with `gcc:value` for each case.

```

1  :R0040o a gcc:Operator;
   rdfs:label "TetR activated operator";
3  gcc:part "R0040o";
   gcc:transcriptionFactor :P0040;
5  gcc:transcriptionFactorBindingRate 0.01;
   gcc:transcriptionFactorUnbindingRate 0.01.
7
9  :R0040p a gcc:Promoter;
   rdfs:label "TetR repressible promoter";
11 gcc:part "R0040p";
   gcc:rnapBindingRate
13   [
     gcc:upstream ([ a rbmo:BoundState;
15                     rbmo:stateOf :R0040o ]);
     gcc:value 7e-7
17   ], [
     gcc:upstream ([ a rbmo:UnboundState;
19                     rbmo:stateOf :R0040o ]);
     gcc:value 0.0007
21   ].


```

Figure 6: An operator and promoter from the repressilator model. The binding rates for the promoter depend on the state of the adjacent operator.

### 3.5 Host and Protein-Protein Interactions

The language can also support protein–protein interactions. To see why these are useful, consider an example from the engineering of a bacterial communication system where the subtilin molecule is used to control population level dynamics. Cells has the receiver device (Bongers et al., 2005; Misirli et al., 2014) to sense the existence of subtilin, and the reporter device to initiate downstream cellular processes (Figures 7a and 7b). In the subtilin receiver, the interactions among the proteins produced by translation and the operator-promoters are mediated by a cascade reaction initiated by the subtilin molecule. Subtilin combines to phosphorylate the *SpaK* protein, which in turn phosphorylates the *SpaR* protein that finally binds to the promoter that controls the emission of a fluorescent green protein.

While the genetic circuit itself can be described in a similar manner to the previous repressilator example, the protein–protein interactions cannot. We do not attempt here to model these interactions in the GCDL though a future extension could do so. Instead we simply allow for inclusion of the relevant program, as a file in the output language (in this case  $\kappa$ -language). It is possible to supply arbitrary code in the low-level language using the `gcc:include` term. This facility makes it feasible to represent such genetic circuits which depend strongly on the host environment in order to operate.



(a) Diagram of the genetic circuit.

```

1 | :m a rbmo:Model;
2 |   dct:title "Subtilin Receiver Two-Component System";
3 |   gcc:include <../subtilin-host.ka>;
4 |   gcc:linear (
5 |     :pSpaRK :RBSa :spaK :RBSb :spaR :Ta
6 |     :pSpaS  :RBSc :gfp  :Tb
7 |   ).
8 |

```

(b) Corresponding semantic model.

Figure 7: Representations of the Subtilin Receiver model.

### 3.6 Protein Fusion

It is also worth noting that this example illustrates that in the high-level language it is immediately possible to represent devices that produce chains of proteins. This is known as protein fusion and is interesting for some applications (Yu et al., 2015). A chain of proteins is produced by adding adjacent (and appropriate) coding sequences. It is enough to simply list the coding sequences in the circuit; nothing else need be done.

### 3.7 Other Parts

The descriptions for the other kinds of biological parts, terminators, coding sequences, follow a similar pattern. There are terms for specifying the rates for the rules in which they participate, and a few specialised terms according to the function of the specific part. It is possible to find the available terms out by inspecting the `gcc` vocabulary included in Appendix A.

```

1 | %agent: D-LacI(us, ds, bs)
2 | %agent: R-LacI(us, ds, bs)
3 | %agent: P-LacI(us, ds, bs)
4 |

```

(a) Distinct agents for each variant of part.

```

1 | %agent: DNA(us, ds, bs, type~LacI)
2 | %agent: RNA(us, ds, bs, type~LacI)
3 | %agent: Protein(us, ds, bs, type~LacI)

```

(b) Generic agents for each variant with part indicated by the `type` site.

Figure 8: Dual representations of parts as agents.

## 4 Output Representations

We now consider the form of the output representation. By using different templates, the compiler can produce output in different languages. We focus on rule-based representations here and use the language of the KaSim simulator (Krivine and Feret, 2017) for concrete illustration as it is widely adopted for stochastic simulation of rule-based models (Wilson-Kanamori et al., 2015). The rule-based modelling approach is merely outlined here and follows that used in KBBF (Wilson-Kanamori et al., 2015) closely. We stress that the though output as executable program in the KaSim language is demonstrated here, alternative rule-based representations like BioNetGen are equally possible as are descriptions in a language like SBOL as input to an experimental process in the laboratory.

### 4.1 Generic Agents

The behaviour of each kind of genetic part can be specified with rules, examples of which are given below. Fundamentally these rules operate on representations of DNA, RNA and proteins. Since each part can be linearly adjacent to others, there must be sites to stand for this linkage. These will be called `us` and `ds` for “upstream” and “downstream” respectively. There is also a need for a site to stand for the binding of protein or RNA polymerase to DNA, or the ribosome to RNA. This will be called `bs` for “binding site”.

We immediately arrive at a modelling choice: the specific part, for example an operator to which the Lac repressor binds, could be represented as distinct kind of agent with DNA, RNA and protein variants (Figure 8a) or it could be represented as a label or tag on a generic DNA, RNA and protein agents (Figure 8b). We choose the latter because not only does it remove the need for having

```

2 | %agent: RNAP(dna, rna)
   | %agent: Ribosome(rna, protein)

```

Figure 9: RNA polymerase and ribosome agents.




Figure 10: Termination rules: transcription and translation

a large number of agents and inventing names for each DNA and RNA variant, but it greatly simplifies the rules. As we shall see the generic representation means that rules can easily be written where it only matters that a part is adjacent to *some* other part without specifying which one in particular. This is simply done by not specifying the `type` site. This is not possible with distinct agents because the Kappa language does not allow for unspecified or wild card agents.

These constructs, with their upstream and downstream linkages are enough to form the “rails” along which transcription and translation happen but we still require agents to join these together, namely RNA polymerase and the ribosome. These agents have two sites, one for each rail that they straddle (Figure 9).

## 4.2 Unbinding Rules

To understand how this works in practice, consider the simplest kind of rule, the unbinding rule. Those for transcription and translation are shown in Figure 10. This does not yet use any of the features that motivated our choice of agent representation, but does already show the “don’t care, don’t write” way of the KaSim dialect of Kappa: those sites that are not necessary for the operation of the rule do not appear. This brevity is a great boon.

An unbinding rule of the same form exists for each DNA part. Particularly significant among these is the unbinding of a protein from an operator.




Figure 11: Binding of RNA polymerase to a promoter with different rates,  $k_u$  and  $k_b$  according to context given by operator state.

#### 4.2.1 Binding Rules with Context

The simplest kind of binding rule is just the same as unbinding with the direction of the arrow reversed. Such rules appear for the initiation of translation — the binding of a ribosome onto a ribosome binding site — as well as for the activation of an operator. These are not reproduced here. Instead, we consider binding rules with context, as in Figure 11.

The explicit context, with the operator adjacent to the promoter being bound to a protein, or not, allows for the modelling of inducible or repressible promoter architectures. The transcription process begins with the binding of RNA polymerase and the rate at which this happens depends on the state of the operators as illustrated in Figure 11. This is the simple case with only one operator but there is no restriction on the number of operators; we allow for upstream and downstream context of arbitrary size.

This example is illustrative in that rules are posed in terms of a “main” part that becomes bound or unbound and in principle it is possible to provide arbitrary amounts of context for *any* rule. This is supported by the low-level language here, but however it is only implemented in the compiler for the par-






Figure 12: Translation of a coding sequence to produce a protein.


ticular family of rules depicted in Figure 11, the activation of promoters through the binding of RNA polymerase. This is sufficient for models involving complex promoter architectures, but an extension allowing for context everywhere is not difficult.

#### 4.2.2 Sliding Rules

In some sense the real work of modelling the transcription and translation machinery is done with sliding rules. Figure 12 shows how this works for the creation of a protein from a coding sequence. This is our first example of a rule where though the adjacent part figures explicitly in the rule, its *type* does not. It is sufficient to know that it is a piece of RNA. In this case, two pieces of RNA are involved, the part that is central to this rule corresponds to the coding sequence for  $X$ . It is adjacent to another piece of RNA, and the ribosome slides from one to the other (to the left, where sliding on DNA happens, as we will see next, to the right) and in the process, emits a protein of type  $X$ .

A somewhat more complicated sliding rule is used to implement transcription, as shown in Figure 13. This shares the feature of the translation rule above where there is a part that is central to this rule, part  $X$ , and there is an adjacent part whose type does not matter. Here, the RNA polymerase starts off bound to the adjacent DNA part, whose type does not matter and so is not specified, and slides onto the central part of type  $X$ . In the process, an RNA part of type  $X$  is inserted into the growing chain.

Other rules are necessary, of course. The rule in Figure 13, for example, cannot operate without a piece RNA bound to the polymerase. Chains of RNA cannot be produced before the first link has been added. The rule that does that is exactly analogous to that of Figure 12. And similarly in the other direction, there is a rule to produce protein chains where a protein already exists and a coding sequence is slid across. This is almost identical to making an RNA chain. All of the other core rules are simply variations on those given above.



```

,
transcription-elongation
, \
2  DNA(ds!2, bs!1),
\
DNA(type~X, us!2,
4  bs), \
RNAp(dna!1, rna
!3), \
RNA(ds!3) \
6 -> \
DNA(ds!2, bs), \
8  DNA(type~X, us!2,
bs!1), \
RNAp(dna!1, rna
!3), \
10 RNA(ds!4), \
RNA(type~X, us!4,
ds!3, bs) \
12 @k

```

Figure 13: Transcription, production of an RNA sequence from DNA

## 5 Genetic Circuit Compiler

Having described the source (high-level) and target (low-level) languages in some detail, we now briefly sketch our implementation of the compiler that translates between them. Many compiler implementations are possible; ours innovatively combines the logical inference that is native to the semantic web with the use of templates to generate the target program. The overall information flow through the compiler is illustrated in Figure 1.

Our strategy is to first gather all the input statements and background facts that are asserted by the various vocabularies in use. In the first inference step, standard RDF rules are then used to make available consequent facts that will be needed to produce the ultimate result. The result is a program in a language such as  $\kappa$  and not Resource Description Framework (RDF), and which uses local variable names and not URIs, so the materialised facts are transformed into a suitable internal representation. Substitution into templates is done, and finally some post-processing is done to derive any remaining program directive that require the complete assembled circuit in order to know.

It is interesting to consider that the entire compiler can be thought of as implementing a kind of inference quite different from what is commonly used with the Semantic Web. The consequent, the executable model, is in a different language from the antecedent, the declarative description. Through the use of embedding annotations, however, the original model is nevertheless carried through to the output, and is unambiguously recoverable. There is thus an arrow from the space of declarative models in RDF to the space of annotated executable models. There is an arrow in the other direction that forgets the executable part and retains the declarative part. In an important sense, the two representations contain the same information, only that the executable model has more materialised detail in order that it may be run.

### 5.1 Semantic Inference

The input from the user is the model description in the high-level language as described in Section 3. This description uses terms from, and makes reference to the `gcc` and `rbmo` vocabularies. The *meaning* of these terms, in the context of deriving an equivalent version of the program in the low-level language, is given by the companion inference rules. This is a somewhat subtle concept so let us illustrate what it means. Consider the statement,

```
| :R0040a a rbmc:Operator.
```

This statement gives the type of `:R0040a` as `rbmc:Operator`.

The implications of this statement allows to identify the correct template to use for this part, found from information provided by the `gcc` vocabulary. Indeed, as a background fact, we are told that

```
1 | rbmc:Operator rbmc:kappaTemplate rbmt:operator.ka.
```

or in other words that an `rbmc:Operator` corresponds to the template `rbmt:operator.ka`. We also have an inference rule, provided with the `gcc` vocabulary that says,

```
1 | { ?part a [ rbmc:kappaTemplate ?template ] } => { ?part
   | rbmc:kappaTemplate ?template }.
```

In the Notation 3 (Berners-Lee and Connolly, 2011; Berners-Lee et al., 2008) language this means that, “for all `?parts` that has a type that corresponds to a `kappa ?template`, that `?part` itself corresponds to that `?template`”. Alternatively,

$$\text{type}(p, x) \wedge \text{kappa}(x, t) \rightarrow \text{kappa}(p, t)$$

It would have been perfectly possible to explicitly write what template should be used for each part in the high-level model description. It is not desirable to do so because it leaks implementation details of the compiler into what ought to be an implementation-independent declarative description.

The above rule, and others like it serve to elaborate the high-level description into a more detailed version suitable for the next stage of the compiler. All implications that can be drawn under the `rdfs` inference rules and the `gcc` specific rules must be drawn and must become part of the in the in-memory RDF storage as the transitive closure of the rules (given the background facts and the provided model facts).

## 5.2 Internal Representation

The output of the first stage of the compiler contains all the information necessary to completely describe the output, but it is not in a convenient form for providing to the template rendering engine. In our case the implementation language for the compiler is in Python and the chosen rendering engine is Jinja2 (Ronacher, 2008). This means that the appropriate data-structure is a dictionary or associative list that can be processed natively by these tools without need of external library. The required internal representation is built up by querying the in-memory RDF storage for the specific information required by the templates.

Our implementation does not require modification when new terms are added to the vocabulary and templates. Suppose that a new kind of part is invented. This should mean writing a new template for it and possibly adding some terms to the vocabulary but should not require changing the compiler software itself. What makes this possible are the inference rules described in the previous Section 5.1. The queries on the RDF storage that produce the internal representation are posed in terms of the *consequents* of the inference rules rather than the specific form of input.

### 5.3 Template Substitution

The templates that produce the bulk of the low-level output are written in the well-known Jinja2 language. This language is commonly used for the server-side generation of web pages. KaSim or BNGL programs are not web pages but they are text documents and Jinja2 is well suited to generating them. It has a notion of inclusion and inheritance that is useful for handling the variations among the different kinds of parts, which typically differ in the rules for one or two of the interactions in which they participate with the others being identical.

A full description of the facilities provided by Jinja2 is beyond the scope of this paper, but a flavour is given in Figure 14 which shows an example of a template for a generic part (not having specific functionality like a promoter or operator might) demonstrating substitution of the `name` variable derived from annotation, and include statements referencing several other templates, one of which is reproduced and shows the actual KaSim code that is produced.

We use specific terms for defining the rates for the rules in which biological parts are involved, and a few other terms according to the function of the biological part of interest. It is possible to find the available terms out by inspecting the `gcc` vocabulary.

A fragment of the `gcc` vocabulary is reproduced in Figure 15. Though this exposes some implementation detail, it is useful to understand the relationships between the various terms used to describe models. This is also important when supplying customised templates.

There are `gcc:Tokens`, so named because they correspond to tokens in the low-level language that are replaced. Each must have a preferred label that gives the literal token. In cases where there exists a sensible default value, this is given with `rbmc:default`. The purpose of these statements is to act as a bridge between the fully materialised RDF representation of the model and the templates that require substitution of locally meaningful names.

For each kind of part (such as the `rbmc:Operator` in the example in Figure 15), there are two main annotations that are necessary. For each machine-readable low-level language, a template is specified. The `gcc:tokens` annotations give the tokens that are pertinent to this kind of part. These must be specified in the high-level model or allowed to take on their default values. In addition to documenting the requirements of the templates for each kind of part, these statements are, “operationalised” and used by the compiler. They can equally well be used to check that a supplied high-level model is well-formed.

### 5.4 Derivation of Declarations

The KaSim language requires forward declaration of the type signatures of agents. This is by design (Ferret and Krivine, 2015) so that the simulator can check that agents are correctly used where they appear in patterns in the rules. While this design choice can help a modeller that is writing a simulation program in the low-level language by hand, to assist in finding mistakes and typographical errors, it is not possible to know *a priori* what these declarations should

be in the present context. The correct declarations for `DNA`, `RNA` and `Protein` depend on the complete set of parts that make up the model so their correct declarations cannot be known in any template for an individual part.

To solve this issue, the compiler implements a post-processing step. The rules that are produced by instantiating the templates for each part are concatenated together with any explicitly written rules that are to be included and then the whole is parsed. The use of each agent in each rule in this rule-set is assumed to be correct by definition. From there a declaration that covers each use of each agent is built up.

## 5.5 Initialisation

At this final stage of the compiler, all rules are present, both supplied by the user for the host environment and implied by the parts that form the genetic circuits and all declarations are also present. What is missing is the statement that creates an initial copy of the DNA sequence itself, which each upstream-downstream bond present. This information is, of course, available in the definition of the circuit, and so an appropriate `%init` statement, creating an instance of the DNA sequence with correct linkages between the agent-parts is produced and added to the output. The low-level program is finally complete and ready to be executed.

## 6 Future Work: Generating Models

So far, we have demonstrated a computational pathway from a succinct model of a genetic circuit written in RDF to an executable program for simulation or a description in a language suited to consumption by laboratory tools. Recall that the rationale for such an infrastructure is to bring computational tools to bear on the design problem of genetic circuits: to identify circuits that are feasible for some purpose through simulation in the first instance, before attempting synthesis in the laboratory, for reasons of cost and accessibility. The question which remains is, how do we know which circuits to model in the first place?

A high-level design problem in genome synthesis is to create a circuit that will respond in a particular way to a given chemical input. The desired specification is given in terms of pairs of input and output measurements — typically time-series of concentrations of chemicals — and the circuit that implements the circuit is thought of as implementing this mapping from input to output.

One approach which does not use computation is to simply produce, in the laboratory, all possible circuits from a given library of parts (Cress et al., 2015; Guet et al., 2002; Menzella et al., 2005; Smanski et al., 2014). In that strategy, DNA sequences are randomly assembled into all possible combinations and one simply looks for output markers such as the commonly used fluorescent green protein that appear or not in response to given input. When a cell that has the desired behaviour is found, its genome is sequenced to find out what combination of parts it has implemented. This approach has the great advantage

of massive parallelism: all possibilities can be attempted in parallel and only those candidate genomes that appear to be of interest analysed further. It has the disadvantage of requiring expensive, specialised equipment to identify potentially feasible solutions.

To bring the design problem into the computational realm, we propose the use of an evolutionary algorithm. The process, which we only briefly sketch here, is as follows. We begin with a specification, a set of (input, output) pairs that describe the desired function of the system. We require a metric suitable for measuring the distance between two such sets. This allows evaluation of the feasibility of a circuit under test. With the problem so specified, we may begin the search for suitable candidates.

To generate circuits, we use a library of parts from a database that have their rates and other characteristics specified as outlined above. A large class of circuits can be immediately eliminated — those that are ill-formed. We use a Pedersen-style grammar (Pedersen and Phillips, 2009) to only generate well-formed circuits. We begin with an arbitrary circuit, perhaps one that is thought to implement a function that is in some way similar to the desired one, or perhaps one that is completely arbitrary. The circuit is then simulated enough times to obtain a distribution of (input, output) pairs — recall that the model is necessarily stochastic. Now substitute one part in the circuit with a different part of the same type from the library and simulate that. If the (empirically) expected result is closer to the specification, adopt the new circuit as the best candidate. Continue substituting parts until no further improvement is found. Occasionally make larger changes, substituting more than one part, in order that this optimisation process does not become trapped in a local minimum.

This strategy for identifying feasible genetic circuits is, of course, a *genetic algorithm*. It imitates the evolutionary process of living organisms in order to find the optimal solution to a given problem. Despite it being far more efficient than an exhaustive search of the space of possible circuits, it may yet be too computationally expensive. More ways to constrain the search space will need to be developed. Nevertheless there is a certain elegance to using a nature-inspired computational technique to design genomes *in silico* for later construction *in vitro*.

## 7 Conclusion

We have, in this paper, presented the GCDL, a high-level Semantic Web language for describing genetic circuits. We have shown how these circuits can be implemented in a rule-based language, and described our compiler that translates between the description and the low-level implementation is implemented taking full advantage of inference rules to maintain succinctness. Finally we have sketched an area of future research in potential solution to the problem of discovering such circuits in the first place.

**Acknowledgements** Thanks to Michael Korbakov for porting the original Haskell implementation of the agent declaration code to Python.

**Funding** W.W., M.C., G.M., A.W., and V.D. acknowledge the support from the Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council (EPSRC) grant EP/J02175X/1 and from UK Research Councils Synthetic Biology for Growth programme. W.W. and V.D. acknowledge the European Union’s Seventh Framework Programme for research, technological development and demonstration grant number 320823 (to V.D. and W.W.). W.W. also acknowledges support from the National Academies Keck Futures Initiative of the National Academy of Sciences award number NAKFI CB12.

**Conflicts of Interest** The authors have no competing interests.

## References

- Ashburner, M., Ball, C. A., Blake, J. A., Botstein, D., Butler, H., Cherry, J. M., Davis, A. P., Dolinski, K., Dwight, S. S., Eppig, J. T., Harris, M. A., Hill, D. P., Issel-Tarver, L., Kasarskis, A., Lewis, S., Matese, J. C., Richardson, J. E., Ringwald, M., Rubin, G. M., and Sherlock, G. (2000). Gene Ontology: tool for the unification of biology. *Nature Genetics*, 25(1):25–29.
- Baldwin, G. (2012). *Synthetic biology: A primer*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Beal, J., Phillips, A., Densmore, D., and Cai, Y. (2011). *High-Level Programming Languages for Biomolecular Systems*, pages 225–252. Springer New York, New York, NY.
- Berners-Lee, T. (2005). An RDF language for the Semantic Web. Design Issues, World Wide Web Consortium.
- Berners-Lee, T. and Connolly, D. (2011). Notation3 (N3): A readable RDF syntax. W3c Team Submission, World Wide Web Consortium.
- Berners-Lee, T., Connolly, D., Kagal, L., Scharf, Y., and Hendler, J. (2008). N3logic: A logical framework for the world wide web. *Theory and Practice of Logic Programming*, 8(03):249–269.
- Blinov, M. L., Faeder, J. R., Goldstein, B., and Hlavacek, W. S. (2004). Bionetgen: software for rule-based modeling of signal transduction based on the interactions of molecular domains. *Bioinformatics*, 20(17):3289–3291.
- Bongers, R. S., Veening, J.-W., Wieringen, M. V., Kuipers, O. P., and Kleerebezem, M. (2005). Development and Characterization of a Subtilin-Regulated Expression System in *Bacillus subtilis*: Strict Control of Gene Expression by Addition of Subtilin. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology*, 71(12):8818–8824.



- Brickley, D. and Guha, R. V. (2014). RDF Schema 1.1. W3c Recommendation, World Wide Web Consortium.
- Cai, Y., Beal, J., Phillips, A., and Densmore, D. (2011). *High-level programming language for Bio-molecular systems*, pages 225–252. SpringerLink.
- Consortium, U. and others (2008). The universal protein resource (UniProt). *Nucleic acids research*, 36(suppl 1):D190–D195.
- Cooling, M. T., Rouilly, V., Misirli, G., Lawson, J., Yu, T., Hallinan, J., and Wipat, A. (2010). Standard virtual biological parts: a repository of modular modeling components for synthetic biology. *Bioinformatics*, 26(7):925–931.
- Cress, B. F., Toparlak, O. D., Guleria, S., Lebovich, M., Stieglitz, J. T., Englaender, J. A., Jones, J. A., Linhardt, R. J., and Koffas, M. A. (2015). Crispathbrick: modular combinatorial assembly of type ii-a crispr arrays for dcas9-mediated multiplex transcriptional repression in e. coli. *ACS synthetic biology*, 4(9):987–1000.
- Crick, F. (1970). Central dogma of molecular biology. *Nature*, 227(5258):561.
- Cyganiak, R., Carroll, J., and Lanthaler, M. (2014). RDF 1.1 Concepts and Abstract Syntax. W3c Recommendation, World Wide Web Consortium.
- Danos, V., Feret, J., Fontana, W., Harmer, R., and Krivine, J. (2007). Rule-Based Modelling of Cellular Signalling. In Caires, L. and Vasconcelos, V. T., editors, *CONCUR 2007 Concurrency Theory*, number 4703 in Lecture Notes in Computer Science, pages 17–41. Springer Berlin Heidelberg. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-540-74407-8\_3.
- Danos, V., Feret, J., Fontana, W., Harmer, R., and Krivine, J. (2008). Rule-based modelling, symmetries, refinements. In *Formal methods in systems biology*, pages 103–122. Springer.
- Danos, V. and Laneve, C. (2004). Formal molecular biology. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 325(1):69–110.
- Drummond, N. and Shearer, R. (2006). The open world assumption. In *eSI Workshop: The Closed World of Databases meets the Open World of the Semantic Web*, volume 15.
- Elowitz, M. B. and Leibler, S. (2000). A synthetic oscillatory network of transcriptional regulators. *Nature*, 403(6767):335–338.
- Feret, J. and Krivine, J. (2015). Personal correspondence.
- Ferry, M. S., Hasty, J., and Cookson, N. A. (2012). Synthetic biology approaches to biofuel production. *Biofuels*, 3(1):9–12.

- Galanie, S., Thodey, K., Trenchard, I. J., Filsinger Interrante, M., and Smolke, C. D. (2015). Complete biosynthesis of opioids in yeast. *Science*, 349(6252):1095–1100.
- Galdzicki, M., Clancy, K. P., Oberortner, E., Pocock, M., Quinn, J. Y., Rodriguez, C. A., Roehner, N., Wilson, M. L., Adam, L., and Anderson, J. C. (2014). The synthetic biology open language (sbol) provides a community standard for communicating designs in synthetic biology. *Nature biotechnology*, 32(6):545.
- Guet, C. C., Elowitz, M. B., Hsing, W., and Leibler, S. (2002). Combinatorial synthesis of genetic networks. *Science*, 296(5572):1466–1470.
- Hallinan, J. S., Gilfellow, O., Misirli, G., and Wipat, A. (2014). Tuning receiver characteristics in bacterial quorum communication: An evolutionary approach using standard virtual biological parts. In *2014 IEEE Conference on Computational Intelligence in Bioinformatics and Computational Biology*, pages 1–8.
- Halpin, H., Hayes, P. J., McCusker, J. P., McGuinness, D. L., and Thompson, H. S. (2010). When owl:sameAs Isn't the Same: An Analysis of Identity in Linked Data. In Patel-Schneider, P. F., Pan, Y., Hitzler, P., Mika, P., Zhang, L., Pan, J. Z., Horrocks, I., and Glimm, B., editors, *The Semantic Web ISWC 2010*, Lecture Notes in Computer Science, pages 305–320. Springer Berlin Heidelberg. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-642-17746-0\_20.
- Harris, L. A., Hogg, J. S., Tapia, J.-J., Sekar, J. A. P., Gupta, S., Korsunsky, I., Arora, A., Barua, D., Sheehan, R. P., and Faeder, J. R. (2016). BioNetGen 2.2: advances in rule-based modeling. *Bioinformatics*, 32(21):3366–3368.
- Hlavacek, W. S., Faeder, J. R., Blinov, M. L., Perelson, A. S., and Goldstein, B. (2003). The complexity of complexes in signal transduction. *Biotechnology and bioengineering*, 84(7):783–794.
- Horrocks, I. (2005). OWL: A Description Logic Based Ontology Language. In *Logic Programming*, pages 1–4. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg.
- Hucka, M., , Finney, A., , Sauro, H. M., , Bolouri, H., , Doyle, J. C., , Kitano, H., , Arkin, A. P., , Bornstein, B. J., , Bray, D., , Cornish-Bowden, A., , Cuellar, A. A., , Dronov, S., , Gilles, E. D., , Ginkel, M., , Gor, V., , Goryanin, I. I., , Hedley, W. J., , Hodgman, T. C., , Hofmeyr, J.-H., , Hunter, P. J., , Juty, N. S., , Kasberger, J. L., , Kremling, A., , Kummer, U., , Le Novre, N., , Loew, L. M., , Lucio, D., , Mendes, P., , Minch, E., , Mjolsness, E. D., , Nakayama, Y., , Nelson, M. R., , Nielsen, P. F., , Sakurada, T., , Schaff, J. C., , Shapiro, B. E., , Shimizu, T. S., , Spence, H. D., , Stelling, J., , Takahashi, K., , Tomita, M., , Wagner, J., , and Wang, J. (2003). The systems biology markup language (sbml): a medium for representation and exchange of biochemical network models. *Bioinformatics*, 19(4):524.

- Hyland, B., Ateazing, G., and Villazn-Terrazas, B. (2014). Best Practices for Publishing Linked Data. W3c Working Group Note, World Wide Web Consortium.
- Krivine, J. and Feret, J. (2017). KaSim.
- Kunze, J. A. and Baker, T. (2007). RFC5013 – The Dublin Core Metadata Element Set. Request for Comments.
- Masinter, L., Berners-Lee, T., and Fielding, R. T. (2005). RFC3896 – Uniform Resource Identifier (URI): Generic Syntax. Request for Comments.
- Menzella, H. G., Reid, R., Carney, J. R., Chandran, S. S., Reisinger, S. J., Patel, K. G., Hopwood, D. A., and Santi, D. V. (2005). Combinatorial polyketide biosynthesis by de novo design and rearrangement of modular polyketide synthase genes. *Nature biotechnology*, 23(9):1171.
- Miles, A., Matthews, B., Wilson, M., and Brickley, D. (2005). SKOS Core: Simple knowledge organisation for the Web. *International Conference on Dublin Core and Metadata Applications*, 0(0):3–10.
- Misirli, G., Cavaliere, M., Waites, W., Pocock, M., Madsen, C., Gilfellow, O., Honorato-Zimmer, R., Zuliani, P., Danos, V., and Wipat, A. (2015). Annotation of rule-based models with formal semantics to enable creation, analysis, reuse and visualization. *Bioinformatics*, page btv660.
- Misirli, G., Hallinan, J., and Wipat, A. (2014). Composable Modular Models for Synthetic Biology. *J. Emerg. Technol. Comput. Syst.*, 11(3):22:1–22:19.
- Neal, M. L., Cooling, M. T., Smith, L. P., Thompson, C. T., Sauro, H. M., Carlson, B. E., Cook, D. L., and Gennari, J. H. (2014). A reappraisal of how to build modular, reusable models of biological systems. *PLoS computational biology*, 10(10):e1003849.
- Nguyen, T., Roehner, N., Zundel, Z., and Myers, C. J. (2016). A converter from the systems biology markup language to the synthetic biology open language. *ACS Synthetic Biology*, 5(6):479–486. PMID: 26696234.
- Paddon, C. J., Westfall, P. J., Pitera, D. J., Benjamin, K., Fisher, K., McPhee, D., Leavell, M. D., Tai, A., Main, A., Eng, D., Polichuk, D. R., Teoh, K. H., Reed, D. W., Treynor, T., Lenihan, J., Jiang, H., Fleck, M., Bajad, S., Dang, G., Dengrove, D., Diola, D., Dorin, G., Ellens, K. W., Fickes, S., Galazzo, J., Gaucher, S. P., Geistlinger, T., Henry, R., Hepp, M., Horning, T., Iqbal, T., Kizer, L., Lieu, B., Melis, D., Moss, N., Regentin, R., Secrest, S., Tsuruta, H., Vazquez, R., Westblade, L. F., Xu, L., Yu, M., Zhang, Y., Zhao, L., Lievense, J., Covello, P. S., Keasling, J. D., Reiling, K. K., Renninger, N. S., and Newman, J. D. (2013). High-level semi-synthetic production of the potent antimalarial artemisinin. *Nature*, 496(7446):528–532.

- Pedersen, M. and Phillips, A. (2009). Towards programming languages for genetic engineering of living cells. *Journal of the Royal Society Interface*, 6(Suppl 4):S437–S450.
- Prud’hommeaux, E. and Carothers, G. (2014). RDF 1.1 Turtle. W3c Recommendation, World Wide Web Consortium.
- Roehner, N., Zhang, Z., Nguyen, T., and Myers, C. J. (2015). Generating systems biology markup language models from the synthetic biology open language. *ACS Synthetic Biology*, 4(8):873–879. PMID: 25822671.
- Ronacher, A. (2008). Jinja2 (The Python Template Engine).
- Ruder, W. C., Lu, T., and Collins, J. J. (2011). Synthetic biology moving into the clinic. *Science*, 333(6047):1248–1252.
- Sauermann, L., Cyganiak, R., and Vkel, M. (2011). Cool URIs for the semantic web.
- Smanski, M. J., Bhatia, S., Zhao, D., Park, Y., Woodruff, L. B., Giannoukos, G., Ciulla, D., Busby, M., Calderon, J., and Nicol, R. (2014). Functional optimization of gene clusters by combinatorial design and assembly. *Nature biotechnology*, 32(12):1241.
- van Harmelen, F. and McGuinness, D. L. (2004). OWL Web Ontology Language. W3c Recommendation, World Wide Web Consortium}.
- Wilson-Kanamori, J., Danos, V., Thomson, T., and Honorato-Zimmer, R. (2015). Kappa Rule-Based Modeling in Synthetic Biology. In Marchisio, M. A., editor, *Computational Methods in Synthetic Biology*, number 1244 in *Methods in Molecular Biology*, pages 105–135. Springer New York. DOI: 10.1007/978-1-4939-1878-2\_6.
- Yu, K., Liu, C., Kim, B.-G., and Lee, D.-Y. (2015). Synthetic fusion protein design and applications. *Biotechnology advances*, 33(1):155–164.

```

1  ## Auto-generated generic part {{ name }}
   {% include "header.ka" %}
3  {% import "context.ka" as context with context %}
   {% import "meta.ka" as meta with context %}
5
   {% include "transcription_elongation.ka" %}
7  {% include "transcription_termination.ka" %}
   {% include "translation_chain.ka" %}
9  {% include "translation_elongation.ka" %}
   {% include "translation_termination.ka" %}
11 {% include "host_maintenance.ka" %}

1  {% set rule = "%s-translation-chain" % name %}
   #
3  #^ :{{ rule }} a rbmo:Rule;
   #^   bqbiol:isVersionOf go:G0:0006415;
5  {{ meta.rule() }}{# #}
   #^   rdfs:label "{{ name }} formation of \
7  #^           translational chains, due to \
   #^           gene fusion or leakiness of \
9  #^           stop codons".
   # {{ name }} formation of translational chains,
11 # due to gene fusion or leakiness of stop codons
   #
13 ' {{ rule }}' \
   RNA(ds!2, bs!1), \
15 Ribosome(rna!1, protein!3), \
   RNA(type~{{ name }}, us!2, bs), \
17 P(ds, bs!3) \
   -> \
19 RNA(ds!2, bs), \
   Ribosome(rna!1, protein!3), \
21 RNA(type~{{ name }}, us!2, bs!1), \
   P(ds!4, bs), \
23 P(type~{{ name }}, us!4, bs!3) \
   @{{ translationElongationRate }}

```

Figure 14: Template examples. On top is the template for a generic part, and it references several other templates, one of which, `translation_chain.ka`, is reproduced on bottom.

```

2  rbmc:transcriptionFactor a rbmc:Token;
   skos:prefLabel "transcriptionFactor".
4  rbmc:transcriptionFactorBindingRate a rbmc:Token;
   skos:prefLabel "transcriptionFactorBindingRate";
   rbmc:default 1.0.
6  rbmc:transcriptionFactorUnbindingRate a rbmc:Token;
   skos:prefLabel "transcriptionFactorUnbindingRate";
   rbmc:default 1.0.

10 rbmc:Operator rdfs:subClassOf rbmc:Part;
   rbmc:kappaTemplate rbmt:operator.ka;
12   rbmc:bnglTemplate rbmt:operator.bngl;
   rbmc:tokens
14     rbmc:transcriptionFactor,
       rbmc:transcriptionFactorBindingRate,
16     rbmc:transcriptionFactorUnbindingRate.

```

Figure 15: The specification in the `rbmc` vocabulary of an `rbmc:Operator` and associated terms.

## A The Genetic Circuit Compiler Language

```
2 # -*- n3 -*-
3 @prefix dct: <http://purl.org/dc/terms/>.
4 @prefix foaf: <http://xmlns.com/foaf/0.1/>.
5 @prefix owl: <http://www.w3.org/2002/07/owl#> .
6 @prefix prov: <http://www.w3.org/ns/prov#>.
7 @prefix rbmo: <http://purl.org/rbm/rbmo#>.
8 @prefix gcc: <http://purl.org/rbm/comp#>.
9 @prefix rbmt: <http://purl.org/rbm/templates/>.
10 @prefix rdfs: <http://www.w3.org/2000/01/rdf-schema#>.
11 @prefix skos: <http://www.w3.org/2004/02/skos/core#>.
12 gcc:part a gcc:Token; skos:prefLabel "name".
13 gcc:Part a owl:Class;
14     gcc:tokens gcc:part.
15
16 gcc:next a gcc:Token; skos:prefLabel "next".
17
18 gcc:transcriptionFactor a gcc:Token;
19     skos:prefLabel "transcriptionFactor";
20     gcc:default 1.0.
21 gcc:transcriptionFactorBindingRate a gcc:Token;
22     skos:prefLabel "transcriptionFactorBindingRate";
23     gcc:default 1.0.
24 gcc:transcriptionFactorUnbindingRate a gcc:Token;
25     skos:prefLabel "transcriptionFactorUnbindingRate";
26     gcc:default 1.0.
27
28 gcc:rnapBindingRate a gcc:Token;
29     skos:prefLabel "rnapBindingRate";
30     gcc:default 1.0.
31 gcc:rnapDNAUnbindingRate a gcc:Token;
32     skos:prefLabel "rnapDNAUnbindingRate";
33     gcc:default 1.0.
34 gcc:rnapRNAUnbindingRate a gcc:Token;
35     skos:prefLabel "rnapRNAUnbindingRate";
36     gcc:default 1.0.
37
38 gcc:ribosomeBindingRate a gcc:Token;
39     skos:prefLabel "ribosomeBindingRate";
40     gcc:default 1.0.
41 gcc:ribosomeRNAUnbindingRate a gcc:Token;
42     skos:prefLabel "ribosomeRNAUnbindingRate";
43     gcc:default 1.0.
44 gcc:ribosomeProteinUnbindingRate a gcc:Token;
45     skos:prefLabel "ribosomeProteinUnbindingRate";
46     gcc:default 1.0.
47
48 gcc:transcriptionInitiationRate a gcc:Token;
49     skos:prefLabel "transcriptionInitiationRate";
50     gcc:default 1.0.
51 gcc:transcriptionElongationRate a gcc:Token;
52     skos:prefLabel "transcriptionElongationRate";
53     gcc:default 1.0.
54
```

```

56 gcc:translationElongationRate a gcc:Token;
   skos:prefLabel "translationElongationRate";
   gcc:default 1.0.
58
60 gcc:rnaDegradationRate a gcc:Token;
   skos:prefLabel "rnaDegradationRate";
   gcc:default 1.0.
62 gcc:proteinDegradationRate a gcc:Token;
   skos:prefLabel "proteinDegradationRate";
64   gcc:default 1.0.
66 gcc:Operator rdfs:subClassOf gcc:Part;
   gcc:kappaTemplate rbmt:operator.ka;
68   gcc:bnglTemplate rbmt:operator.bngl;
   gcc:tokens
70     gcc:transcriptionFactor,
   gcc:transcriptionFactorBindingRate,
72     gcc:transcriptionFactorUnbindingRate,
   gcc:rnapDNAUnbindingRate,
74     gcc:rnapRNAUnbindingRate,
   gcc:transcriptionInitiationRate,
76     gcc:transcriptionElongationRate,
   gcc:ribosomeRNAUnbindingRate,
78     gcc:ribosomeProteinUnbindingRate,
   gcc:translationElongationRate,
80     gcc:rnaDegradationRate,
   gcc:proteinDegradationRate.
82
84 gcc:Promoter rdfs:subClassOf gcc:Part;
   gcc:kappaTemplate rbmt:promoter.ka;
   gcc:bnglTemplate rbmt:promoter.bngl;
86   gcc:tokens
   gcc:next,
88     gcc:rnapBindingRate,
   gcc:rnapDNAUnbindingRate,
90     gcc:rnapRNAUnbindingRate,
   gcc:transcriptionInitiationRate,
92     gcc:transcriptionElongationRate,
   gcc:ribosomeRNAUnbindingRate,
94     gcc:ribosomeProteinUnbindingRate,
   gcc:translationElongationRate,
96     gcc:rnaDegradationRate,
   gcc:proteinDegradationRate.
98
100 gcc:RibosomeBindingSite rdfs:subClassOf gcc:Part;
   gcc:kappaTemplate rbmt:rbs.ka;
   gcc:bnglTemplate rbmt:rbs.bngl;
102   gcc:tokens
   gcc:rnapDNAUnbindingRate,
104     gcc:rnapRNAUnbindingRate,
   gcc:transcriptionElongationRate,
106     gcc:ribosomeBindingRate,
   gcc:ribosomeRNAUnbindingRate,
108     gcc:ribosomeProteinUnbindingRate,
   gcc:translationElongationRate,
110     gcc:rnaDegradationRate,
   gcc:proteinDegradationRate.

```



```

112 gcc:protein a gcc:Token;
114     skos:prefLabel "protein".

116 gcc:CodingSequence rdfs:subClassOf gcc:Part;
    gcc:kappaTemplate rbmt:cds.ka;
118     gcc:bnglTemplate rbmt:cds.bngl;
    gcc:tokens
120         gcc:protein,
    gcc:rnapDNAUnbindingRate,
122         gcc:rnapRNAUnbindingRate,
    gcc:transcriptionElongationRate,
124         gcc:ribosomeRNAUnbindingRate,
    gcc:ribosomeProteinUnbindingRate,
126         gcc:translationElongationRate,
    gcc:rnaDegradationRate,
128         gcc:proteinDegradationRate.

130 gcc:Terminator rdfs:subClassOf gcc:Part;
    gcc:kappaTemplate rbmt:generic.ka;
132     gcc:bnglTemplate rbmt:generic.bngl;
    gcc:tokens
134         gcc:rnapDNAUnbindingRate,
    gcc:rnapRNAUnbindingRate,
136         gcc:transcriptionElongationRate,
    gcc:ribosomeRNAUnbindingRate,
138         gcc:ribosomeProteinUnbindingRate,
    gcc:translationElongationRate,
140         gcc:rnaDegradationRate,
    gcc:proteinDegradationRate.

```

composition.ttl

## B Additional Inference Rules for GCC

```
1 # -*- n3 -*-
  @prefix dct: <http://purl.org/dc/terms/>.
3 @prefix foaf: <http://xmlns.com/foaf/0.1/>.
  @prefix owl: <http://www.w3.org/2002/07/owl#> .
5 @prefix prov: <http://www.w3.org/ns/prov#>.
  @prefix rbmo: <http://purl.org/rbm/rbmo#>.
7 @prefix gcc: <http://purl.org/rbm/comp#>.
  @prefix rbmt: <http://purl.org/rbm/templates/>.
9 @prefix rdfs: <http://www.w3.org/2000/01/rdf-schema#>.
  @prefix skos: <http://www.w3.org/2004/02/skos/core#>.
11
12 ## The preferred label of a part is it's part slug
13 { ?part gcc:part ?label } => { ?part skos:prefLabel ?label }.
14
15 ## Derivation of templates
16 { ?part a [ gcc:kappaTemplate ?template ] } => { ?part
17   gcc:kappaTemplate ?template }.
18 { ?part a [ gcc:bnglTemplate ?template ] } => { ?part
19   gcc:bnglTemplate ?template }.
20
21 ## Translation of special predicates to replacement instructions
22 { ?kind gcc:tokens ?token .
23   ?token skos:prefLabel ?label .
24   ?part a ?kind; ?token ?value } =>
25 { ?part gcc:replace [ gcc:string ?label; gcc:value ?value ] }.
```

composition.n3