

Explore or exploit? A model-based screening strategy for PETase secretion by *Corynebacterium glutamicum*

Laura M. Helleckes^{1,2,+}, Carolin Müller^{1,2,+}, Tim Griesbach¹,
Vera Waffenschmidt¹, Matthias Moch¹, Michael Osthege^{1,2},
Wolfgang Wiechert^{1,3}, Marco Oldiges^{1,2*}

¹ Institute of Bio- and Geosciences, IBG-1: Biotechnology,
Forschungszentrum Jülich GmbH, Jülich, Germany

² Institute of Biotechnology, RWTH Aachen University, Aachen,
Germany

³ Computational Systems Biotechnology (AVT.CSB), RWTH Aachen
University, Aachen, Germany

+ These authors contributed equally

* Correspondence: Marco Oldiges, Forschungszentrum Jülich GmbH,
Wilhelm-Johnen-Straße, 52428 Jülich, +49 2461 613951,
m.oldiges@fz-juelich.de

Running title: Model-based screening for PETase secretion

Laura M. Helleckes	l.helleckes@fz-juelich.de	0000-0001-7825-7998
Carolin Müller	car.mueller@fz-juelich.de	0000-0002-6277-1009
Tim Griesbach	tim.griesbach@gmx.de	0000-0003-0548-0667
Vera Waffenschmidt	vera.waffenschmidt@ime.fraunhofer.de	0000-0002-7737-1067
Matthias Moch	m.moch@fz-juelich.de	
Michael Osthege	m.osthege@fz-juelich.de	0000-0002-2734-7624
Wolfgang Wiechert	w.wiechert@fz-juelich.de	0000-0001-8501-0694
Marco Oldiges	m.oldiges@fz-juelich.de	0000-0003-0704-5597

Abstract

Extracellular production of target proteins simplifies downstream processing due to obsolete cell disruption. However, optimal combinations of a heterologous protein, suitable signal peptide and secretion host can currently not be predicted, resulting in large strain libraries that need to be tested. On the experimental side, this challenge can be tackled by miniaturization, parallelization and automation, which provide high-throughput screening data. These data need to be condensed into a candidate ranking for decision making to focus bioprocess development on the most promising candidates.

We screened for *Bacillus subtilis* signal peptides mediating Sec secretion of two polyethylene terephthalate degrading enzymes (PETases), leaf-branch compost cutinase (LCC) and polyester hydrolase (PE-H) mutants, by *Corynebacterium glutamicum*. We developed a fully automated screening process and constructed an accompanying Bayesian statistical modeling framework, which we applied in screenings for highest activity in 4-nitrophenyl palmitate degradation. In contrast to classical evaluation methods, batch effects and biological errors are taken into account and their uncertainty is quantified. Within only two rounds of screening, the most suitable signal peptide was identified for each PETase. Results from LCC secretion in microliter-scale cultivation were shown to be scalable to laboratory-scale bioreactors.

This work demonstrates an experiment-modeling loop that can accelerate early-stage screening in a way that experimental capacities are focused to the most promising strain candidates. Combined with high-throughput cloning, this paves the way for using large strain libraries of several hundreds of strains in a Design-Build-Test-Learn approach.

Keywords

secretion, high-throughput screening, polyethylene terephthalate hydrolase, Bayesian statistical modeling, experiment-modeling loop

1 Introduction

Plastics are widely used for packaging, building and construction among other applications. In the European Union, Norway, Switzerland and the United Kingdom, 29 million tons of post-consumer plastic waste were collected in 2020. Of this waste, still 23.4% were sent to landfill, instead of recycling or at least energy recovery (PlasticsEurope, 2022). The discovery of a PETase from the bacterium *Ideonella sakaiensis* in 2016 has strongly promoted research in the field of biotechnological plastics degradation (Yoshida et al., 2016). Reviews on this topic and subsequent plastic upcycling can be found elsewhere (Kawai et al., 2019; Taniguchi et al., 2019; Tiso et al., 2021). Other examples for PETases are the thermostable LCC, whose mutant ICCG outperforms the *I. sakaiensis* PETase (Sulaiman et al., 2012; Tournier et al., 2020). The PETase PE-H from the marine mesophilic bacterium *Pseudomonas aestusnigri* in contrast shows higher activity at lower temperatures already. The rationally engineered PE-H mutant Y250S is also able to hydrolyze polyethylene terephthalate (PET) film substrates from PET bottles (Bollinger et al., 2020). Both PETases are presumably secreted by their native host mediated by a signal peptide (Bollinger et al., 2020; Sulaiman et al., 2012).

Since it is not possible to predict a suitable combination of a signal peptide and target protein for the selected host for heterologous protein secretion, a set of combinations have to be tested (Brockmeier et al., 2006; Degering et al., 2010; Müller et al., 2022). Such signal peptide screenings can be accelerated using automation, parallelization and miniaturization by using a microbioreactor integrated into a liquid handling platform (Hemmerich et al., 2016). Müller et al. (2022) established automated workflows from strain construction to enable high-throughput screening for heterologous Sec-dependent secretion with *C. glutamicum* mediated by *B. subtilis* signal peptides. The Gram-positive *C. glutamicum* is a promising host for protein secretion because it has been used for decades for large-scale industrial production of amino acids and other small molecules and has low extracellular protease activity (Freudl, 2017; Liu et al., 2021; Vertès, 2013). Best performing *B. subtilis* signal peptides for heterologous *Fusarium solani* f. sp. *pisi* cutinase secretion were identified using automated workflows (Müller et al., 2022). This cutinase is also able to degrade amorphous PET, albeit with lower activities than the LCC (Tournier et al., 2020; Vertommen et al., 2005).

We demonstrate in this study that the workflows for strain construction and, in particular, secretion screening for *B. subtilis* signal peptides are transferable to the LCC mutant ICCG and PE-H mutant Y250S as target proteins. To our knowledge,

this is the first approach to secrete PETases with *C. glutamicum*. We have optimized and extended the workflow for comparing 24 different strains in one run. The aforementioned techniques pave the way for generating and testing hundreds of combinations; experimental design and efficient data analysis thus become increasingly important topics.

Notably, early-stage screening experiments need to reliably reduce the number of candidate strains before process optimization and validation in laboratory and pilot scale bioreactors (Hemmerich et al., 2018), even if microbioreactors are used. In other words, small-scale screenings need to result in a candidate ranking regarding a key performance indicator (KPI) that is the decision criterion for later stages. These KPIs often cannot be observed directly, but rather need to be derived using models, e.g., small regression models (Hemmerich et al., 2018; Neubauer et al., 2013). A second challenge is the batch-wise screening process, which demands to select, in the case of this study, 24 variants for each round of cultivation. However, with the number of potential candidates exceeding this number, many strategies can be applied, e.g., selecting the same number of replicates for each strain and distribute them randomly over batches or performing a pre-screening with few replicates before investigating the top x-percent in more detail. Especially if experiments are prone to batch effects between runs, the experimental design decisions become more and more complex. Moreover, experimental capacity needs to be focused to the most promising candidate strains to obtain exact KPIs with low uncertainty, while low performers need to be immediately sorted out, not wasting unnecessary replicate experiments on them.

Generally, these challenges constitute a classical exploration-exploitation tradeoff: First, a detailed examination of all variants as much as possible could be aimed at, which corresponds to the goal of exploration (i.e. choosing new variants). Second, expensive or time-intensive experiments may require maximizing the exploitation (i.e. choosing known variants) in such a way that a greedy algorithm would choose the candidate with the so far highest mean KPI to make use of the obtained knowledge (Russo et al., 2018). For an efficient screening, both objectives need to be balanced to make sure that novel variants are explored but no replicates are wasted for unpromising candidates that have little probability to outperform the others. A heuristic to balance this exploration–exploitation trade-off is Thompson sampling (Thompson, 1933), which recently gained popularity in various fields due to its simple implementation and good efficiency (Agrawal & Goyal, 2012; Chapelle & Li, 2011). The broad range of applications include the exploration of chemical design spaces (Hernández-Lobato et al., 2017), mobile health applications (Tomkins

et al., 2021) or real-time content selection for web pages (Hill et al., 2017). In this paper, we present a model-based screening strategy to obtain the KPIs and apply probability-based decision making. We make use of a Bayesian process model that accounts for various experimental effects such as pipetting errors or batch effects between different cultivations. The probability distributions for the KPIs are the basis for Thompson sampling, which we use to suggest replicates to be cultivated in sequential batch cultivation rather than in the same batch cultivation. Together with the aforementioned automation workflow, this study presents an efficient screening of signal peptides for secretion of two PETases by *C. glutamicum* and demonstrates how the interaction of experiment and model in a Design-Build-Test-Learn (DBTL) (Carbonell et al., 2018; Pouvreau et al., 2018) approach can enhance early bioprocess development. This versatile approach can be universally applied to other secretory target proteins of interest and signal peptide libraries of larger sizes from various species.

2 Methods

2.1 Cultivation media and strains

C. glutamicum ATCC 13032 (Kinoshita et al., 1957) was cultivated at 30 °C in CGXII (Unthan et al., 2014) or brain heart infusion (BHI) medium. Cultivation in flasks was done in baffled flasks with a filling volume of 0.1x flask volume and a shaking diameter of 25 mm. For cultivation on plates, 10 g L⁻¹ agar were added to BHI medium with additional 91 g L⁻¹ D-sorbitol. Media were supplemented with 30 µg mL⁻¹ kanamycin. *E. coli* strains DH5α and TOP10 (both Thermo Fisher Scientific, USA) were used for DNA cloning and cultivated in lysogeny broth (LB) with Miller's modifications (Miller, 1972) and 50 µg mL⁻¹ kanamycin at 37 °C. Solid LB was prepared with additional 15 g L⁻¹ agar-agar.

2.2 Preparation of PETase secretion strains

C. glutamicum strains with pCMEx8-based secretion of PE-H mutant Y250S or LCC mutant ICCG mediated by *B. subtilis* signal peptides were prepared as described elsewhere (Müller et al., 2022). All plasmids used in this study are listed in the supplementary Table S1. Briefly, the signal peptide sequence of *B. subtilis yncM* in pCMEx8 was exchanged by cassette mutagenesis (Wells et al., 1985). Oligonucleotides were purchased from Eurofins (Germany, supplementary Table S2),

hybridized and ligated with NdeI/EcoRI-digested pCME_x8 to generate plasmids pCME_x8-[SP₂] with SP₂ = 10 different *B. subtilis* signal peptide sequences. Synthetic PETase genes *lcc*^{CCG} and *pe-h*^{Y250S} were provided by Synbio Technologies (USA) in pUC57-based plasmids and cloned into plasmids pCME_x8-[SP₁] (Müller et al., 2022) and pCME_x8-[SP₂] by Golden Gate assembly. After sequence verification by Eurofins (Germany), *C. glutamicum* ATCC 13032 was transformed by electroporation as previously described (van der Rest et al., 1999).

2.3 Determination of cell density

The optical density (OD) was measured at 600 nm. 0.9% (w/v) NaCl solution was used as a blank and for sample dilution to fit OD 0.1–0.3 in the linear range. For cell dry weight determination, weighed 1.5 mL reaction tubes were dried at 90 °C for 24 h and put into a desiccator. 1.5 mL cultivation samples were transferred into these reaction tubes and centrifuged at 21 500 × *g* and 4 °C for 10 min. The supernatant was discarded, cells were washed with 0.9% (w/v) NaCl and dried at 90 °C for 24 h before weight determination.

2.4 Strain maintenance

Strain master cell banks were prepared in BHI medium inoculated from a single transformant. After overnight incubation at 30 °C and 250 rpm, 750 µL culture were mixed with 750 µL 100% (w/v) glycerol in a cryogenic vial to a final glycerol concentration of 50% (w/v). For working cell banks, 3.5 mL CGXII per well of a Riplat[®] SW 10 mL 24 Wells plate (Ritter, Germany) were inoculated with 100 µL of a respective master cell bank and incubated overnight at 30 °C and 900 rpm. After centrifugation for 5 min at 2 000 × *g*, the supernatant was discarded and cells were washed with 1.5 mL fresh CGXII. Cells were resuspended in 3.5 mL fresh CGXII medium and incubated for 5 h at 30 °C and 900 rpm. 100 µL culture was mixed with 100 µL 50% (w/v) glycerol in a 96-well microtiter plate (MTP). The MTP was sealed with aluminium foil and stored at –80 °C. For bioreactor cultivations, additional working cell banks were prepared in flasks. 50 mL CGXII were inoculated with 250 µL of a master cell bank and incubated for around 15 h at 250–300 rpm at 30 °C with online biomass monitoring (SFR vario, PreSense Precision Sensing, Germany). Cells were harvested in the late exponential phase by centrifuging with 9 283 × *g* for 5 min. Sedimented cells were resuspended to an OD 60 with 0.9% (w/v) NaCl and 2x diluted with 50% (w/v) glycerol. 1 mL aliquots were stored in

cryogenic vials at -80°C .

2.5 High-throughput PETase secretion screening

High-throughput PETase secretion screenings were conducted using a Tecan Freedom EVO[®] robotic platform with washable fixed tips made of stainless steel and coated with polytetrafluoroethylene (PTFE). The robotic platform includes an integrated BioLector[®] Pro microcultivation device (Beckman Coulter), centrifuge (Rotanta 460 Robotic, Hettich), cooled sample storage (cooling carrier connected to a Microcool MC 600, Lauda) and microplate reader (Infinite[®] M Nano, Tecan). A 96-well MTP with cryo-conserved cultures and CGXII medium in a trough were placed on deck of the robotic platform. For pre-cultures, 760 μL CGXII was transferred to 10–24 wells of a FlowerPlate[®] with pH and DO optodes covered with a gas-permeable sealing foil with perforated silicone layer for automation (Beckman Coulter). 40 μL of each cryo-conserved culture was used to inoculate one of the pre-culture wells. Remaining cryo culture wells in the MTP not used for pre-culture were discarded.

Standard cultivation conditions were 30°C , 1 400 rpm and $\geq 85\%$ relative humidity with measurement of backscatter, pH and DO every 13 min. Data from BioLector online measurements was parsed during the cultivation using the `bletl` package (Osthege et al., 2022a, 2022b). For full automation of the process, backscatter-triggered inoculation and induction as well as time-triggered sampling are managed by worklists written with the `robotools` package (Osthege & Helleckes, 2021) and executed by a device control system developed by M. Osthege and J. Hemmerich (Forschungszentrum Jülich GmbH, in preparation).

As soon as a pre-culture exceeded a certain device-dependent backscatter threshold in the exponential phase, wells for one or three main cultures were filled with 780 μL CGXII and inoculated with 20 μL of the respective pre-culture. Target protein expression in the main cultures was induced by addition of isopropyl- β -D-thiogalactopyranoside (IPTG) to a final concentration of 500 μM triggered by a device-dependent backscatter signal in the early exponential phase. Cells were harvested 4 h after induction by centrifugation for 6 min at $3\,756 \times g$ and 4°C . Supernatants were stored in a 1 mL deep well plate on a cooling carrier until all cultivations were finished for subsequent cutinase activity assay. A scheme for the screening workflow with 24 pre-cultures and 24 main cultures is depicted in Fig 1.

For the second round of LCC screening, in which only two different signal peptide variants were chosen by the algorithm described in Section 2.10, the design was

changed to the workflow described by Müller et al. (2022) in order to require less cryo cultures and increase the number of main cultures. Here, only the twelve wells in the outer columns were used for pre-culture cultivation. The remaining 36 wells were used for main culture cultivation in triplicates inoculated from respective pre-cultures.

2.6 Bioreactor cultivation

A pre-culture of 50 mL CGXII medium in a baffled flask was inoculated from a cryo-conserved *C. glutamicum* PETase secretion strain. Cells were incubated for 16 h at 30 °C and 300 rpm with online biomass monitoring (SFR vario, PreSense Precision Sensing, Germany) until the late exponential growth phase. After centrifugation at $9\,283 \times g$ for 5 min at 4 °C, cells were resuspended in 0.9% (w/v) NaCl. The main culture was carried out in four parallel 1.5 L DASGIP® bioreactors equipped with two Rushton-type impellers (6 blades, 1 cm height, 3 cm distance). Included DASGIP® modules were TC4SC4 for temperature and agitation control, PH4PO4 for control of DO and pH, MF4 for mass flow controlled gassing, MP8 for control of feed flow rates and GA4 exhaust analyzer. DO was measured with VisiFerm DO 225 optical probe and pH with 405-DPAS-SC-K8S electrodes. Deviating from the standard CGXII medium with 20 g L⁻¹ glucose, 3-(morpholin-4-yl)propane-1-sulfonic acid and urea were omitted in bioreactor CGXII medium and 50 µg mL⁻¹ kanamycin as well as an appropriate amount of Antifoam 204 (Sigma-Aldrich, USA) were added. 1 L CGXII in a bioreactor was inoculated to an OD of 0.3 from a respective pre-culture, and cells were incubated in batch mode at 30 °C. The DO was kept $\geq 40\%$ with a constant air flow rate $q_{in} = 1 \text{ vvm}$ by adjusting the agitation speed $n = 400\text{--}1\,500 \text{ rpm}$. The pH was adjusted to pH 7 with 18% (w/w) NH₄OH and 30% (w/w) H₃PO₄.

PETase secretion was induced around OD 1 by adding IPTG to a final concentration of 200 µM. If necessary, further sterile Antifoam 204 (Sigma-Aldrich, USA) was added. Samples for measuring OD, cell dry weight and activity assay were taken after inoculation as well as at six time points over the course of the fermentation (see supplementary information).

2.7 Cutinase activity assay

Activity of PETases in cultivation supernatant samples was determined spectrophotometrically by degradation of 4-nitrophenyl palmitate as a substrate analogue (Winkler & Stuckmann, 1979) as described by Müller et al. (2022). Briefly, 9 parts reaction buffer (2.3 g L^{-1} Na-desoxycholate, 1.1 g L^{-1} gum arabic in 50 mM potassium phosphate buffer, pH 8) were mixed with 1 part 3 g L^{-1} 4-nitrophenyl palmitate in 2-propanol. $200 \mu\text{L}$ were filled into MTP wells and pre-warmed to 37°C . Supernatant samples were appropriately diluted with 50 mM potassium phosphate buffer pH 8 (72x for BioLector samples and 12x for bioreactor samples). $40 \mu\text{L}$ diluted supernatant were pipetted into two wells filled with the reaction mix for technical duplicates. 4-nitrophenol formation was measured at 410 nm and 37°C for 40 min in a microplate reader.

$40 \mu\text{L}$ $0\text{--}2.3 \text{ mM}$ 4-nitrophenol were mixed with $200 \mu\text{L}$ reaction mix in triplicates (final concentration $0\text{--}0.38 \text{ mM}$) and absorption was measured to convert absorption into product concentration.

In the traditional data analysis, enzymatic activities in U mL^{-1} were calculated in relation to the assay volume with the absorption A_{410} in a.u., slope of the 4-nitrophenol standard m_{standard} in a.u. mM^{-1} and the unitless supernatant dilution factor DF (Eq 1). 95% confidence intervals were calculated with t values from replicates.

$$\text{EA} = \Delta A_{410} \cdot \frac{1}{m_{\text{standard}}} \cdot \text{DF} \quad (1)$$

2.8 Software

All analyses and plots presented in this study were performed with recent versions of Python 3.8, PyMC $\geq 4.0.0\text{b2}$ (Wiecki et al., 2022), ArviZ $\geq 0.11.4$ (Kumar et al., 2019), matplotlib ≥ 3.5 (Hunter, 2007), NumPy ≥ 1.20 (Harris et al., 2020), pandas ≥ 1.3 (McKinney et al., 2010; Reback et al., 2021), SciPy ≥ 1.7 (Virtanen et al., 2020) and related packages. For calibration models, the in-house developed, publicly available calibr8 package was used with versions $\geq 6.2.1$ (L. M. Helleckes et al., 2022; Osthege & Helleckes, 2022). For parsing of BioLector data, the bletl package (Osthege et al., 2022a, 2022b) was applied. Photometric measurement were analysed using the in-house developed retl package (not published). The robotools Python package was used to facilitate multi-step liquid-handling instructions on the robotic platform (Osthege & Helleckes, 2021). For a full list of dependencies see the accompanying GitHub repository (L. Helleckes & Osthege, 2022).

2.9 Process model

With the term process model, we refer to a model describing the enzymatic assay and the experimental effects influencing it, rather than a description of the unit operations in cultivation and analytics. The process model constructed in this paper is a Bayesian hierarchical model build with the PyMC Python package. Accordingly, prior distributions were chosen for each parameter of the model. A graphical representation can be found in [Fig 2](#).

Starting in the lower left, the measured product absorbance in the cutinase assay is evaluated against the modeled concentration using a customized likelihood. For this, we used a calibration model that was fitted with the `calibr8` Python package (L. M. Helleckes et al., 2022), assuming a linear relationship between product absorbance and concentration and a Student-t-distributed measurement noise. A plot of the fitted calibration model can be found in the appendix.

The product concentration during the assay was assumed to follow a first order mass action law, such that

$$P_t = S_0 \cdot \left(1 - e^{(-k_{\text{assay}} \cdot t)}\right), \quad (2)$$

with P_t as the product concentration at time t , S_0 as initial substrate concentration and k_{assay} as the rate constant.

An additional absorbance offset was observed at the beginning of each measurement, which could not be explained with the offset obtained from the calibration model. It was therefore modeled by the parameter `absorbance_intercept`. While k_{assay} is the parameter that is observed in each reaction well in the MTP, the KPI of interest for the strain ranking is the actual rate k_{strain} of each variant. However, we found several biological and technical effects that influence this rate constant, e.g., an effect of the position in the assay MTP (`assay effect`), which is further discussed in [Section 3.1](#). Moreover, variance between batch runs, for example caused by small differences in viable cells in cryo cultures, as well as the pipetting error of robotic liquid handling are taken into account.

A mathematical notation of the model can be found in the supplementary information. Additionally, the code for the process model can be found on the accompanying GitHub repository.

Posterior probability distributions, according to Bayes theorem, are calculated using probability distributions for prior beliefs as well as the likelihood. In this work, they were obtained by Markov chain Monte Carlo sampling, using the No-U-Turn sampler (Hoffman, Gelman, et al., 2014) in PyMC. For a more detailed introduction on

Bayesian methods, we refer the reader to van de Schoot et al., 2021. Convergence checks and inspection of the traces were performed using ArviZ.

2.10 Thompson sampling for experimental design

As described in Section 2.9, the reaction kinetics of PETases in the cutinase activity assay are modeled by a first order mass action, where k_{strain} is the rate constant of each strain in this reaction. The model inherently assumes that the reaction rate is proportional to the amount of secreted enzyme, thus k was chosen as the KPI for a strain ranking. The posterior probabilities after each cultivation round were used as the basis for Thompson sampling. In this process, a batch of strain replicates for the following round was drawn by parallel Thompson sampling (Kandasamy et al., 2017) using the `sample_batch` function from the `pyrff` package (Osthege & Felton, 2020) and then randomly assigned to pre-culture wells in the FlowerPlate®. The obtained process data was then used to re-run the process model to obtain posterior probabilities of KPIs for the next round and so on.

3 Results and Discussion

3.1 Model building and experimental learning

An essential part of the screening workflow is the Bayesian process model described in Section 2.9. Before applying the process model to the LCC and PE-H secretion strain libraries, the influence of different experimental effects was investigated and an iterative cycle of model building and experimental improvements was performed. In the following, two findings of this workflow improvement are highlighted: first, the choice of the reaction kinetics is explained, second, a bias in the detected activities caused by the position of samples in the assay MTP is detailed.

In previous studies (Hemmerich et al., 2018; Müller et al., 2022), the slope of absorption in the cutinase activity assay has been used to calculate enzymatic activities. Therefore, a process model assuming linear reaction kinetics was constructed first (Fig 3a and c). Fig 3a shows the trajectory of absorbance value over the incubation time of 40 min for the LCC combined with LipB as a signal peptide, a variant with a comparably high activity (see Fig 8). After 35 min assay reaction time, the model significantly deviates from the measurements, which is also evident from the lack-of-fit indicated in the residual plot (Fig 3a and c). The trajectory indicates that the lower substrate concentration seems to limit the reaction rate towards the end

of measurement. Therefore, the kinetics was changed to a first order mass action law (Fig 3b and d). This exponential trajectory describes the kinetics with a lower lack-of-fit (Fig 3d). The first order kinetics were thus chosen in the final process model.

As part of model building, the influence of pipetting errors, batch effects and positional effects was investigated within the different MTPs of the automated screening workflow (Section 2.5). Fig 4 shows one finding, namely a positional effect, where all 8 wells in the first column of the 96-well MTP show a systematically lower activity of the PETases (Section 2.9). The plot includes the median (white dot) as well as intervals of 94% probability (whiskers) for the parameter assay effect in all 12 columns of the assay MTP. A value of 1 indicates that the respective column has no influence on the activity, values smaller and greater than 1 correspond to lower and higher activities caused by the position in the MTP. The probability distributions are deduced from replicate data of the same signal peptide which lie in different columns. Fig 4a shows the assay effect before experimental optimization. Here, it can be seen that wells in the first column show systematically lower activities with a median of around 0.85. However, the probability distribution interval of the first column is similar to all other columns, indicating that all wells of this column are affected in the same manner. With this feedback from the model, the experimental workflow of the cutinase activity assay was re-examined.

The robotic liquid handler uses fixed tips, which distribute the substrate solution column-wise. The substrate solution dispense step of the last column is followed by a washing step with water to clean the needles and to prevent carry-over of substrate. However, dispense of the substrate in the first column was done with needles that were not conditioned with the organic substrate solution. Since the pipettes were not wetted initially, the first column contained slightly less substrate. Wetting of the PTFE coating of the stainless steel tips with the organic substrate 4-nitrophenyl palmitate diminished the positional effect of the first column. The experimental procedure was thus changed to include a step of tip wetting before the substrate is distributed into the assay MTP. The improved result can be seen in Fig 4b.

After optimization, the positional effect of the first column was resolved and the posterior probabilities of the parameter assay effect are now similar for all columns. The prior for the assay effect is $f_{\text{assay effect}} \sim \text{LogNormal}(\mu = 0, \sigma = 0.1)$, which was chosen to allow for fluctuation of the activity around 20%. The highest density interval containing 94% of the prior probability mass is approximately [0.83, 1.21]. Overall, the distributions for all columns fluctuate in a similar range, with the me-

dian close to 1. This shows that the remaining certainty in the parameter assay effect is now reflecting random noise, rather than the systematic bias that was previously seen due to the positional effect. This shows that the assay effect was strongly reduced by the improvements of the pipetting operation and it can be neglected in the process model for future experiments.

To conclude, the examples show that the Bayesian process parameters are easy to interpret, since they mimic experimental errors. The width of their probability distributions can give an insight on how well the respective effect is characterized by the observed data. The analysis can also point out experimental sources of error and targets for workflow improvements, as it was demonstrated for the parameter assay effect. It was thus shown how the process model can guide experimental developments in an iterative cycle, where experimental improvements can simplify the required process model. An additional influential factor, namely a batch effect between different cultivation rounds, is discussed in section [Section 3.3](#).

3.2 Screening of PE-H

After the successful strain construction of the *C. glutamicum* variants secreting the PETases PE-H mutant Y250S and LCC mutant ICCG mediated by 24 different *B. subtilis* signal peptides, secretion performance was examined. It has to be noted here that enzymatic activities and reaction kinetics are determined as 4-nitrophenyl palmitate hydrolytic activities rather than PET degradation. Nevertheless, the degradation of 4-nitrophenyl palmitate is a valid measure to compare the secretion performance between different signal peptides for the secretion of the same enzyme. However, secretion performance cannot be compared in absolute values regarding PET hydrolysis. This is due to the structural differences of the LCC and the PE-H (Bollinger et al., [2020](#); Sulaiman et al., [2014](#)), which is why they can presumably convert the 4-nitrophenyl palmitate substrate to different extents. Moreover, for method development, which is the actual focus of this work, it is helpful to use an already established and automated activity assay for the detection of secreted target proteins.

Firstly, the process model was applied to the strain library of 24 signal peptides combined with the PE-H mutant Y250S. In order to facilitate the process of model building and assess model parameters such as the batch effect, the first round of screening consisted of two batch cultivations as described in [Section 2.5](#). In each batch cultivation, all 24 variants were cultivated, resulting in 24 main cultures which were automatically inoculated from the respective 24 pre-cultures, induced

with IPTG and harvested. The supernatant of each culture was subjected to the cutinase activity assay in duplicates ([Section 2.7](#)). Accordingly, the two batch cultivations led to four replicates for activity measurements per variant, which were simultaneously analyzed with the process model. In the following, the combined analysis of these two batch cultivations is always referred to as round 1.

As a KPI for finding the most suitable signal peptide for PE-H secretion, the rate constant k of the first order reaction kinetics ([Section 2.9](#)) was chosen. The more active enzyme is present in the supernatant, the higher the rate constant k of the variant. The resulting probability of the KPI for round 1 is depicted in [Fig 5a](#).

The plot reveals that more than half of the signal peptides lead to a low rate constant, indicating that little active enzyme was present in the supernatant. This can be the consequence of either low overall secretion or misfolding and thus inactive enzyme. Strikingly, four technical replicates are enough to distinguish these unpromising candidates from the remaining top 6 *B. subtilis* signal peptides, namely YpjP, YoaA, Pel, LipA, YoaW and Mpr. Biological as well as technical errors such as the pipetting, which are taken into account by the model, cause uncertainty in the estimation, which is reflected by the broad distributions for k for the best signal peptides. For example, the 94% probability range (highest density interval) of the rate constant k for variant YpjP lies between $[0.53, 1.09] \frac{1}{\text{min}}$. The distributions shown here are the basis for the Thompson sampling algorithm to draw variants for the next cultivation round. To understand this process, the probability for each variant to be the best signal peptide so far was calculated as described in [Section 2.10](#). The results are shown in [Fig 6a](#).

After the first round of two biological replicates per variant with four technical replicates of the assay, only four signal peptides have a probability significantly greater than zero to be the best performing one. This demonstrates the exploitation part of Thompson sampling. Since the process model can clearly distinguish low performing variants from the top ones, they have no chance to be chosen for the next rounds. However, exploration is still necessary to distinguish the top four variants. Within these, YpjP has the highest probability of being the best signal peptide at around 46%. It is followed by YoaA with around 30%, Pel with around 22% and LipA with less than 2%. For comparison, using *C. glutamicum* and the same plasmid expression system for secretion of a heterologous cutinase resulted in very poor secretion performance for the *B. subtilis* signal peptides from Pel and YpjP ([Müller et al., 2022](#)). These results confirm that the selection of an appropriate signal peptide is heavily dependent on the target protein.

As indicated by the text in subplot a, the choice for the next round reflects the

probabilities of a signal peptide being the best, while small deviations in the ratio are caused by the small batch size of only 24 main culture wells. The whole screening workflow was conducted a second time with the respective replicates. Fig 6b shows the results after the second screening round. With overall 28 replicates from three batch cultivations, YpjP shows the highest probability of around 80% to be the best signal peptide, while YolA, Pel, LipA and Mpr show significantly lower probabilities smaller than 10%. The resulting probability distributions for the KPIs can be seen in Figure Fig 6b. For comparison, in a strategy with equal numbers of replicates per signal peptide, it would have taken 14 rounds of cultivation and thus more than four times longer to obtain the same certainty about the KPI for the most suitable signal peptide YpjP for PE-H secretion. This shows the efficiency of combined process model and Thompson sampling algorithm.

3.3 Screening of LCC

For signal peptide screening for secretion of the LCC mutant ICCG, the same strategy was used as for the successful screening with the secretory PE-H target protein. The first round comprised four technical replicates per variant accordingly, while the second was composed of suggestions from Thompson sampling. The resulting rankings after each round concerning the rate constant k are shown in Fig 7.

Again, compared to the heterologous secretion of the *F. solani* f. sp. *pisi* cutinase (Müller et al., 2022) or to the PE-H, two other signal peptide sequences, namely those of LipA and LipB, led to the highest extracellular LCC activities. All other signal peptides showed significantly less activity in the enzyme assay, more precisely less than half the rate constant. These results highlight the need to determine an appropriate signal peptide sequence for each target protein and thus the potential for combining automation and process models with Thompson sampling for accelerated screening. Moreover, it can be seen for round 1 (Fig 7a) that the activities after secretion mediated with signal peptides LipA and LipB were very similar when taking measurement uncertainties into account, where the median (white dot) of LipB is slightly higher.

For round 2 (Fig 7b), Thompson sampling selected to an equal amount of replicates accordingly. With these data, the variants can be separated to a higher extend, where LipA shows a higher median in the probability distribution for k . Moreover, the higher number of replicates lead to narrower intervals of 95% probability (whiskers) compared to round 1. Although the variants other than LipA and LipB were not measured in round 2, their distributions are wider than before. This

is caused by the the parameter batch effect of the process model (Section 2.9), which assumes an experimental error between different biological replicates in different rounds. Between round 1 and round 2, it could be observed that the activities increased for both LipA and LipB (compare Fig 10 in section Section 3.5) due to an apparent batch effect. After only one round, no such effect could be assumed and the width of distributions is thus mainly influenced by deviation between technical replicates in the assay. However, with the information gained from LipA and LipB in both rounds, the process model can now account for the batch effect. Since the other variants were only measured in round 1, but uncertainty is added by the batch effect, the posterior distributions in Fig 7b are wider. The batch effect will be further discussed in section Section 3.5.

Taking the probability distributions for k from Fig 7, the question which signal peptide has the highest probability to be the best variant can be answered (Fig 8).

As for the ranking, Fig 8a illustrates that LipA and LipB were very close after round 1, with LipB having a slightly higher probability to be advantageous concerning secretion. In Thompson sampling, the candidates for the next round are drawn randomly according to their probability of being optimal based on the available data. Here, probabilities of LipA and LipB are close to 50%, which results in 18 main cultures of each variant being suggested for round 2.

Fig 8b shows the results after analysis of all 22 technical replicates of LipA and LipB after two rounds. Although the measurements were very similar for both variants (see classical statistical analysis in Section 3.5), the pairwise comparison of posterior samples results in a probability of around 75% that LipA is the best signal peptide. This shows the advantages of the process model, as no distinction between LipA and LipB could be seen in the classical statistical analysis. Importantly, the previously discussed positional effects and the batch effect between round 1 and 2 are taken into account, assuring that the rate constant k of the secreted enzyme is the dominant factor in the ranking. To investigate whether the screening is representative for pre-selection of variants, both LipA and LipB, as well as the third-best variant YoaW, were chosen for a scale-up application.

3.4 Comparison with batch fermentation in liter-scale bioreactors

In order to examine the scalability of the microcultivation process and to validate the results, *C. glutamicum* was cultivated in laboratory-scaled stirred-tank reactors with 1 L working volume. LCC secretion mediated by the best *B. subtilis* signal peptides

from microcultivation in the BioLector, i.e., LipA, LipB and YoaW, were compared with laboratory-scale cultivation data depicted in the supplementary information (Figs S1 and S2). Maximum oxygen transfer rates of almost $100 \text{ mmol L}^{-1} \text{ h}^{-1}$ were reached after approximately 12 h and the final cell dry weights were around $9.1\text{--}9.6 \text{ g L}^{-1}$. The probability distributions of the rate constant k between the microliter- and liter-scale are compared in Fig 9.

The laboratory bioreactor data (red) show a similar ranking for the LipA and LipB signal peptides with YoaW approximately 40% behind. In comparison to the first BioLector run (blue), the laboratory-scale bioreactor data shows a very similar performance ranking. Thus, protein production with *C. glutamicum* could be transferred from the shaken cultivation in the BioLector in microliter-scale to the 1 L stirred tank reactor in the liter-scale, as demonstrated elsewhere for cutinase secretion by *C. glutamicum* (Rohe et al., 2012). However, uncertainties are higher for LipA and LipB in the liter-scale bioreactor despite the equal number of biological replicates ($n = 2$). The higher uncertainty is likely to be caused by the different scheme of sampling. While all BioLector experiments were sampled 4 hours after induction, which corresponds to the early stationary phase, the fermentation was sampled at six different time points before and after induction. Due to different growth behaviors at the two scales, samples cannot be compared at the exact same process time. However, it is possible to take samples in identical growth phases. Accordingly, all available time points in the stationary phase were used for analysis of liter-scale bioreactor data. In case of LipA and LipB, these correspond to 22, 25 and 26 h process time (see supplementary information). The combination of three different sampling points with slightly different activities is likely to account for the higher uncertainty in the estimated rate constant k of LipA and LipB.

For the YoaW signal peptide, which was measured with four biological replicates in the bioreactor, the uncertainties are more similar to those of BioLector replicates. Moreover, only one time point lied within the stationary phase, which was after 23.5 hours process time. This also suggests that the different time points have an influence on the uncertainty. In the future, a time-dependent analysis for the activity could be conducted for both scales. However, the obtained results for the rate constant k are in good accordance for different scales. This demonstrate the advantage of the high-throughput approach, which is representing the larger scale well.

The probabilities in Fig 9 shown in green are the results of combining round 1 of microliter-scale cultivation and the liter-scale bioreactor data with BioLector round 2, where additional 18 biological replicates of LipA and LipB were mea-

sured. In contrast to the other probabilities, rate constants k for LipA and LipB can be better distinguished in the combined case. Moreover, a batch effect becomes evident, which can be detected from the higher overall median in the combined case. This is caused by overall higher activities in BioLector round 2, which are further discussed later in this section.

Overall, the scale-up shows that a large number of replicates is necessary to see differences of strain variants with a very similar secretion performance. This is often not feasible in laboratory-scale cultivations due to the higher costs and efforts. For this purpose, microliter-scale cultivations are beneficial as they allow for a large number of replicates and thus a better resolution of very similar variants.

3.5 Comparison to linear regression analysis

As a final validation of the method, a classical statistical analysis by linear regression of the absorbance measurements was conducted as described in [Section 2.7 \(Fig 10\)](#). After the first round, LipA (dark blue) and LipB (light blue) cannot be distinguished, which can be seen by the overlapping 95% confidence intervals between the variants. While the activities are still similar between the variants in the second round, the higher number of replicates leads to smaller confidence intervals and indicates that LipA is the better signal peptide. However, the large batch effect between round 1 and round 2 for both variants makes it difficult to combine the results of both rounds in a purely statistical analysis. A main challenge is that technical and biological error could not be separated if all data are pooled for the linear regression, leading to large confidence intervals that do not allow to distinguish the variants. This is important though to exclude that LipA is favored by positional or batch effect in the second round. Batch effects most likely result from the activity assay and not from the cultivation, since differences in cryo culture viability are compensated by backscatter-triggered individual inoculation of the main cultures and induction of target protein expression and secretion (Müller et al., 2022). In the activity assay, the reaction mix has a limited stability only (Hemmerich et al., 2018). Although directly prepared before each assay, the reaction mix could impact enzymatic 4-nitrophenyl palmitate degradation due to minor deviations in the composition and the poor solubility of the organic substrate. Here, the process model proves advantageous, since the uncertainty can be assigned to several experimental and biological effects and the data from different rounds can inform the probability of both, batch effects and pipetting errors. Using the process model we determined a probability of around 75% for LipA being the best signal peptide (see [Fig 8](#)). Overall, this demonstrates

how the approach sampling can lead to more insight and faster screening and is thus promising for large libraries.

4 Conclusion

To our knowledge, Sec-dependent secretion of the heterologous PETases LCC mutant ICCG and PE-H mutant Y250S could be shown for the first time using *C. glutamicum* as a secretion host. Utilizing our automated workflows for high-throughput screening and the accompanying modeling, the best suitable out of 24 *B. subtilis* Sec-type signal peptides was identified within two rounds of screening only. Even strain variants that were indistinguishable with classical methods due to batch effects could be resolved. The successful transfer from shaken cultivation in the BioLector to 1 L stirred tank reactors demonstrates the scalability of the secretion screening results.

Combined with the automated workflows for high-throughput cloning, this paves the way for screening of hundreds of strains or different process conditions in the DBTL cycle. Especially for application examples with much increased design space, where screening of all variants in multiple replicates becomes infeasible due to restrictions of resources in terms of both time and cost, model-based decision making as presented in this study is a valuable addition to the experimental high-throughput platforms.

In the future, the process model could be further extended by process conditions such as temperature. By solving these complex optimization problems such as strain and process conditions, our modeling approach can become an even more powerful tool to tackle the exploration–exploitation dilemma even in expanded design spaces in the future.

Author's contributions

LH and CM wrote the manuscript. *C. glutamicum* PETase secretion strains were prepared by CM, TG and VW. LH, CM, TG and VW contributed to the automation of the screening workflows and TG screened for PETase secretion in microliter-scale. MM did cultivations in laboratory-scale bioreactors and measured the PETase activities in the respective samples. LH build the process model with contributions from MOs. LH analyzed data and implemented Thompson sampling for experimental design. MOI and WW contributed to the study design, review and editing. MOI was responsible for funding acquisition, project administration and supervision. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Acknowledgements

The authors thank the CLIB-Competence Center Biotechnology (CKB) funded by the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF), the Microbial Bioprocess Lab (MiBioLab), part of the Enabling Spaces Program "Helmholtz Innovation Labs" as well as the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation) for financial support.

Data availability

The data that support the findings of this study are provided in the article or the supplementary information.

Funding

This study was funded by the European Regional Development Fund (grant 34.EFRE-0300097, CLIB-Kompetenzzentrum Biotechnologie [CKB]) and "Microbial Bioprocess Lab – A Helmholtz Innovation Lab", part of the Enabling Spaces Program "Helmholtz Innovation Labs" of the [German Helmholtz Association](#). Open access publication was funded by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation) – 491111487.

Conflict of interest

All authors declare that they have no commercial or financial conflict of interest.

Ethics approval

This article does not contain studies with human participants or animals performed by any of the authors.

Patient consent

Not applicable.

Permission to reproduce material from other sources

Not applicable.

Clinical trial registration

Not applicable.

References

- Agrawal, S., & Goyal, N. (2012). Analysis of Thompson Sampling for the Multi-armed Bandit Problem. *Conference on learning theory*, 39–1.
- Bollinger, A., Thies, S., Knieps-Grünhagen, E., Gertzen, C., Kobus, S., Höppner, A., Ferrer, M., Gohlke, H., Smits, S. H. J., & Jaeger, K.-E. (2020). A novel polyester hydrolase from the marine bacterium *Pseudomonas aestusnigri* – structural and functional insights. *Front Microbiol*, 11. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fmicb.2020.00114>
- Brockmeier, U., Caspers, M., Freudl, R., Jockwer, A., Noll, T., & Eggert, T. (2006). Systematic screening of all signal peptides from *Bacillus subtilis*: A powerful strategy in optimizing heterologous protein secretion in gram-positive bacteria. *J Mol Biol*, 362(3), 393–402. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmb.2006.07.034>
- Carbonell, P., Jervis, A. J., Robinson, C. J., Yan, C., Dunstan, M., Swainston, N., Vinaixa, M., Hollywood, K. A., Currin, A., Rattray, N. J., et al. (2018). An automated Design-Build-Test-Learn pipeline for enhanced microbial production of fine chemicals. *Communications biology*, 1(1), 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s42003-018-0076-9>
- Chapelle, O., & Li, L. (2011). An Empirical Evaluation of Thompson Sampling. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 24.

- Degering, C., Eggert, T., Puls, M., Bongaerts, J., Evers, S., Maurer, K.-H., & Jaeger, K.-E. (2010). Optimization of protease secretion in *Bacillus subtilis* and *Bacillus licheniformis* by screening of homologous and heterologous signal peptides. *Appl Environ Microbiol*, 76(19), 6370–6376. <https://doi.org/10.1128/aem.01146-10>
- Freudl, R. (2017). Beyond amino acids: Use of the *Corynebacterium glutamicum* cell factory for the secretion of heterologous proteins. *J Biotechnol*, 258, 101–109. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbiotec.2017.02.023>
- Harris, C. R., Millman, K. J., Van Der Walt, S. J., Gommers, R., Virtanen, P., Cournapeau, D., Wieser, E., Taylor, J., Berg, S., Smith, N. J., et al. (2020). Array programming with NumPy. *Nature*, 585(7825), 357–362. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-020-2649-2>
- Helleckes, L., & Osthege, M. (2022). *JubioTech/petase-ts-paper: 2022-07-26* (Version 2022-07-26). Zenodo. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.6908129>
- Helleckes, L. M., Osthege, M., Wiechert, W., von Lieres, E., & Oldiges, M. (2022). Bayesian calibration, process modeling and uncertainty quantification in biotechnology. *PLoS computational biology*, 18(3), e1009223. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pcbi.1009223>
- Hemmerich, J., Rohe, P., Kleine, B., Jurischka, S., Wiechert, W., Freudl, R., & Oldiges, M. (2016). Use of a Sec signal peptide library from *Bacillus subtilis* for the optimization of cutinase secretion in *Corynebacterium glutamicum*. *Microb Cell Fact*, 15(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12934-016-0604-6>
- Hemmerich, J., Tenhaef, N., Steffens, C., Kappelmann, J., Weiske, M., Reich, S. J., Wiechert, W., Oldiges, M., & Noack, S. (2018). Less sacrifice, more insight: Repeated low-volume sampling of microbioreactor cultivations enables accelerated deep phenotyping of microbial strain libraries. *Biotechnol J*, 14(9), 1800428. <https://doi.org/10.1002/biot.201800428>
- Hernández-Lobato, J. M., Requeima, J., Pyzer-Knapp, E. O., & Aspuru-Guzik, A. (2017). Parallel and distributed thompson sampling for large-scale accelerated exploration of chemical space. *International conference on machine learning*, 1470–1479.
- Hill, D. N., Nassif, H., Liu, Y., Iyer, A., & Vishwanathan, S. (2017). An efficient bandit algorithm for realtime multivariate optimization. *Proceedings of the 23rd ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, 1813–1821.

- Hoffman, M. D., Gelman, A., et al. (2014). The No-U-Turn sampler: Adaptively setting path lengths in hamiltonian monte carlo. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, 15(1), 1593–1623.
- Hunter, J. D. (2007). Matplotlib: A 2D graphics environment. *Computing in science & engineering*, 9(03), 90–95. <https://doi.org/10.1109/mcse.2007.55>
- Kandasamy, K., Dasarathy, G., Schneider, J., & Póczos, B. (2017). Multi-fidelity Bayesian optimisation with continuous approximations. *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 1799–1808.
- Kawai, F., Kawabata, T., & Oda, M. (2019). Current knowledge on enzymatic PET degradation and its possible application to waste stream management and other fields. *Appl Microbiol Biotechnol*, 103(11), 4253–4268. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00253-019-09717-y>
- Kinoshita, S., Udaka, S., & Shimono, M. (1957). Studies on the amino acid fermentation. *J Gen Appl Microbiol*, 3(3), 193–205. <https://doi.org/10.2323/jgam.3.193>
- Kumar, R., Carroll, C., Hartikainen, A., & Martìn, O. A. (2019). ArviZ a unified library for exploratory analysis of Bayesian models in Python. <https://doi.org/10.21105/joss.01143>
- Liu, X.-X., Li, Y., & Bai, Z.-H. (2021). *Corynebacterium glutamicum* as a robust microbial factory for production of value-added proteins and small molecules: Fundamentals and applications. In *Microbial Cell Factories Engineering for Production of Biomolecules* (pp. 235–263). Elsevier. <https://doi.org/10.1016/b978-0-12-821477-0.00006-4>
- McKinney, W., et al. (2010). Data structures for statistical computing in Python. *Proceedings of the 9th Python in Science Conference*, 445(1), 51–56. <https://doi.org/10.25080/majora-92bf1922-00a>
- Miller, J. (1972). *Experiments in molecular genetics*. Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory.
- Müller, C., Bakkes, P. J., Lenz, P., Waffenschmidt, V., Helleckes, L. M., Jaeger, K.-E., Wiechert, W., Knapp, A., Freudl, R., & Oldiges, M. (2022). Accelerated strain construction and characterization of *C. glutamicum* protein secretion by laboratory automation. *Applied Microbiology and Biotechnology*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00253-022-12017-7>
- Neubauer, P., Cruz, N., Glauche, F., Junne, S., Knepper, A., & Raven, M. (2013). Consistent development of bioprocesses from microliter cultures to the industrial scale. *Engineering in Life Sciences*, 13(3), 224–238. <https://doi.org/10.1002/elsc.201200021>

- Osthege, M., & Felton, K. (2020). *Michaelosthege/pyrff: V2.0.1* (Version v2.0.1). Zenodo. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.4317685>
- Osthege, M., & Helleckes, L. (2021). *Jubiotech/robotools: V1.3.0* (Version v1.3.0). Zenodo. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.5745938>
- Osthege, M., & Helleckes, L. (2022). *Jubiotech/calibr8: Toolbox for non-linear calibration modeling*. (Version v6.2.1). Zenodo. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.5961920>
- Osthege, M., Tenhaef, N., Helleckes, L., & Müller, C. (2022a). *Jubiotech/bletl: V1.1.0* (Version v1.1.0). Zenodo. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.6284777>
- Osthege, M., Tenhaef, N., Zyla, R., Müller, C., Hemmerich, J., Wiechert, W., Noack, S., & Oldiges, M. (2022b). Bletl - A Python package for integrating BioLector microcultivation devices in the Design-Build-Test-Learn cycle. *Eng Life Sci*. <https://doi.org/10.1002/elsc.202100108>
- PlasticsEurope. (2022). *Plastics – the Facts 2021: An analysis of european plastics production, demand and waste data*. Retrieved March 14, 2022, from <https://plasticseurope.org/knowledge-hub/plastics-the-facts-2021/>
- Pouvreau, B., Vanhercke, T., & Singh, S. (2018). From plant metabolic engineering to plant synthetic biology: The evolution of the design/build/test/learn cycle. *Plant Science*, 273, 3–12. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.plantsci.2018.03.035>
- Reback, J., jbrockmendel, McKinney, W., den Bossche, J. V., Augspurger, T., Cloud, P., Hawkins, S., gyoung, Roeschke, M., Sinhrks, Klein, A., Petersen, T., Tratner, J., She, C., Ayd, W., Hoefler, P., Naveh, S., Garcia, M., Schendel, J., . . . Seabold, S. (2021). *Pandas-dev/pandas: Pandas 1.3.4* (Version v1.3.4). Zenodo. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.5574486>
- Rohe, P., Venkanna, D., Kleine, B., Freudl, R., & Oldiges, M. (2012). An automated workflow for enhancing microbial bioprocess optimization on a novel microbioreactor platform. *Microb Cell Fact*, 11(1), 144. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1475-2859-11-144>
- Russo, D. J., Van Roy, B., Kazerouni, A., Osband, I., Wen, Z., et al. (2018). A tutorial on Thompson sampling. *Foundations and Trends® in Machine Learning*, 11(1), 1–96. <https://doi.org/10.1561/22000000070>
- Sulaiman, S., Yamato, S., Kanaya, E., Kim, J.-J., Koga, Y., Takano, K., & Kanaya, S. (2012). Isolation of a novel cutinase homolog with polyethylene terephthalate-degrading activity from leaf-branch compost by using a metagenomic ap-

- proach. *Appl Environ Microbiol*, 78(5), 1556–1562. <https://doi.org/10.1128/aem.06725-11>
- Sulaiman, S., You, D.-J., Kanaya, E., Koga, Y., & Kanaya, S. (2014). Crystal structure and thermodynamic and kinetic stability of metagenome-derived LC-cutinase. *Biochemistry*, 53(11), 1858–1869. <https://doi.org/10.1021/bi401561p>
- Taniguchi, I., Yoshida, S., Hiraga, K., Miyamoto, K., Kimura, Y., & Oda, K. (2019). Biodegradation of PET: Current status and application aspects. *ACS Catalysis*, 9(5), 4089–4105. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acscatal.8b05171>
- Thompson, W. R. (1933). On the likelihood that one unknown probability exceeds another in view of the evidence of two samples. *Biometrika*, 25(3-4), 285–294. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2332286>
- Tiso, T., Winter, B., Wei, R., Hee, J., de Witt, J., Wierckx, N., Quicker, P., Bornscheuer, U. T., Bardow, A., Nogales, J., & Blank, L. M. (2021). The metabolic potential of plastics as biotechnological carbon sources – Review and targets for the future. *Metab Eng*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ymben.2021.12.006>
- Tomkins, S., Liao, P., Klasnja, P., & Murphy, S. (2021). IntelligentPooling: Practical Thompson sampling for mHealth. *Machine learning*, 110(9), 2685–2727. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10994-021-05995-8>
- Tournier, V., Topham, C. M., Gilles, A., David, B., Folgoas, C., Moya-Leclair, E., Kamionka, E., Desrousseaux, M.-L., Texier, H., Gavalda, S., Cot, M., Guémard, E., Dalibey, M., Nomme, J., Cioci, G., Barbe, S., Chateau, M., André, I., Duquesne, S., & Marty, A. (2020). An engineered PET depolymerase to break down and recycle plastic bottles. *Nature*, 580(7802), 216–219. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-020-2149-4>
- Unthan, S., Grünberger, A., van Ooyen, J., Gätgens, J., Heinrich, J., Paczia, N., Wiechert, W., Kohlheyer, D., & Noack, S. (2014). Beyond growth rate 0.6: What drives *Corynebacterium glutamicum* to higher growth rates in defined medium. *Biotechnol Bioeng*, 111(2), 359–371. <https://doi.org/10.1002/bit.25103>
- van der Rest, M. E., Lange, C., & Molenaar, D. (1999). A heat shock following electroporation induces highly efficient transformation of *Corynebacterium glutamicum* with xenogeneic plasmid DNA. *Appl Microbiol Biotechnol*, 52(4), 541–545. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s002530051557>
- van de Schoot, R., Depaoli, S., King, R., Kramer, B., Märtens, K., Tadesse, M. G., Vannucci, M., Gelman, A., Veen, D., Willemsen, J., et al. (2021). Bayesian

- statistics and modelling. *Nature Reviews Methods Primers*, 1(1), 1–26. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s43586-020-00001-2>
- Vertès, A. A. (2013). Protein Secretion Systems of *Corynebacterium glutamicum*. In H. Yukawa & M. Inui (Eds.), *Corynebacterium glutamicum: Biology and biotechnology* (pp. 351–389). Springer Berlin Heidelberg. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-29857-8_13
- Vertommen, M. A. M. E., Nierstrasz, V. A., van der Veer, M., & Warmoeskerken, M. M. C. G. (2005). Enzymatic surface modification of poly(ethylene terephthalate). *J Biotechnol*, 120(4), 376–386. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbiotec.2005.06.015>
- Virtanen, P., Gommers, R., Oliphant, T. E., Haberland, M., Reddy, T., Cournapeau, D., Burovski, E., Peterson, P., Weckesser, W., Bright, J., et al. (2020). SciPy 1.0: Fundamental algorithms for scientific computing in Python. *Nature methods*, 17(3), 261–272. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41592-019-0686-2>
- Wells, J. A., Vasser, M., & Powers, D. B. (1985). Cassette mutagenesis: An efficient method for generation of multiple mutations at defined sites. *Gene*, 34(2-3), 315–323. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-1119\(85\)90140-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-1119(85)90140-4)
- Wiecki, T., Salvatier, J., Patil, A., Kochurov, M., Engels, B., Lao, J., Colin, Martin, O., Vieira, R., Willard, B. T., & Osthege, M. (2022). *Pymc-devs/pymc: v4.0.0b2* (Version v4.0.0b2). Zenodo. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.5850149>
- Winkler, U. K., & Stuckmann, M. (1979). Glycogen, hyaluronate, and some other polysaccharides greatly enhance the formation of exolipase by *Serratia marcescens*. *J Bacteriol*, 138, 663–670. <https://doi.org/10.1128/jb.138.3.663-670.1979>
- Yoshida, S., Hiraga, K., Takehana, T., Taniguchi, I., Yamaji, H., Maeda, Y., Toyohara, K., Miyamoto, K., Kimura, Y., & Oda, K. (2016). A bacterium that degrades and assimilates poly(ethylene terephthalate). *Science*, 351(6278), 1196–1199. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aad6359>

Figure legends

Figure 1: Screening workflow for 24 pre- and main cultures. Pre-cultures are inoculated from cryo cultures frozen in MTPs. Upon reaching a certain backscatter level, 20 μ L of the respective pre-culture was used to inoculate a main culture in the adjacent well. IPTG induction was triggered by backscatter in the early exponential phase. Harvesting of cells and centrifugation took place after 4 h. Samples were duplicated in a MTP for usage in the cutinase assay.

Figure 2: Graphical representation of the process model. The KPI used for ranking is the rate constant of each strain, k_{strain} (upper right).

Figure 3: Comparison of linear (a, c) and exponential (b, d) model for reaction kinetics in wells E04 and E10 of PE-H screening in round 1. Plots c and d show the residuals between data and model fit. The density bands visualize the distribution of predicted absorbance by the model.

Figure 4: Influence of position in assay MTP before (a) and after (b) experimental optimization of the assay. The probability distributions of the assay effect for each column is shown. An assay effect of 1 indicates that the position has no influence while smaller and higher values indicate a negative and positive influence on the activity, respectively.

Figure 5: Posterior probability distributions of rate constant k for each signal peptide variant of PE-H after round 1 (a) and round 2 (b).

Figure 6: Probability for each signal peptide to be the best variant for PE-H secretion after first and second round of screening.

Figure 7: Probability distributions of rate constant k for each signal peptide variant of LCC after round 1 (a) and round 2 (b).

Figure 8: Probability for each signal peptide to be the best variant for LCC secretion after first (a) and second (b) round of screening.

Figure 9: Comparison of LCC rankings after microliter-scale BioLector cultivation 1, fermentation in liter-scale bioreactors and the combined analysis of all BioLector and fermentation runs.

Figure 10: Results for LipA (dark blue) and LipB (light blue) for two rounds of screening with classical data analysis by linear regression. Error bars represent the 95% confidence intervals. The number of replicates refers to the technical replicates.