The emergence of adaptive laboratory evolution as an efficient tool for biological discovery and industrial biotechnology

Sandberg, Troy E.; Salazar, Michael J; Weng, Liam L; Palsson, Bernhard O; Feist, Adam M

Published in:
Metabolic Engineering

Link to article, DOI:
[10.1016/j.ymben.2019.08.004](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ymben.2019.08.004)

Publication date:
2019

Document Version
Peer reviewed version

[Link back to DTU Orbit](#)

Citation (APA):
Sandberg, T. E., Salazar, M. J., Weng, L. L., Palsson, B. O., & Feist, A. M. (2019). The emergence of adaptive laboratory evolution as an efficient tool for biological discovery and industrial biotechnology. *Metabolic Engineering*, 56, 1-16. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ymben.2019.08.004>

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Journal Pre-proof

The emergence of adaptive laboratory evolution as an efficient tool for biological discovery and industrial biotechnology

Troy E. Sandberg, Michael J. Salazar, Liam L. Weng, Bernhard O. Palsson, Adam M. Feist

PII: S1096-7176(19)30153-3

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ymben.2019.08.004>

Reference: YMBEN 1583

To appear in: *Metabolic Engineering*

Received Date: 10 April 2019

Revised Date: 1 August 2019

Accepted Date: 5 August 2019

Please cite this article as: Sandberg, T.E., Salazar, M.J., Weng, L.L., Palsson, B.O., Feist, A.M., The emergence of adaptive laboratory evolution as an efficient tool for biological discovery and industrial biotechnology, *Metabolic Engineering* (2019), doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ymben.2019.08.004>.

This is a PDF file of an article that has undergone enhancements after acceptance, such as the addition of a cover page and metadata, and formatting for readability, but it is not yet the definitive version of record. This version will undergo additional copyediting, typesetting and review before it is published in its final form, but we are providing this version to give early visibility of the article. Please note that, during the production process, errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

© 2019 Published by Elsevier Inc. on behalf of International Metabolic Engineering Society.

The emergence of adaptive laboratory evolution as an efficient tool for biological discovery and industrial biotechnology

Authors

Troy E. Sandberg¹, Michael J. Salazar¹, Liam L. Weng¹, Bernhard O. Palsson^{1,2}, Adam M. Feist^{1,2}

Affiliations:

1. Department of Bioengineering, University of California, San Diego, CA 92093, USA.
2. Novo Nordisk Foundation Center for Biosustainability, Technical University of Denmark, 2800 Lyngby, Denmark.

*Address correspondence to Adam M. Feist, afeist@ucsd.edu

Abstract

Harnessing the process of natural selection to obtain and understand new microbial phenotypes has become increasingly possible due to advances in culturing techniques, DNA sequencing, bioinformatics, and genetic engineering. Accordingly, Adaptive Laboratory Evolution (ALE) experiments represent a powerful approach to both investigate the evolutionary forces influencing strain phenotypes, performance, and stability, and to acquire production strains that contain beneficial mutations. In this review, we summarize and categorize the applications of ALE to various aspects of microbial physiology pertinent to industrial bioproduction by collecting case studies that highlight the multitude of ways in which evolution can facilitate the strain construction process. Further, we discuss principles that inform experimental design, complementary approaches such as computational modeling that help maximize utility, and the future of ALE as an efficient strain design and build tool driven by growing adoption and improvements in automation.

1 **1. Introduction**

2 Adaptive Laboratory Evolution, or ALE, experiments are an increasingly popular
3 technique for both improving microbial phenotypes and investigating biological
4 phenomena. ALE experiments can be traced back to reports of controlled evolution
5 studies in the earliest parts of the last century (Atwood et al., 1951; Bennett and
6 Hughes, 2009; Novick and Szilard, 1950) and are methodologically straightforward. In
7 their simplest form, experiments consist of prolonged culturing of cells in a chosen
8 environment to naturally select for those which acquire beneficial mutations. Given the
9 speed with which beneficial mutations can arise and fix, it is safe to say that many
10 biologists have 'adaptively evolved' their lab microbe of choice simply via the
11 unavoidable cycles of growth/plating/freezing involved in cell culturing. ALE works
12 robustly in microbes due to the ease with which large populations (10^8 - 10^{10} cells) of
13 rapidly dividing (20 min - <10 hour generation time) cells can be maintained; typical
14 mutation rates and genome sizes ensure extensive sampling of the adaptive space,
15 providing ample genetic diversity from which beneficial mutants will be naturally
16 enriched (Gresham and Dunham, 2014). Furthermore, the rising use of ALE has been
17 driven by the increasing availability of low cost, high throughput DNA sequencing
18 (Shendure et al., 2017), which, when paired with appropriate bioinformatics tools,
19 facilitates the increasingly critical mutation-identification step in the ALE process.
20 Similarly, genome engineering is a key complementary technology (R. Liu et al., 2015),
21 enabling the introduction of desired mutations into strains of interest for causal
22 determination or phenotypic alteration.

23 Evolution's reliance on natural selection to enrich for mutants with increased
24 fitness allows strain optimization to be performed without requiring *a priori* knowledge of
25 the genetic alterations necessary to effect such changes (Fig. 1). With perfect
26 information on an organism's genotype-to-phenotype mapping, desired traits could
27 simply be engineered in rather than evolved, but the incredible complexity of biological
28 systems renders our current knowledgebase insufficient to inform such rational design.
29 ALE thus serves as a powerful technique for strain construction, complementing or even
30 replacing rational design approaches which frequently induce stressed cellular states
31 that negatively impact phenotype. It is important to note that, despite some

interchangeable use of the terms, ALE is distinct from the field of ‘directed evolution’ (Packer and Liu, 2015; Arnold, 2018) – ALE finds whatever genome-wide mutations aid in the fitness of actively growing cultures, while directed evolution typically targets a particular gene for mutagenesis and then screens resultant variants for a phenotype of interest, often independent of fitness effects. However, both approaches fall under the category of ‘evolutionary engineering’ (Sauer, 2001; Shepelin et al., 2018) given that they generate new phenotypes via random mutation followed by selection or screening.

Key to the success of ALE experiments is the fitness advantage bestowed by adaptive mutations, allowing the mutant strains to outcompete their ancestor and dominate the population. However, it is important to note that “fitness” is not a well-defined term, but rather depends on the growth environment employed in the ALE experiment. For example, if batch cultures are kept propagating in constant exponential-phase and with excess nutrients, then fitness is essentially equivalent to growth rate (Sandberg et al., 2014). If, instead, exponential-phase growth is not constantly maintained, then fitness expands to include factors other than just growth rate, such as survival in stationary phase or decreased lag phase (Wiser and Lenski, 2015). This sensitive environmental dependence of fitness thus allows different traits to be selected for based on the specifics of the ALE procedure. In addition to batch culturing, the most popular alternative growth method is continuous culture (e.g, chemostats or turbidostats) (Gresham and Dunham, 2014). Other ALE culturing methods have also been implemented for specific purposes, but have yet to see widespread use (See Section 4).

Once a desired growth environment has been carefully selected, an ALE experiment enables the generation of a whole lineage of mutant strains with improved fitness relative to the ancestral (i.e., starting) strain (Fig. 1B) and sequencing enables causal mutation determination (Fig. 1C). Selective sweeps often occur as the result of single beneficial mutations overtaking the population, but cultures contain significant amounts of genetic diversity from which intrapopulation competition can lead to clonal interference (Maddamsetti et al., 2015). It is common practice to save frozen stocks of cells periodically over the course of an ALE experiment, allowing for characterization of both endpoint strains and evolutionary intermediates. Although midpoints are perforce

less fit than endpoints (and, in turn, might have less of a tradeoff for alternate phenotypic properties), including them in characterizations can greatly aid in understanding the adaptive steps taken by the evolving ancestor to eventually arrive at an endpoint. Furthermore, by virtue of their smaller number of genetic alterations, midpoints can allow for easier discrimination of the minimum mutational set necessary to enable a bioprocess-relevant beneficial phenotype. In concert with phenotypic characterization (or screening), which establishes the fitness improvements realized over the course of the ALE, genetic characterization allows determination of the causal mutations that enable improved fitness in the ALE environment. To aid in causal mutation identification, independent replicates starting from the same ancestral strain are often evolved simultaneously – genes or genetic regions found to mutate multiple times across the independent replicates are almost surely adaptive (Bailey et al., 2015). Such causal mutations can thus be distinguished from neutral or even deleterious hitchhiker mutations that might otherwise require categorization via site-directed mutagenesis and growth profiling of the resultant mutants. Causal establishment of ALE mutations via reintroduction to a starting strain was possible and demonstrated in the mid 2000s (Herring et al., 2006), and this process is now more efficient with high-throughput genome engineering (R. Liu et al., 2015).

This review will focus on the use of ALE in industrial biotechnology and related fields by compiling a comprehensive collection of relevant studies, analyzing their collective contributions, and highlighting several case studies of importance. An analysis of the most common methods used for ALE and the strains utilized will be included. The review will also touch on the emergence of automation and bioinformatics in the field and the impact this has had. Previous reviews relating to ALE have addressed the underlying genetic and metabolic basis for adaptive evolution experiments (Conrad et al., 2011; Gresham and Dunham, 2014; Long et al., 2015; Long and Antoniewicz, 2018; Remigi et al., 2019), the role of systems biology and *in silico* evolution (Hansen et al., 2017; Hindré et al., 2012; Papp et al., 2011), overall strategies to improve metabolic performance (Rabbers et al., 2015; Shepelin et al., 2018; Williams et al., 2016) and tolerance (Peabody et al., 2014), as well as other industrially relevant strain properties (Bachmann et al., 2015; Dragosits and Mattanovich, 2013; Portnoy et

al., 2011/8; Stella et al., 2019; Winkler and Kao, 2014; Fernández-Cabezón et al., 2019). This work provides an updated review and categorization of studies useful for metabolic engineering, as well as other selected foundational studies using laboratory evolution that are relevant to industrial biotechnology. As such, studies focused on the use of ALE in understanding antimicrobial resistance and other fundamental principles of evolutionary biology will not be covered here, as they have been reviewed elsewhere (Hughes and Andersson, 2015; Kawecki et al., 2012; Palmer and Kishony, 2013; Remigi et al., 2019).

Figure 1. Adaptive Laboratory Evolution

A) Microbes are cultured in a desired growth environment for an extended period of time, allowing natural selection to enrich for mutant strains (altered coloration) with improved fitness. This example depicts ALE via serial propagation of batch cultures. **B)** Evolved strains are characterized for phenotypic improvements relative to the ancestral strain, using whatever “fitness” metric is appropriate given the evolutionary environment. **C)** Evolved strains have their DNA sequenced to reveal the adaptive mutations

enabling phenotypic improvement. This example case depicts the fixation of two successive mutations targeting the same genetic region.

2. Applications of ALE

ALE has become a valuable tool in metabolic engineering for strain development and optimization by reliably facilitating microbial fitness improvements, via both predictable and non-intuitive mechanisms. However, specific mutations themselves are rarely predictable given current knowledge, and the adaptive strategies employed are often strain-specific. Supplemental Table 1 outlines a collection of ALE-based manuscripts that will serve as case studies and a source of content for this review. The different uses of ALE can be roughly categorized into five general application areas (Figure 2): 1) growth rate optimization, 2) increasing tolerance, 3) substrate utilization, 4) increasing product yield/titer, and 5) general discovery. Although these categories and applications are not mutually exclusive and ALE experiments often improve multiple strain properties simultaneously, it serves as a useful heuristic.

Several features are revealed through a categorization of ALE studies relevant to industrial biotechnology. First, the predominant use of ALE in this collection involves increasing an organism's ability to tolerate stresses (55 out of 159 included studies, 35%). Tolerance evolutionary engineering has significant industrial implications due to the toxicity that many biorenewables have on microorganisms' overall production capacity and viability (Lee and Kim, 2015; Qi et al., 2019; S. Wang et al., 2018). Most starting strains and production chassis have never had to deal with high amounts of desired product chemicals in their native environments, thus improved tolerance mechanisms are almost always beneficial for a successful strain design. Second, there is significant focus on metabolite production as well as nutrient uptake, with 15% and 20% of the studies, respectively. In metabolic engineering the two concepts are frequently linked, given that sufficient nutrient uptake is a prerequisite for any metabolite biosynthesis, but there are distinct cases where microorganisms are designed and/or evolved to either utilize poorly accessible substrates or produce non-native metabolites. Nutrient uptake is particularly relevant in industrial settings where poor uptake of desired feedstocks can lead to inefficient conversion and inhibition of metabolic

pathways (Görke and Stülke, 2008; Ingram and Doran, 1995). Lastly, the general discovery category contains studies covering an array of topics that are relevant to industrial biotechnology and can be investigated with ALE, including systems biology, evolutionary modeling, and genome dynamics (Barrick and Lenski, 2013). This general category could be significantly expanded via inclusion of purely computational or theoretical rather than empirical evolution studies, but that is beyond the scope of this review.

Each category will be individually addressed in the following sections to outline a general summary of their applications, highlight case studies useful for demonstration, and summarize the lessons learned from each collection of studies.

Figure 2: A Categorization of ALE Studies

A diagram of different categories of use for laboratory evolution experiments, detailing the percent makeup of studies examined (159 total). 'Growth rate optimization' illustrates fitness development over the course of an ALE, with noticeable fitness jumps. 'Increase tolerance' illustrates an experimental schematic of an initially mixed population acquiring beneficial mutations (red cells) that promote cell survival in a constantly increasing external stress environment (e.g., pH, antibiotics, temperature, etc). 'Substrate utilization' and 'Increase Product Yield/titer' illustrate evolutionary pathways enabled via ALE that enhance the organism's ability to make use of alternative nutrient sources (colored circles), and to increase production of metabolites of interest (colored squares), respectively. Lastly, 'General Discovery' encompasses studies that examined ALEs at a genetic or systems level in greater detail.

2.1 Growth Rate Optimization

While "fitness" is often a complex trait with many contributing factors, growth rate ($\ln(2)/\text{doubling time}$) is generally the most important fitness determinant in ALE experiments (Vasi et al., 1994). Indeed, although the other ALE use categories are more specialized, the enrichment for adaptive mutants would not be possible without a growth advantage relative to the starting strain, regardless of the specifics of the environment. A key reason for the use of microbes in biotech and research is their short generation time, and ALE allows for rapid improvement of this desirable trait. ALE has been applied to optimize the growth rate of various industrially relevant microbial species (Hong et al., 2011; LaCroix et al., 2014; Pfeifer et al., 2017; Yu et al., 2013), to ameliorate growth defects in engineered strains (Aguilar et al., 2018; Carroll and Marx, 2013; Radek et al., 2017; Thyer et al., 2018; Zelle et al., 2011), or to study how and why growth rate changes over the course of evolution (Barrick et al., 2009; Ferea et al., 1999; Lenski et al., 2015, 1998, 1991; Lenski and Travisano, 1994; Weikert et al., 1997; Wong and Liao, 2009).

ALE can significantly increase a strain's growth rate, even in frequently used culturing environments for which one might expect growth to already be close to optimal. For example, a simple ~1 month ALE experiment in glucose minimal medium resulted in growth rate improvements of up to 60% for the commonly used lab strain and engineering chassis *E. coli* K-12 MG1655 (LaCroix et al., 2014). This rapid growth

phenotype was achieved predominantly through mutations to only three genetic regions, suggesting their easy use as allelic knock-ins to improve growth on glucose of production strains derived from MG1655, as has been demonstrated in the case of an RNA polymerase mutation (Rugbjerg et al., 2018). Such causal mutations can even have cross-phylum fitness implications – evolution on glucose minimal media led to mutations in pyruvate kinase and the CorA magnesium transporter in both *C. glutamicum* (Pfeifer et al., 2017) and MG1655. Moreover, the metabolic flux state of the MG1655 evolved strains was found to be remarkably unperturbed - rather than changing relative pathway usage, faster growth was enabled by proportional increases to all intracellular rates of central carbon metabolism (Long et al., 2017). ALE has been used to successfully improve growth capabilities of a variety of non-bacterial species (Supplemental Figure 1), most notably yeast, where a similar volume of ALE work has been performed (Mans et al., 2018). As with *E. coli*, improved growth rates in different organisms frequently come along with other beneficial traits, such as evolved yeast strains outperforming rationally designed ones in several phenotypic metrics (Hong et al., 2011), and evolved microalgae achieving improved lipid productivity (Yu et al., 2013).

In addition to optimizing industrially or scientifically relevant wild-type strains, ALE has been successfully applied to fix fitness defects in strains rationally designed for a specific metabolic phenotype. An increased growth rate, in most cases, also makes a strain more robust to perturbations resulting from genetic alterations, as mutations can restore microbes back to their wild-type physiology and activate flux through alternate energy generation pathways (McCloskey et al., 2018). In one study, an engineered *M. extorquens* strain with a foreign metabolic pathway (resulting in abnormal morphology and significantly decreased growth rate) was subjected to laboratory evolution (Carroll and Marx, 2013). ALE resulted in the isolation of evolved strains with up to 150% growth rate improvements, elimination of morphological abnormalities, and insight into the metabolic consequences resulting from introduction of the foreign pathway. In another study, ALE was used in concert with strain engineering to impart novel metabolic capabilities onto yeast (Zelle et al., 2011). The native malic enzyme in *S. cerevisiae* is unable to function anaplerotically via pyruvate carboxylation, nor is heterologous

expression of the *E. coli* malic enzyme sufficient to activate this ability, but ALE successfully selected for a mutant enzyme that enabled this trait. ALE can also reliably ameliorate fitness defects resulting from ambitious, large-scale strain alterations - a genomically recoded *E. coli* with all 300+ amber stop codons removed was evolved to achieve strains with both significantly faster (>40%) growth rates and improved incorporation of nonstandard amino acids, opening the door to novel protein production capabilities (Wannier et al., 2018). Similarly, a genome-reduced *E. coli* with more than 1 million basepairs removed from its chromosome grew 3-fold slower than the wild-type in glucose minimal media, and yet a <1,000 generation ALE experiment almost completely abolished this severe fitness deficit (Choe et al., 2019).

ALE for improvement in growth rate thus serves not only to increase the ease and speed of microbial culturing, but also as a technique for targeted selection on specific rate-limiting system components. This is especially important when a strain has been engineered and rate-limiting constraints now significantly impact fitness, which will become an increasingly frequent occurrence as genome engineering techniques continue to improve. With proven efficacy across a number of species and the frequent occurrence of concomitant desirable traits such as increased productivity/yield, growth optimization stands as a key application for ALE experiments. Although the following sections delve into more specialized uses, it is important to note that growth rate improvements underlie these ALE outcomes as well.

2.2 Increase Tolerance

When exposed to stress, cells respond by activating stress responses, which require a reallocation of cellular resources to enact and thus inhibit growth potential. Cellular stress can be caused by a complex growth environment that induces some form of metabolic misregulation, or by exposure to specific inhibitory chemicals or biomolecules. Common stressors of both basic and applied interest introduce a diverse range of challenges for growing cells to overcome, and ALE has been established as an efficient tool to surmount such challenges. ALE studies have investigated the adaptive responses to many of these stressful environments: different levels of pH (Fletcher et al., 2017; Kildegaard et al., 2014; Zorraquino-Salvo et al., 2014), osmotic pressure

(Dhar et al., 2011; Dragosits et al., 2013; Stoebel et al., 2009; Tilloy et al., 2014; Winkler et al., 2014), temperature (Blaby et al., 2012; Caspeta et al., 2014; Deatherage et al., 2017; Riehle et al., 2003; Rudolph et al., 2010; Sandberg et al., 2014; Sleight and Lenski, 2007; Tenaillon et al., 2012), UV irradiation (Alcántara-Díaz et al., 2004; González-Ramos et al., 2016), inhibitors (most frequently, metabolic byproducts produced during biomass pretreatment) (Adamo et al., 2012; Almario et al., 2013; Atsumi et al., 2010; Avrahami-Moyal et al., 2012; Cakar et al., 2005; Goodarzi et al., 2010; Haft et al., 2014; Henson et al., 2018; Horinouchi et al., 2010; Jiang et al., 2012; Koppram et al., 2012; Linville et al., 2013; Luan et al., 2013; Minty et al., 2011; McCarthy et al., 2017; Qin et al., 2016; Reyes et al., 2012; Reyes et al., 2013; Royce et al., 2015; Sehnem et al., 2013; Shao et al., 2011; Wallace-Salinas and Gorwa-Grauslund, 2013; Wang et al., 2018; Xu et al., 2018; Zhu et al., 2015); and nutritional stressors (Bachmann et al., 2012; Brennan et al., 2015; Cakar et al., 2009; Dhar et al., 2013; Hawkins and Doran-Peterson, 2011; Jansen et al., 2005; Jung et al., 2017; Lee et al., 2013; Mundhada et al., 2017; Pereira et al., 2015; Summers et al., 2012). Utilization of ALE to understand stress responses and overcome growth inhibition is one of the most popular and historically relevant applications (Figure 2), frequently increasing the utility and robustness of industrially valuable strains. Moreover, stress tolerance ALEs are particularly efficacious due to the complex, global physiological response stresses often induce – tuning a large number of gene expression levels to restore robust growth is currently beyond the realm of rational design, but ALE can reliably uncover point mutations in global regulators which achieve just that (Sandberg et al., 2014).

Compounds with potential biotechnological value can often not be efficiently metabolized or produced in living systems due to toxicity. For example, many carboxylic acids are promising biorenewables but induce membrane damage, and attempts to rationally engineer greater membrane integrity have failed to improve carboxylic acid production. Royce *et al.* addressed this with an ALE experiment of *E. coli* onto octanoic acid, wherein strains were obtained that had improved tolerance not just to octanoic acid but also several other carboxylic acids and butanol isomers, with concomitant 5 fold higher production titer (Royce et al., 2015). This highlights how stress mitigation can simultaneously improve production properties, and how certain classes of stressors

1 trigger similar physiological responses that cause particular mutations to be beneficial
2 across multiple environments. In another study, knowledge of *S. cerevisiae* metabolism
3 led to an ALE experiment designed for osmotic stress tolerance - this pushed the yeast
4 metabolic state more towards glycerol production and away from ethanol, resulting in
5 evolved strains with improved properties for lower-alcohol wine production (Tilloy et al.,
6 2014).

7 Causal mutations in tolerance-evolved strains are straightforward to identify with
8 DNA sequencing, but interpreting the molecular causality underlying a mutation's
9 phenotypic impact is often more challenging. A study by Caspeta *et al.* stands as a
10 successful example of ALE results elucidating the molecular mechanisms of adaptation
11 – yeast was evolved for improved thermotolerance, yielding strains that grew >50%
12 faster at 40°C (Caspeta et al., 2014). Mutational convergence in independently evolved
13 replicates revealed that a gene inactivation changed the sterol composition of the cells
14 from ergosterol to fecosterol, optimizing membrane fluidity at the elevated growth
15 temperatures. ALE can also be used to increase tolerance to multiple stressors at once,
16 as demonstrated by a study in which an industrial yeast strain was evolved for improved
17 tolerance to both biomass hydrolysate inhibitors and high temperature, creating a robust
18 strain for ethanol production via simultaneous saccharification and fermentation
19 (Wallace-Salinas and Gorwa-Grauslund, 2013). However, it should be noted that
20 tolerance to one stress often comes with tradeoffs in a separate growth environment,
21 depending on the particular adaptive mutations acquired – while strains evolved to high-
22 temperature typically lose fitness at low-temperature, one ALE-identified mutation
23 managed to avoid such a tradeoff (Rodriguez-Verdugo et al., 2014).

24 A significant effort to overcome the toxicity of a nutrient stressor, specifically L-
25 serine in high concentration, was seen in the studies performed by Mundhada *et al.* L-
26 serine is a promising target for commercial bioproduction but induces inhibition of
27 various cellular processes such as peptidoglycan synthesis and cell division, and the
28 reactive byproducts such as acrylates can hinder cell growth (Zhang and Newman,
29 2008; Zhang et al., 2010; de Lorenzo et al., 2015). An initial study succeeded in
30 achieving L-serine tolerance in *E. coli* by employing random mutagenesis and selection,
31 but it was not able to meet the demand for extensive serine production (Mundhada et

al., 2016). By implementing ALE, *E. coli* lacking L-serine degradation pathways (which makes cells much more susceptible to toxicity) were evolved to increasing concentrations of L-serine that reached 100 g/L, resulting in a titer much higher than the mutagenized strain with the same pathway (Mundhada et al., 2017).

Evolutionary engineering for improved stress tolerance stands as a dominant ALE application for metabolic engineering and industrial biotechnology. As previously stated, wild-type cells are rarely well-poised to deal with the burdens caused by growth environments with high concentrations of an atypical but desired bioproduction chemical. Where rational engineering approaches can fall short due to a lack of requisite knowledge, ALE enables mechanistically naïve but reliable improvements to industrially valuable strain properties. Mutational results from ALE experiments can then be used to inform further strain design attempts, while also elucidating basic tenants of biological systems. Further, attempts to rationally design strains for a specific phenotype often induce fitness defects which can be countervailed by evolution. Even if specific tolerance mechanisms can be rationally engineered into a strain, necessary gene expression levels can be hard to infer. In contrast, in a single experiment, ALE can find both the mechanisms underlying fitness defects and the gene expression levels necessary to enable a functional and robust phenotype. ALE also enables acclimation to growth environments with complex combinations of stressors that rational design cannot currently address given our existing biological knowledge base. Importantly, when stress on strains is reduced via ALE, the result is typically not only growth rate increases, but also phenotypic improvements in industrially relevant properties such as production or degradation capabilities.

2.3 Substrate Utilization

Efficient substrate uptake is necessary to enable satisfactory production of metabolites and additional products of interest in most, if not all, industrial applications. There exists a very direct link between organism fitness and the ability to efficiently uptake and metabolize rate-limiting growth nutrients, thus ALE experiments with a properly designed selective environment readily uncover mutations conducive to robust growth on substrates of interest. Primary motivations for improving substrate utilization

of an organism are tied to current market surpluses/prices (Ji et al., 2011; Lin and Tanaka, 2006) and harnessing the energy of inaccessible or toxic byproducts to improve yield of commodity chemicals (Plácido and Capareda, 2016). The most ubiquitous organism studied to improve uptake is the yeast *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* (Cadière et al., 2011; Garcia Sanchez et al., 2010; Guimarães et al., 2008; Kim et al., 2012; Smith et al., 2014; Sonderegger and Sauer, 2003; Zha et al., 2014; Zhang et al., 2018; Zhou et al., 2012), with the CEN.PK strain and its derivatives the most common (de Kok et al., 2012; Ho et al., 2017; Jansen et al., 2004; Klimacek et al., 2014; Kuyper et al., 2005, 2004; Marques et al., 2017; Merico et al., 2011; Novy et al., 2014; Ochoa-Estopier et al., 2011; Papapetridis et al., 2018; Scalcinati et al., 2012; Strucko et al., 2018; van Rossum et al., 2016), mainly due to its widespread use in industry, robust fermentative capability, and inherent ethanol tolerance. There has been considerable interest in generating microbial strains that can utilize the fermentable sugars in lignocellulosic biomass (Clark et al., 2012; Sanderson, 2011); *S. cerevisiae* has again been the driving force in discovery to this end (Klimacek et al., 2014; Marques et al., 2017; Zha et al., 2014), with some work done in *E. coli* strains (Lee and Palsson, 2010; Rajaraman et al., 2016; Sandberg et al., 2017, 2016; Utrilla et al., 2012) and other various bacteria and yeast (Cordova et al., 2016; Latif et al., 2015; Moser et al., 2017).

Saccharomyces cerevisiae, due to its anaerobic fermentative capabilities and tolerance to low pH and phage infection, has been the species of interest for industrial production of specialty metabolites (Moysés et al., 2016). Although *S. cerevisiae* does not natively catabolize xylose or other pentose sugars readily available in plant biomass, there has been considerable work to engineer strains capable of co-utilizing these compounds (Chu and Lee, 2007; Van Vleet and Jeffries, 2009). Adaptive laboratory evolution has been used in tandem with other metabolic engineering techniques to further drive substrate utilization. In (Klimacek et al., 2014), previously constructed *S. cerevisiae* strains with enhanced expression of heterologous genes involved in xylose metabolism were evolved via a two phase process. ALE selection for anaerobic xylose fermentation led to a strain with faster growth but undesirable metabolic byproducts, and a subsequent ALE on this strain under batch culture conditions ameliorated these phenotypic defects. The final strain grew more than 500%

1 faster than the original progenitor despite fewer than 100 total generations of evolution,
2 highlighting the impressive speed with which ALE can realize significant fitness
3 improvements.

4 ALE has been used to tackle challenges in the utilization of plant biomass as a
5 nutrient source, such as the presence of toxic or inhibitory byproducts like furfural and
6 acetate (Bellissimi et al., 2009; Heer and Sauer, 2008). A study by Rajaraman *et al.*
7 addressed this with a chemostat ALE on several *E. coli* strains with acetate as the sole
8 carbon source (Rajaraman et al., 2016). Evolved strains had a specific growth rate
9 increase of ~25% and significantly altered expression for a number of genes, enabled
10 by a single amino acid substitution in the RNA polymerase complex subunit RpoA;
11 unlike with rational engineering of specific genes for altered expression, ALE can find
12 point mutations changing global expression patterns in a net beneficial way not
13 predictable with current protein modeling techniques. In addition to improving growth
14 rate on non-optimal nutrients, a properly designed ALE experiment can also enable
15 growth on completely non-permissive substrates. With a passage protocol in which
16 glycerol concentration was steadily lowered while L-1,2-propanediol was increased, *E.*
17 *coli* strains were obtained capable of growth solely on the latter substrate, despite the
18 ancestral strain's inability to uptake or metabolize this nonnative carbon source (Lee
19 and Palsson, 2010). A study that significantly expanded this approach involved
20 automation of the process, weaning cultures off of a helper substrate (which generated
21 diversity), and selecting for strains that could utilize a number of non-native carbon
22 sources by directly targeting promiscuity properties of enzymes (Guzmán et al., 2019;
23 Notebaart et al., 2018). Impressively, growth on these new substrates was enabled by
24 the acquisition of only one or two point mutations – completely 'novel' phenotypes for a
25 particular strain can readily be acquired via evolution if the growth environment provides
26 the necessary fitness benefit for such an occurrence.

27 Although ALE has proven efficacy for enabling growth on non-native substrates,
28 access to a new nutrient niche can require large jumps across the fitness landscape
29 that render a phenotype infeasible to select for on reasonable timeframes – famously, it
30 took 15 years for one of twelve Long Term Evolution Experiment populations to acquire
31 a citrate-consuming phenotype, and the other eleven populations are still unable to

1 consume citrate after 30 total years (Leon et al., 2018). Rational design with
2 heterologous pathways can facilitate such fitness landscape leaps, but clever use of
3 ALE alone can sometimes suffice. Szapponos et al. utilized metabolic modeling to
4 identify non-native growth substrates with similar catabolic pathways, then performed a
5 multi-step ALE to select for a complex metabolic innovation (Szapponos et al., 2016).
6 Specifically, *E. coli* cannot natively grow on propylene glycol (PG) or ethylene glycol
7 (EG), but culturing of a hypermutable variant resulted in isolation of PG+, but not EG+,
8 strains. However, selecting for EG growth using PG+ mutant strains did successfully
9 yield the EG+ phenotype, indicating an increase in adaptation rate of more than two
10 orders of magnitude. Innovative niche expansions can thus be achieved via stepwise
11 evolution, with complimentary technologies such as metabolic modeling providing the
12 information necessary to choose suitable substrate targets.

13 ALE has seen significant use as a tool for improving substrate uptake and
14 metabolism, often countervailing the growth-inhibitory effects of toxic byproducts or
15 fixing metabolic network misregulation in non-optimal growth environments. In this
16 way, the utility of ALE has been established in use cases ranging from improving wild-
17 type strain growth on a sub-optimal substrate, to facilitating proper metabolic
18 assimilation of heterologous pathways in engineered strains, to imparting novel growth
19 phenotypes even in unengineered strains - in each case improving substrate uptake as
20 a coupled property. The mutational mechanisms range from single-nucleotide
21 polymorphisms and small indels (insertions or deletions) in specific enzymes that
22 enable pure innovation (e.g., utilizing a novel substrate), to altered transporter activity
23 that leads to more efficient import and routing of substrates into central metabolism, to
24 regulatory mutations which globally rebalance the metabolic network, shutting down
25 cellular content unnecessary for bioreactor growth and freeing up resources for growth-
26 coupled processes like substrate uptake. ALE can thus greatly complement traditional
27 engineering techniques for altering microbial response to various feedstocks, creating
28 more efficient organisms with improved chemical conversion to industrially desirable
29 products.

30 2.4 Product Titer/Yield Optimization

Maximizing the bioproduction of metabolites of interest is a difficult task, and rational approaches to strain design are frequently insufficient to achieve desired productivity (Guimarães et al., 2008; Kuyper et al., 2005, 2004; Shepelin et al., 2018). A main source of difficulty lies in the conflict between fast, robust strain growth and the fitness-counterproductive repurposing of cellular resources to produce large amounts of a desirable compound. Nevertheless, ALE studies with proper experimental design can be used to overcome this conflict and optimize metabolite production and increase titer (Basso et al., 2011; Charusanti et al., 2012; Fong et al., 2005a; Fu et al., 2013; Grabar et al., 2006; Jiang et al., 2013; Lee et al., 2016, 2014; Lu et al., 2012; Luo et al., 2019; Mahr et al., 2015; Otero et al., 2013; Pontrelli et al., 2018; Reyes et al., 2014; Royce et al., 2015; Shen et al., 2012; Smith and Liao, 2011; Vilela et al., 2015; Wang et al., 2012; Wisselink et al., 2007; Zhang et al., 2007; Zhao et al., 2013; Zhou et al., 2005, 2003). Given that an ALE experiment's efficacy is contingent on the fitness advantage bestowed by adaptive mutations, it is essential to tie metabolite production to fitness in some way. The most straightforward way to do this is to genetically alter strains to couple production to overall energy and biomass generation rates in a given environment, and computational studies suggest a multitude of possible growth-coupled products that go far beyond simple and intuitive strain designs (Burgard et al., 2003; Klamt and Mahadevan, 2015; Pharkya et al., 2004; von Kamp and Klamt, 2017). However, given the limited scope of molecules for which this has been executed and validated (i.e., coupling production to overall energy generation), innovative methods (e.g., using a selective environment where production of the molecule of interest provides some protective or fitness-beneficial function) and advanced selection systems (e.g., fluorescent reporters + FACS sorting) are often needed to improve production for a wide range of molecules. Success cases for multiple forms of production optimization via growth coupling will now be discussed.

Genetic alterations that modify the metabolic network of a cell can force growth-sustaining flux through desired pathways, thereby coupling cell viability to the production of a compound of interest. Significant computational work has been performed to enable prediction of specific gene knockouts or heterologous pathway insertions that result in growth-coupling (Burgard et al., 2003; Feist et al., 2010; Jensen

et al., 2019; Klamt and Mahadevan, 2015; Pharkya et al., 2004; von Kamp and Klamt, 2017), and such approaches have been experimentally validated (Alper et al., 2005; Fong et al., 2005a; Yim et al., 2011) and are growing in utility due to advances in genome-scale metabolic modeling techniques (King et al., 2017). In a study by Jantama *et al.*, this modeling-informed rational design was combined with ALE to optimize an *E. coli* strain with gene knockouts that forced NAD⁺ regeneration to occur via malate- and succinate-producing pathways under anaerobic growth conditions (Jantama et al., 2008). By thus coupling production to NADH oxidation, necessary for the growth-essential maintenance of ATP generation, ALE successfully selected for strains with robust minimal medium growth and improved malate and succinate titer. Further, physiological characterization of evolved strains pointed to additional knockouts to decrease byproduct formation, ultimately yielding strains with even greater chemical yields. Properly designed growth-coupling strategies can even see utility across diverse organisms and enzyme types (Jensen et al., 2019), as exemplified by recent work coupling SAM-dependent methylation to growth (Luo et al., 2019). By tying production of the essential amino acid cysteine to the activity of methyltransferases, Luo *et al.* were able to use ALE to select for both *E. coli* and *S. cerevisiae* strains with mutations providing 2-fold increases in heterologous methyltransferase activity. Ensuring that the methyltransferase activity was rate-limiting for growth forced adaptive mutations to preferentially target this enzymatic bottleneck; *in vivo* enzyme engineering was thus undertaken by the evolving cells, with demonstrated success for improving activity of both N- and O-type methyltransferases.

Innovative selection strategies and systems have also been demonstrated, which expand the range of compounds whose production can be optimized using ALE beyond those that can be directly growth-coupled. One such selective approach involves utilizing interspecies competition or cooperation (i.e., syntrophy). Charusanti *et al.* serially propagated MRSA alongside an antibiotic-producing microorganism, harnessing competition to achieve an *S. clavuligerus* strain with constitutive holomycin expression (Charusanti et al., 2012). The production of this molecule, though energetically costly, was nevertheless selectable with ALE due to the competitive co-culturing growth environment utilized. Similarly, through the use of syntrophic coupling and co-cultures,

Lloyd *et al.* designed and evolved mutually reliant strains to optimize the sharing and production of non-trivial compounds (Lloyd *et al.*, 2019). Environmental manipulation in monocultures has also been successfully employed, as in a study by Reyes *et al.* wherein exposure to hydrogen peroxide selected for more than 3-fold increases in carotenoid production due to these compounds' antioxidant properties (Reyes *et al.*, 2014). Such approaches change the meaning of "fitness" to now include production of the molecule of interest as a factor, but other selective techniques are possible – a noteworthy study in this category used FACS to apply multi-dimensional selection to a strain engineered with a biosensor for valine-induced fluorescence (Mahr *et al.*, 2015). Biosensors provide a powerful way to link otherwise-obscured intracellular states to a screenable output (D. Liu *et al.*, 2015), and by screening out and serially propagating only the most highly fluorescent cells, Mahr *et al.* increased valine titer by ~25% alongside growth rate improvements and decreased byproduct formation, despite maximum possible growth rate being higher if the cells had acquired mutations to eliminate their energetically wasteful expression of fluorescent proteins.

When paired with properly selected experimental methodology and biological design, ALE's ability to increase bioproduction of desired molecules has been established. Though more difficult to select for than simple growth rate improvements, fitness can still be tied to titer increases in a variety of circumstances: when the produced molecule can enable better growth or survivability in spite of production costs; when evolution can countervail phenotypic defects resulting from metabolic engineering for a novel production phenotype; or when growth rate maximization is not the sole driving force behind selection. An important factor to keep in mind is the stability of production strains – though production phenotypes can be selectable under carefully designed ALE conditions, industrial-scale bioreactor growth can open the door for population-takeover by mutant strains which genetically purge the production machinery (Rugbjerg and Sommer, 2019). Engineering techniques can improve strain stability by removing mobile genetic elements or error-prone polymerases and thus reducing mutation rate (Csorgo *et al.*, 2012), but, fortunately, this is not a strict necessity – a 1,4-BDO bioproduction strain (Yim *et al.*, 2011) has been used at industrial scales by Genomatica, and found to remain genetically stable over the course of a bioprocess

cycle (personal communication, John D. Trawick). As our knowledge of metabolic and regulatory networks grows and techniques for engineering and strain design continue to improve, we are poised to see an increased adoption of ALE as a complementary technology for optimizing microbial production strains.

2.5 General Discovery

By enabling observation of evolutionary outcomes in a controlled laboratory setting, ALE facilitates research into basic bioprocesses in addition to its more applied uses as an engineering and strain design/optimization tool. ALE studies have yielded insight into important evolutionary phenomena such as clonal interference and regulatory rewiring (Kao and Sherlock, 2008; Oud et al., 2013; Sniegowski and Gerrish, 2010; Maddamsetti et al., 2015), rate and mechanism of mutation development (Araya et al., 2010; Chang et al., 2013; Dunham et al., 2002; Notley-McRobb and Ferenci, 1999; Yona et al., 2012; Lind et al., 2017; Ene et al., 2018; Lauer et al., 2018), and response to genetic perturbation or sub-optimal growth environment (Charusanti et al., 2010; Conrad et al., 2010; Fong et al., 2005b; Wang et al., 2010; Giusy M. Adamo et al., 2012; Deng and Fong, 2011; Szamecz et al., 2014; Wenger et al., 2011; Wright et al., 2011). ALE has also been used to study fundamental aspects of biology such as regulatory gene network response to external stressors or a new environment (Quan et al., 2012; Zhu et al., 2015), as well as the impact of genome shuffling and recombination techniques on the construction of industrially pertinent strains (Peabody et al., 2016; Reyes et al., 2012; Winkler and Kao, 2012). When paired with *in silico* modeling and algorithmic approaches frequently used in systems-level analyses, ALE additionally serves as an empirical hypothesis tester (Dekel and Alon, 2005; Ibarra et al., 2002).

Several studies have been dedicated to uncovering the molecular framework of an organism's response to a genetic perturbation, with obvious implications for strain engineering. Gene essentiality and the impact of gene knockouts has been analyzed using ALE (Charusanti et al., 2010; Tokuyama et al., 2018), wherein strain physiology immediately post knockout can be compared against the physiological state following the strain's adaptive evolution. For example, Charusanti *et al.* investigated the adaptive

1 response of multiple *E. coli* lineages following knockout of the important
2 phosphoglucose isomerase (*pgi*) gene (Charusanti et al., 2010), a frequent target for
3 disruption in engineered strains (Chin and Cirino, 2011; Papapetridis et al., 2018; Shiue
4 et al., 2015). Distinct phenotypic outcomes were reached across the different evolved
5 endpoints, and examination of the flux state via carbon-13 metabolic flux analysis
6 determined that the dominant mechanism of adaptation was to overcome key
7 bottlenecks in cofactor metabolism and substrate uptake that were induced by the
8 knockout (Long et al., 2018). Studies such as these examining evolutionary response to
9 genetic perturbation are increasingly yielding insight into the regulatory architecture of
10 metabolic networks (McCloskey et al., 2018).

11 Modifications to ALE experiment methodology have been explored for the
12 purposes of speeding adaptation, increasing mutation rate, and maintaining beneficial
13 mutations. Bacterial asexual reproduction leads to clonal interference, preventing many
14 beneficial mutations from reaching fixation within the evolving populations. Chu *et al.*
15 investigated induced horizontal gene transfer as a method to speed adaptation and
16 circumvent clonal interference, and found that genetic exchange between distinct co-
17 cultured *E. coli* strains could significantly aid in adaptation to growth on novel carbon
18 sources, contingent on the specifics of donor vs. host strain similarity and evolutionary
19 environment (Chu et al., 2018). Contrasting with horizontal gene transfer, another
20 technique to increase the accessibility of adaptive mutations is simply to increase the
21 mutation rate, which can be induced with chemical mutagens (Lee et al., 2011) or
22 naturally result from a DNA repair gene deactivation (LaCroix et al., 2014; Lenski et al.,
23 2015); in all cases, mutation rate positively correlated with the speed of adaptation and
24 magnitude of fitness gains. However, Couce et al. found that, even under conditions of
25 strong selection and with improving population fitness, hypermutability leads to steady
26 decay of the genome and can cause 'genomic draft,' whereby deleterious mutations
27 hitchhike and cannot be purged from the population (Couce et al., 2017). Care should
28 thus be taken when evolving hypermutable strains – though hypermutability can
29 facilitate the speed and magnitude of ALE fitness increases, and even make leaps
30 across the fitness landscape accessible by providing a large mutational pool with

1 complex epistatic interactions, there are downsides in regards to genome stability and
2 even adaptive potential, if the mutation rate is inordinately high (Sprouffske et al., 2018).

3 The novel or improved microbial phenotypes achievable with ALE makes it a
4 powerful engineering tool, and studying the genetic and metabolic mechanisms
5 underlying these phenotypic changes can yield valuable biological discoveries.
6 Moreover, modifications to the selection protocol and evolutionary environment are
7 easily explorable with ALE, allowing investigation into methods by which adaptation can
8 be facilitated. Insights gained through the use of ALE can then be employed in other
9 design strategies for novel solutions in industrial settings.

11 3. Strain Types and Generations

12 As long as an organism is reproducibly culturable in laboratory conditions it can
13 be subjected to ALE, though the majority of studies analyzed in this review utilize either
14 bacteria or yeast, specifically *E. coli* and *S. cerevisiae* (Supplemental Figure 1A). This is
15 due to their fast growth, genetic tractability, and status as model organisms, providing
16 the necessary knowledge base with which to interpret evolutionary outcomes. Using
17 different organisms such as algae can allow for evolved phenotypes not achievable with
18 bacteria or yeast, but ALE studies focusing on less standard microbial species are
19 comparatively scant. Although much less relevant to metabolic engineering, higher
20 organisms like fruit flies or even mice have been selectively competed and bred under
21 controlled conditions (Barrett et al., 2019; Folk and Bradley, 2005), though these non-
22 microbial ALE studies are beyond the scope of this review. ALE for mammalian
23 production systems is limited given their slow growth rates and more involved culturing
24 requirements, but some work has been done examining the genetic changes which
25 accumulate in CHO cell lines under various culturing conditions (Feichtinger et al.,
26 2016). Earlier examples without genetic analysis also exist, such as adapting hybridoma
27 cells to lower serum concentrations (Lee et al., 1991). However, larger scale DNA
28 sequencing is needed to reliably identify the potential causal mutations from such
29 mammalian selection experiments, and epigenetic factors can further complicate the
30 interpretation of results .

A critical parameter in an ALE experiment is the length of time for which populations of strains are evolved. Generations is the most commonly used metric for evolutionary time, though alternatives exist that include more data on the selective protocol employed, such as Cumulative Cell Divisions, which factors in population bottlenecks resulting from serial passage (Lee et al., 2011; Sandberg et al., 2014). Most ALE studies have a duration of 100-500 generations of growth (Supplemental Figure 1B), though significantly reduced (<50 generations) and increased (>60,000 generations) timescales have also seen use. The decision to stop an ALE experiment after a certain number of generations is always somewhat arbitrary - though evolved strains get labelled 'endpoints,' this does not mean further fitness gains are not achievable with increased experiment duration. The Long Term Evolution Experiment (LTEE) provides the best example of this; *E. coli* has been kept adapting to glucose minimal media for over 30 years, and competition assays on strains spanning 60,000 generations of evolution revealed that fitness gains best fit a power-law model, indicating a decreasing rate of improvement over time but no asymptotic limit (Lenski et al., 2015). Despite fitness gains being achievable indefinitely, for practical applications it is important to strike an appropriate balance between acquiring a fit endpoint and not wasting resources drawing out an experiment excessively. For example, Hua *et al.* evolved *E. coli* onto lactate growth and found ~60% fitness improvements with less than 250 generations of ALE, while increasing experiment duration to 900 generations only resulted in a further fitness gain of less than 20% (Hua et al., 2007).

When an ALE experiment is performed in a way that facilitates easy fitness tracking over time, it is typically sufficient to set an 'endpoint' based on subjective valuation of when fitness starts to plateau. If fitness-tracking is not possible, the studies collected herein establish ALEs of a several hundred generation timescale as suitable for most purposes. Further, modeling approaches have been developed to optimize ALE experimentation and best decide passage protocols and when to end an experiment (Bittihn et al., 2017; LaCroix et al., 2017). Such approaches will better enable automation and optimization of ALE use in the strain design process.

4. ALE Protocols and Experimental Setup

1 The evolutionary environment employed in an ALE experiment determines the
2 selective pressure guiding adaptation, and is thus a critical choice when a particular
3 phenotypic outcome is sought. Batch culturing is both the simplest and most popular
4 ALE method (Supplemental Figure 1C), though there are significant differences
5 between various batch culturing methods. Often it is desirable for fitness and growth
6 rate to be equivalent, and serial batch culture propagation is a way to enforce this if
7 cultures are passed while still in exponential phase and with excess nutrients. Without
8 limited resources or shifts in growth phase between lag/exponential/stationary,
9 improvements to maximum growth rate determine which strains come to dominate the
10 population. Unfortunately, as growth rate increases over the course of the ALE,
11 changes must be made either to the passage frequency or passage volume used for
12 propagation if stationary phase is to be avoided (Charusanti et al., 2010; Fong and
13 Palsson, 2004). Increasing passage frequency can be prohibitively difficult without
14 automation, while decreasing passage volume leads to tighter population bottlenecks
15 and a potential loss in adaptive mutations. Given these issues, many researchers opt
16 for batch culture propagation of fixed volumes at fixed intervals (generally once per
17 day), as in the LTEE (Lenski et al., 1991). This is a more easily maintainable
18 experimental setup, but by virtue of going through cycles of resource excess followed by
19 depletion selection occurs for more than just growth rate: decreases in lag phase and
20 survival in stationary phase also significantly impact fitness. With a dynamic
21 environment such as this, selection can also lead to co-existing specialist strains that
22 thrive in different phases of the daily cycle (Rozen et al., 2009).

23 Non-batch ALE culturing setups are dominated by chemostat use, but other
24 methods also exist and are practiced. Chemostats are the second most popular
25 culturing technique for ALEs, and this method differs from batch culturing in ways that
26 alter the selective forces at play. Chemostats culture cells in a bioreactor, enabling tight
27 control over environmental parameters like pH and oxygenation, and maintain
28 continuous growth via a constant influx of media at a set dilution rate (Gresham and
29 Dunham, 2014). Although this can facilitate undesirable adaptive events, such as
30 bacterial persistence due to adhesive wall growth (Rao and Rao, 2004), and can be
31 more difficult to maintain multiple replicates in parallel, it can also be used to select for

particular phenotypes. For example, Koppram *et al.* evolved yeast for improved biomass inhibitor tolerance via both batch and chemostat culture, and found that batch culture selected more for improvements in growth rate, glucose consumption, and ethanol productivity, while chemostat evolution favored improved inhibitor conversion rates (Koppram *et al.*, 2012). Other culturing methods have seen occasional use in ALE experiments for specific purposes, such as long term culturing in a single flask to select for a growth advantage in stationary phase (Westphal *et al.*, 2018), or growth on an oversized petri dish with antibiotic gradients to allow spatiotemporal tracking of competing lineages (Baym *et al.*, 2016). Serial propagation of colonies streaked onto plates, by virtue of the clonal bottlenecks at each step, is not a form of 'adaptive' evolution without some secondary screening measure influencing the transfer process, but can be used for mutation accumulation studies (Shibai *et al.*, 2017).

5. Automation and ALE

Although ALE experiments can be performed manually without significant difficulty and require little setup or specialized equipment, automating the process can facilitate greatly increased experimental capabilities, throughput, and clarity in outcome. In terms of expanding capabilities while running an ALE experiment, automation allows for complex culturing procedures which cannot be reasonably performed manually (e.g., propagating cultures many times a day, or splitting many independent cultures at different thresholds) as well as for dynamic alterations to passage protocols (e.g., alternating substrates or temperature from flask to flask) (Sandberg *et al.*, 2017; Wong *et al.*, 2018). Automation also allows for improved monitoring of physiological properties of evolving cultures, enabling researchers to better understand the evolutionary dynamics at play and to make informed decisions on when and how many times to sequence for adaptive mutations. Furthermore, eliminating repetitive manual ALE passage work saves time and effort and reduces researcher fatigue, which can lead to mistakes and premature stoppage of an experiment where a mutational jump in fitness is still possible. Perhaps the most important aspect of automated ALE is the ability to efficiently execute multiple independent replicates of the same experiment at one time.

1 With this ability to “play the same game” repeatedly, evolved genotypes can be more
2 easily interpreted by leveraging cross-replicate mutational comparisons (e.g., identifying
3 genetic hitchhikers which lack statistically significant independent recurrence), and
4 multiple equivalent fitness-optimized clones are obtainable from which a strain with
5 desirable properties can be selected, spanning the range of intracellular states enabling
6 improved growth (e.g., a high uptake rate vs. a high yield clone).

7 Automation can speed up the time it takes to obtain a desirable strain by virtue of
8 less stringent population bottlenecks and sustained exponential-phase growth,
9 translating to faster mutant fixation. The tight environmental control of automated
10 systems can also obviate an important issue intrinsic to manually performed batch
11 culture propagation (Gresham and Dunham, 2014), namely the difficulty in maintaining
12 a strict selection pressure that evolves cells under essentially invariant conditions. For
13 example, automation has been used to select for growth rate improvement in a 2,000
14 generation ALE in which the cells never experienced nutrient limitation or left
15 exponential growth phase, all while maintaining large passage volumes (LaCroix et al.,
16 2014). When contrasted with the manually-performed Long Term Evolution Experiment
17 (Lenski et al., 1991), this automated ALE saw equivalent fitness gains on a real-world
18 timescale nearly 10 times shorter.

19 A number of automated ALE devices have been developed that span the range
20 of culturing methods: large volume batch culture (Sandberg et al., 2014; LaCroix et al.,
21 2014; Wong et al., 2018), microtiter plates (Horinouchi et al., 2014; Radek et al., 2017),
22 chemostats/turbidostats (Blaby et al., 2012; Toprak et al., 2013), or microfluidics (Rotem
23 et al., 2016). Such demonstrations establish the broad scope of technologies which can
24 be part of automated strain construction workflows (Chao et al., 2017). Putting some of
25 the current capabilities of such automated systems in context, gains in throughput
26 enabled by automation allowed for more than 30 independent replicates to be evolved
27 simultaneously on the same robotic system, or for large culture volumes to be
28 propagated multiple times per day, minimizing the risk of missing out on adaptive
29 mutations due to population bottlenecks (LaCroix et al., 2017). With real-time tracking of
30 growth response to environmental particulars, automation allows a ‘sweet spot’ of
31 chemical concentration to be maintained, such as keeping cultures in a constantly

growth-inhibiting but non-lethal antibiotic environment to study mechanisms of resistance evolution (Toprak et al., 2013). This ability to modify an ALE environment on the fly opens up a number of experimental possibilities - tolerance to certain chemicals can be incrementally built up, resulting in optimized bioproduction strains (Mohamed et al., 2017), or the growth environment can be rapidly alternated to yield strains with desirable diauxic phenotypes (Sandberg et al., 2017). The information needed to develop inexpensive, automated culturing systems is also becoming publicly available (Wong et al., 2018), contrasting with systems using industrial-grade hardware (LaCroix et al., 2014), and will doubtlessly lead to more widespread and innovative adoption of ALE as a powerful technique for both biological discovery and metabolic engineering.

6. Conclusions and Future Directions

Adaptive laboratory evolution stands as a powerful tool available to strain engineers and biologists, yielding strains with phenotypic improvements that stem from random mutation and natural selection rather than rational engineering. This renders ALE a multi-functional technique: 1) it enables laboratory investigation of evolutionary processes, expanding the biological knowledge base that informs successful strain engineering through identification of beneficial mutations associated to a specific selection pressure, or those which counteract production goals; 2) it complements rational design approaches by improving engineered strain properties, countervailing the fitness defects frequently introduced by genetic manipulation; and 3) it can replace rational design approaches when a desired phenotype is selectable due to a fitness benefit in a particular environment. Furthermore, with a sizable and well-annotated collection of causal mutations, phenotypes of interest could be designed by directly engineering ALE-identified alleles into a strain to induce a particular cellular state. ALE can thus be of great utility in the Design-Build-Test-Learn cycle employed in strain construction (R. Liu et al., 2015), augmenting or even replacing the Design and Build steps (Figure 3).

Figure 3: ALE for use in the Design, Build, Test, Learn cycle.

A) The typical Design, Build, Test, Learn cycle used in metabolic engineering to generate a strain with a desired property. **B)** Augmentation of the cycle where ALE is included in the Build step to rescue a strain that has decreased fitness due to a perturbation, or to optimize a strain after removal or addition of genetic content. **C)** Augmentation of the cycle where a collection of mutations (e.g., ALEdb (Phaneuf et al., 2018)) associated to a particular phenotype is leveraged for the Design step **D)** Augmentation of the cycle where ALE can be used to completely replace the Design and Build steps and a desirable strain is acquired directly from ALE when a phenotype can be tied to selection without engineering.

ALE can serve as a powerful tool, but several principles constrain such experiments. First and foremost, ALE only has efficacy with achieving evolutionarily selectable phenotypes. Growth rate improvements are inherently selectable, making tolerance and substrate-utilization ALEs straightforward approaches for phenotypic

improvement, but desired phenotypes can be fitness-counterproductive for cells (e.g., overproduction of some metabolite), preventing evolution from selecting for such traits. In these cases, approaches must be taken to alter the environment and/or genome of the starting strain in a way that links the property of interest to a growth advantage, e.g. via metabolic growth-coupling, or by using a growth environment where the otherwise-wasteful metabolite production now confers a benefit. Additionally, the choice of organism is key; model organisms are genetically tractable and have the knowledgebase with which to interpret mutational results, but more rarely-used species can have atypical physiological properties that make them ideal for a particular phenotype. The overall goals of the study are paramount to consider when selecting ALE experimental parameters, such as replicate number, evolutionary duration, serial passage bottleneck size, etc. – e.g., if a particular strain phenotype is all that's desired then replicates are less important, but if one wants to decipher molecular mechanisms then replicates greatly facilitate identifying regions of convergent evolution. Fortunately, tools exist to aid in the selection of parameters for optimizing results from an ALE experiment without wasting time or resources (LaCroix et al., 2017).

Advances in genetic engineering techniques are facilitating ambitious and novel strain designs, which can benefit from ALE as a method by which to understand limitations in these highly perturbed systems and uncover fitness-restoring mutations. Some prominent examples of studies enabled by advanced genetic engineering include synthetic minimal cells (Hutchison et al., 2016) and genome-wide codon repurposing (Wannier et al., 2018). ALE can aid in these efforts by mitigating the fitness defects of such highly altered strains, as demonstrated in the case of an *E. coli* strain with nearly 25% of its genome removed (Choe et al., 2019). Additionally, improvements in strain engineering techniques allow for particular phenotypes to be linked to other properties, such as biosensors that cause cellular fluorescence upon production of a desired compound. Biosensors hold great promise as a complementary ALE technology, but advancements are needed in their dynamic ranges and saturation points, compatibility across organisms, and evolutionary robustness to 'cheaters' that purge the sensing components, all of which currently limit efficacy in host strains (Williams et al., 2016). Nevertheless, biosensors enable enrichment for traits other than simple growth rate

1 when the selective environment is properly designed (Mahr et al., 2015). Modifications
2 to the ALE environment can also select for complex phenotypes, such as the evolution
3 of multicellularity in a unicellular yeast as a result of predator-induced selection against
4 small or individual cells (Ratcliff et al., 2015). The inherent dependence of 'fitness' on
5 the particulars of the evolutionary environment makes ALE capable of selecting for
6 diverse and novel traits.

7 The growing body of ALE work and the increased throughput of studies driven by
8 automation necessitate bioinformatics pipelines and databases to fully realize its
9 potential as an efficient tool in the strain engineering process. The ability to generate
10 hundreds of relevant clones and populations in any given experiment (which can
11 contain thousands of unique mutations), and the ease and cost-efficiency with which
12 they can be sequenced, makes mutational analysis and data handling non-trivial. In
13 addition, new technologies are enabling increased clarity on genetic alterations, such as
14 long-read sequencing that reveals genomic rearrangements and expansions difficult to
15 discover with shotgun sequencing alone (Pollard et al., 2018). There is a need to
16 coalesce the growing body of studies ($\sim 10^2$), relevant strains ($\sim 10^4$), and mutations
17 ($\sim 10^{5-6}$) derived from ALE to learn the overarching principles and mutational types that
18 drive phenotypic changes. Work towards meeting this challenge has appeared in the
19 form of a database which collates ALE-derived mutations across a variety of species,
20 growth environments, and selection schemes (Phaneuf et al., 2018). Such mutation
21 collections essentially represent "parts lists" for cell engineers (Fig. 3C), and are ripe for
22 computational probing with Big Data techniques that can extract salient evolutionary
23 features. Inclusion of mutations identified in environmental and clinical isolates can also
24 expand this rich source of allelic parts for strain engineering. The grand promise of such
25 collections is that ALE wet lab experiments may not be required to engineer a desirable
26 trait - mutations could be mined directly from a structured database with query tools to
27 isolate alleles which convey desired physiological features.

28 In conclusion, ALE has facilitated a number of strain engineering efforts, and the
29 rapid improvements in complementary technologies leave it poised for accelerated
30 adoption, improved utility, and establishment as an essential method in the metabolic
31 engineer's experimental toolbox. Causal mutations identified in evolved strains serve

both as a way to interpret the biochemical method by which fitness and any associated production or growth-coupled property was increased, and as genetic parts that can be introduced into related strains to induce a desired phenotype; importantly, these mutations are also patentable and can form the basis for intellectual property generation.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank Zachary A. King, Nathan E. Lewis, and John D. Trawick for informative discussions and insights related to the review. Funding for this work was provided by the Novo Nordisk Foundation through the Center for Biosustainability at the Technical University of Denmark under Grant NNF10CC1016517. Funding was also provided by the NIH National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases under Grant no. U01AI124316. TES was supported in part through the National Science Foundation Graduate Research Fellowship (grant DGE1144086).

Supplementary Files

Supplemental Table 1 - A collection and categorization of ALE studies relevant to industrial biotechnology. Excel file .xlsx

Supplemental Figure 1 - Categorization of species, timescales of evolutions studies, and experimental culturing setups used in ALE studies.

References

- Adamo, G.M., Brocca, S., Passolunghi, S., Salvato, B., Lotti, M., 2012. Laboratory evolution of copper tolerant yeast strains. *Microb. Cell Fact.* 11, 1. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1475-2859-11-1>
- Adamo, G.M., Lotti, M., Tamás, M.J., Brocca, S., 2012. Amplification of the CUP1 gene is associated with evolution of copper tolerance in *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*. *Microbiology* 158, 2325–2335. <https://doi.org/10.1099/mic.0.058024-0>

- 1 Aguilar, C., Martínez-Batallar, G., Flores, N., Moreno-Avitia, F., Encarnación, S., Escalante, A.,
2 Bolívar, F., 2018. Analysis of differentially upregulated proteins in ptsHlcr- and rppH-
3 mutants in *Escherichia coli* during an adaptive laboratory evolution experiment. *Appl.*
4 *Microbiol. Biotechnol.* 102, 10193–10208. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00253-018-9397-3>
- 5 Alcántara-Díaz, D., Breña-Valle, M., Serment-Guerrero, J., 2004. Divergent adaptation of
6 *Escherichia coli* to cyclic ultraviolet light exposures. *Mutagenesis* 19, 349–354.
7 <https://doi.org/10.1093/mutage/geh039>
- 8 Almario, M.P., Reyes, L.H., Kao, K.C., 2013. Evolutionary engineering of *Saccharomyces*
9 *cerevisiae* for enhanced tolerance to hydrolysates of lignocellulosic biomass. *Biotechnol.*
10 *Bioeng.* 110, 2616–2623. <https://doi.org/10.1002/bit.24938>
- 11 Alper, H., Jin, Y.-S., Moxley, J.F., Stephanopoulos, G., 2005. Identifying gene targets for the
12 metabolic engineering of lycopene biosynthesis in *Escherichia coli*. *Metab. Eng.* 7, 155–
13 164. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ymben.2004.12.003>
- 14 Araya, C.L., Payen, C., Dunham, M.J., Fields, S., 2010. Whole-genome sequencing of a
15 laboratory-evolved yeast strain. *BMC Genomics* 11, 88. [https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2164-](https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2164-11-88)
16 11-88
- 17 Arnold, F.H., 2018. Directed Evolution: Bringing New Chemistry to Life. *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed*
18 *Engl.* 57, 4143–4148. <https://doi.org/10.1002/anie.201708408>
- 19 Atsumi, S., Wu, T.-Y., Machado, I.M.P., Huang, W.-C., Chen, P.-Y., Pellegrini, M., Liao, J.C.,
20 2010. Evolution, genomic analysis, and reconstruction of isobutanol tolerance in
21 *Escherichia coli*. *Mol. Syst. Biol.* 6, 449. <https://doi.org/10.1038/msb.2010.98>
- 22 Atwood, K.C., Schneider, L.K., Ryan, F.J., 1951. Periodic selection in *Escherichia coli*. *Proc.*
23 *Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* 37, 146–155.
- 24 Avrahami-Moyal, L., Engelberg, D., Wenger, J.W., Sherlock, G., Braun, S., 2012. Turbidostat
25 culture of *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* W303-1A under selective pressure elicited by ethanol
26 selects for mutations in SSD1 and UTH1. *FEMS Yeast Res.* 12, 521–533.
27 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1567-1364.2012.00803.x>
- 28 Bachmann, H., Pronk, J.T., Kleerebezem, M., Teusink, B., 2015. Evolutionary engineering to
29 enhance starter culture performance in food fermentations. *Curr. Opin. Biotechnol.* 32, 1–7.
30 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copbio.2014.09.003>
- 31 Bachmann, H., Starrenburg, M.J.C., Molenaar, D., Kleerebezem, M., van Hylckama Vlieg,
32 J.E.T., 2012. Microbial domestication signatures of *Lactococcus lactis* can be reproduced
33 by experimental evolution. *Genome Res.* 22, 115–124.
34 <https://doi.org/10.1101/gr.121285.111>
- 35 Bailey, S.F., Rodrigue, N., Kassen, R., 2015. The effect of selection environment on the
36 probability of parallel evolution. *Mol. Biol. Evol.* 32, 1436–1448.
37 <https://doi.org/10.1093/molbev/msv033>
- 38 Barrett, R.D.H., Laurent, S., Mallarino, R., Pfeifer, S.P., Xu, C.C.Y., Foll, M., Wakamatsu, K.,
39 Duke-Cohan, J.S., Jensen, J.D., Hoekstra, H.E., 2019. Linking a mutation to survival in wild
40 mice. *Science* 363, 499–504. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aav3824>
- 41 Barrick, J.E., Lenski, R.E., 2013. Genome dynamics during experimental evolution. *Nat. Rev.*
42 *Genet.* 14, 827–839. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nrg3564>
- 43 Barrick, J.E., Yu, D.S., Yoon, S.H., Jeong, H., Oh, T.K., Schneider, D., Lenski, R.E., Kim, J.F.,
44 2009. Genome evolution and adaptation in a long-term experiment with *Escherichia coli*.
45 *Nature* 461, 1243–1247. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature08480>
- 46 Basso, T.O., de Kok, S., Dario, M., do Espírito-Santo, J.C.A., Müller, G., Schlögl, P.S., Silva,
47 C.P., Tonso, A., Daran, J.-M., Gombert, A.K., van Maris, A.J.A., Pronk, J.T., Stambuk,
48 B.U., 2011. Engineering topology and kinetics of sucrose metabolism in *Saccharomyces*
49 *cerevisiae* for improved ethanol yield. *Metab. Eng.* 13, 694–703.
50 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ymben.2011.09.005>
- 51 Baym, M., Lieberman, T.D., Kelsic, E.D., Chait, R., Gross, R., Yelin, I., Kishony, R., 2016.

- 1 Spatiotemporal microbial evolution on antibiotic landscapes. *Science* 353, 1147–1151.
2 <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aag0822>
- 3 Bellissimi, E., van Dijken, J.P., Pronk, J.T., van Maris, A.J.A., 2009. Effects of acetic acid on the
4 kinetics of xylose fermentation by an engineered, xylose-isomerase-based *Saccharomyces*
5 *cerevisiae* strain. *FEMS Yeast Res.* 9, 358–364. [https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1567-](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1567-1364.2009.00487.x)
6 1364.2009.00487.x
- 7 Bennett, A.F., Hughes, B.S., 2009. Microbial experimental evolution. *Am. J. Physiol. Regul.*
8 *Integr. Comp. Physiol.* 297, R17–25. <https://doi.org/10.1152/ajpregu.90562.2008>
- 9 Bittihn, P., Hasty, J., Tsimring, L.S., 2017. Suppression of Beneficial Mutations in Dynamic
10 Microbial Populations. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 118, 028102.
11 <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.118.028102>
- 12 Blaby, I.K., Lyons, B.J., Wroclawska-Hughes, E., Phillips, G.C.F., Pyle, T.P., Chamberlin, S.G.,
13 Benner, S.A., Lyons, T.J., Crécy-Lagard, V. de, Crécy, E. de, 2012. Experimental evolution
14 of a facultative thermophile from a mesophilic ancestor. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* 78, 144–
15 155. <https://doi.org/10.1128/AEM.05773-11>
- 16 Brennan, T.C.R., Williams, T.C., Schulz, B.L., Palfreyman, R.W., Krömer, J.O., Nielsen, L.K.,
17 2015. Evolutionary Engineering Improves Tolerance for Replacement Jet Fuels in
18 *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* 81, 3316–3325.
19 <https://doi.org/10.1128/AEM.04144-14>
- 20 Burgard, A.P., Pharkya, P., Maranas, C.D., 2003. Optknock: a bilevel programming framework
21 for identifying gene knockout strategies for microbial strain optimization. *Biotechnol.*
22 *Bioeng.* 84, 647–657. <https://doi.org/10.1002/bit.10803>
- 23 Cadière, A., Ortiz-Julien, A., Camarasa, C., Dequin, S., 2011. Evolutionary engineered
24 *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* wine yeast strains with increased in vivo flux through the
25 pentose phosphate pathway. *Metab. Eng.* 13, 263–271.
26 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ymben.2011.01.008>
- 27 Cakar, Z.P., Alkim, C., Turanli, B., Tokman, N., Akman, S., Sarikaya, M., Tamerler, C.,
28 Benbadis, L., François, J.M., 2009. Isolation of cobalt hyper-resistant mutants of
29 *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* by in vivo evolutionary engineering approach. *J. Biotechnol.*
30 143, 130–138. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbiotec.2009.06.024>
- 31 Cakar, Z.P., Seker, U.O.S., Tamerler, C., Sonderegger, M., Sauer, U., 2005. Evolutionary
32 engineering of multiple-stress resistant *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*. *FEMS Yeast Res.* 5,
33 569–578. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.femsyr.2004.10.010>
- 34 Carroll, S.M., Marx, C.J., 2013. Evolution after introduction of a novel metabolic pathway
35 consistently leads to restoration of wild-type physiology. *PLoS Genet.* 9, e1003427.
36 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pgen.1003427>
- 37 Caspeta, L., Chen, Y., Ghiaci, P., Feizi, A., Buskov, S., Hallström, B.M., Petranovic, D., Nielsen,
38 J., 2014. Biofuels. Altered sterol composition renders yeast thermotolerant. *Science* 346,
39 75–78. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1258137>
- 40 Chang, S.-L., Lai, H.-Y., Tung, S.-Y., Leu, J.-Y., 2013. Dynamic large-scale chromosomal
41 rearrangements fuel rapid adaptation in yeast populations. *PLoS Genet.* 9, e1003232.
42 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pgen.1003232>
- 43 Chao, R., Mishra, S., Si, T., Zhao, H., 2017. Engineering biological systems using automated
44 biofoundries. *Metab. Eng.* 42, 98–108. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ymben.2017.06.003>
- 45 Charusanti, P., Conrad, T.M., Knight, E.M., Venkataraman, K., Fong, N.L., Xie, B., Gao, Y.,
46 Palsson, B.Ø., 2010. Genetic basis of growth adaptation of *Escherichia coli* after deletion of
47 *pgi*, a major metabolic gene. *PLoS Genet.* 6, e1001186.
48 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pgen.1001186>
- 49 Charusanti, P., Fong, N.L., Nagarajan, H., Pereira, A.R., Li, H.J., Abate, E.A., Su, Y., Gerwick,
50 W.H., Palsson, B.O., 2012. Exploiting adaptive laboratory evolution of *Streptomyces*
51 *clavuligerus* for antibiotic discovery and overproduction. *PLoS One* 7, e33727.

- <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0033727>
- Chin, J.W., Cirino, P.C., 2011. Improved NADPH supply for xylitol production by engineered *Escherichia coli* with glycolytic mutations. *Biotechnol. Prog.* 27, 333–341. <https://doi.org/10.1002/btpr.559>
- Choe, D., Lee, J.H., Yoo, M., Hwang, S., Sung, B.H., Cho, S., Palsson, B., Kim, S.C., Cho, B.-K., 2019. Adaptive laboratory evolution of a genome-reduced *Escherichia coli*. *Nat. Commun.* 10, 935. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-019-08888-6>
- Chu, B.C.H., Lee, H., 2007. Genetic improvement of *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* for xylose fermentation. *Biotechnol. Adv.* 25, 425–441. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biotechadv.2007.04.001>
- Chu, H.Y., Sprouffske, K., Wagner, A., 2018. Assessing the benefits of horizontal gene transfer by laboratory evolution and genome sequencing. *BMC Evol. Biol.* 18, 54. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12862-018-1164-7>
- Clark, J.H., Luque, R., Matharu, A.S., 2012. Green chemistry, biofuels, and biorefinery. *Annu. Rev. Chem. Biomol. Eng.* 3, 183–207. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-chembioeng-062011-081014>
- Conrad, T.M., Frazier, M., Joyce, A.R., Cho, B.-K., Knight, E.M., Lewis, N.E., Landick, R., Palsson, B.Ø., 2010. RNA polymerase mutants found through adaptive evolution reprogram *Escherichia coli* for optimal growth in minimal media. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* 107, 20500–20505. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0911253107>
- Conrad, T.M., Lewis, N.E., Palsson, B.Ø., 2011. Microbial laboratory evolution in the era of genome-scale science. *Mol. Syst. Biol.* 7, 509. <https://doi.org/10.1038/msb.2011.42>
- Cordova, L.T., Lu, J., Cipolla, R.M., Sandoval, N.R., Long, C.P., Antoniewicz, M.R., 2016. Co-utilization of glucose and xylose by evolved *Thermus thermophilus* LC113 strain elucidated by (13)C metabolic flux analysis and whole genome sequencing. *Metab. Eng.* 37, 63–71. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ymben.2016.05.001>
- Couce, A., Caudwell, L. V., Feinauer, C., Hindre, T., Feugeas, J. P., Weigt, M., Lenski, R. E., Schneider, D., Tenaillon, O., 2017. Mutator genomes decay, despite sustained fitness gains, in a long-term experiment with bacteria. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A.* 114, E9026–E9035.
- Csorgo, B., Feher, T., Timar, E., Blattner, F. R., Posfai, G., 2012. Low-mutation-rate, reduced-genome *Escherichia coli*: an improved host for faithful maintenance of engineered genetic constructs. *Microb Cell Fact.* 11, 11.
- Deatherage, D.E., Kepner, J.L., Bennett, A.F., Lenski, R.E., Barrick, J.E., 2017. Specificity of genome evolution in experimental populations of *Escherichia coli* evolved at different temperatures. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* 114, E1904–E1912. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1616132114>
- Dekel, E., Alon, U., 2005. Optimality and evolutionary tuning of the expression level of a protein. *Nature* 436, 588–592. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature03842>
- de Kok, S., Nijkamp, J.F., Oud, B., Roque, F.C., de Ridder, D., Daran, J.-M., Pronk, J.T., van Maris, A.J.A., 2012. Laboratory evolution of new lactate transporter genes in a *jen1Δ* mutant of *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* and their identification as ADY2 alleles by whole-genome resequencing and transcriptome analysis. *FEMS Yeast Res.* <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1567-1364.2012.00787.x>
- de Lorenzo, V., Sekowska, A., Danchin, A., 2015. Chemical reactivity drives spatiotemporal organisation of bacterial metabolism. *FEMS Microbiol. Rev.* 39, 96–119. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1574-6976.12089>
- Deng, Y., Fong, S.S., 2011. Laboratory evolution and multi-platform genome re-sequencing of the cellulolytic actinobacterium *Thermobifida fusca*. *J. Biol. Chem.* 286, 39958–39966. <https://doi.org/10.1074/jbc.M111.239616>
- Dhar, R., Sägesser, R., Weikert, C., Wagner, A., 2013. Yeast adapts to a changing stressful

- environment by evolving cross-protection and anticipatory gene regulation. *Mol. Biol. Evol.* 30, 573–588. <https://doi.org/10.1093/molbev/mss253>
- Dhar, R., Sägesser, R., Weikert, C., Yuan, J., Wagner, A., 2011. Adaptation of *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* to saline stress through laboratory evolution. *J. Evol. Biol.* 24, 1135–1153. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1420-9101.2011.02249.x>
- Dragosits, M., Mattanovich, D., 2013. Adaptive laboratory evolution -- principles and applications for biotechnology. *Microb. Cell Fact.* 12, 64. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1475-2859-12-64>
- Dragosits, M., Mozhayskiy, V., Quinones-Soto, S., Park, J., Tagkopoulos, I., 2013. Evolutionary potential, cross-stress behavior and the genetic basis of acquired stress resistance in *Escherichia coli*. *Mol. Syst. Biol.* 9, 643. <https://doi.org/10.1038/msb.2012.76>
- Dunham, M.J., Badrane, H., Ferea, T., Adams, J., Brown, P.O., Rosenzweig, F., Botstein, D., 2002. Characteristic genome rearrangements in experimental evolution of *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* 99, 16144–16149. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.242624799>
- Ene, I.V., Farrer, R.A., Hirakawa, M.P., Agwamba, K., Cuomo, C.A. Bennett, R.J., 2018. Global analysis of mutations driving microevolution of a heterozygous diploid fungal pathogen. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* 115, E8688-E8697. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1806002115>
- Feichtinger, J., Hernandez, I., Fischer, C., Hanscho, M., Auer, N., Hackl, M., Jadhav, V., Baumann, M., Kreml, P. M., Schmidl, C., Farlik, M., Schuster, M., Merkel, A., Sommer, A., Heath, S., Rico, D., Bock, C., Thallinger, G. G., Borth, N., 2016. Comprehensive genome and epigenome characterization of CHO cells in response to evolutionary pressures and over time. *Biotechnol Bioeng.* 113, 2241-53.
- Feist, A.M., Zielinski, D.C., Orth, J.D., Schellenberger, J., Herrgard, M.J., Palsson, B.Ø., 2010. Model-driven evaluation of the production potential for growth-coupled products of *Escherichia coli*. *Metab. Eng.* 12, 173–186. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ymben.2009.10.003>
- Ferea, T.L., Botstein, D., Brown, P.O., Rosenzweig, R.F., 1999. Systematic changes in gene expression patterns following adaptive evolution in yeast. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* 96, 9721–9726.
- Fernández-Cabezón, L., Cros, A., Nikel, P.I., 2019. Evolutionary Approaches for Engineering Industrially Relevant Phenotypes in Bacterial Cell Factories. *Biotechnol. J.*, <https://doi.org/10.1002/biot.201800439>
- Fletcher, E., Feizi, A., Bisschops, M.M.M., Hallström, B.M., Khoomrung, S., Siewers, V., Nielsen, J., 2017. Evolutionary engineering reveals divergent paths when yeast is adapted to different acidic environments. *Metab. Eng.* 39, 19–28. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ymben.2016.10.010>
- Folk, D.G., Bradley, T.J., 2005. Adaptive evolution in the lab: unique phenotypes in fruit flies comprise a fertile field of study. *Integr. Comp. Biol.* 45, 492–499. <https://doi.org/10.1093/icb/45.3.492>
- Fong, S.S., Burgard, A.P., Herring, C.D., Knight, E.M., Blattner, F.R., Maranas, C.D., Palsson, B.O., 2005a. In silico design and adaptive evolution of *Escherichia coli* for production of lactic acid. *Biotechnol. Bioeng.* 91, 643–648. <https://doi.org/10.1002/bit.20542>
- Fong, S.S., Joyce, A.R., Palsson, B.Ø., 2005b. Parallel adaptive evolution cultures of *Escherichia coli* lead to convergent growth phenotypes with different gene expression states. *Genome Res.* 15, 1365–1372. <https://doi.org/10.1101/gr.3832305>
- Fong, S.S., Palsson, B.Ø., 2004. Metabolic gene-deletion strains of *Escherichia coli* evolve to computationally predicted growth phenotypes. *Nat. Genet.* 36, 1056–1058. <https://doi.org/10.1038/ng1432>
- Fu, W., Guðmundsson, O., Paglia, G., Herjólfsen, G., Andrsson, O.S., Palsson, B.O.,

- 1 Brynjólfsson, S., 2013. Enhancement of carotenoid biosynthesis in the green microalga
2 *Dunaliella salina* with light-emitting diodes and adaptive laboratory evolution. *Appl.*
3 *Microbiol. Biotechnol.* 97, 2395–2403. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00253-012-4502-5>
- 4 Garcia Sanchez, R., Karhumaa, K., Fonseca, C., Sánchez Nogué, V., Almeida, J.R., Larsson,
5 C.U., Bengtsson, O., Bettiga, M., Hahn-Hägerdal, B., Gorwa-Grauslund, M.F., 2010.
6 Improved xylose and arabinose utilization by an industrial recombinant *Saccharomyces*
7 *cerevisiae* strain using evolutionary engineering. *Biotechnol. Biofuels* 3, 13.
8 <https://doi.org/10.1186/1754-6834-3-13>
- 9 González-Ramos, D., Gorter de Vries, A.R., Grijseels, S.S., van Berkum, M.C., Swinnen, S.,
10 van den Broek, M., Nevoigt, E., Daran, J.-M.G., Pronk, J.T., van Maris, A.J.A., 2016. A new
11 laboratory evolution approach to select for constitutive acetic acid tolerance in
12 *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* and identification of causal mutations. *Biotechnol. Biofuels* 9,
13 173. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13068-016-0583-1>
- 14 Goodarzi, H., Bennett, B.D., Amini, S., Reaves, M.L., Hottes, A.K., Rabinowitz, J.D., Tavazoie,
15 S., 2010. Regulatory and metabolic rewiring during laboratory evolution of ethanol
16 tolerance in *E. coli*. *Mol. Syst. Biol.* 6, 378. <https://doi.org/10.1038/msb.2010.33>
- 17 Görke, B., Stülke, J., 2008. Carbon catabolite repression in bacteria: many ways to make the
18 most out of nutrients. *Nat. Rev. Microbiol.* 6, 613–624. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nrmicro1932>
- 19 Grabar, T.B., Zhou, S., Shanmugam, K.T., Yomano, L.P., Ingram, L.O., 2006. Methylglyoxal
20 bypass identified as source of chiral contamination in l(+) and d(-)-lactate fermentations by
21 recombinant *Escherichia coli*. *Biotechnol. Lett.* 28, 1527–1535.
22 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10529-006-9122-7>
- 23 Gresham, D., Dunham, M.J., 2014. The enduring utility of continuous culturing in experimental
24 evolution. *Genomics* 104, 399–405. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ygeno.2014.09.015>
- 25 Guimarães, P.M.R., François, J., Parrou, J.L., Teixeira, J.A., Domingues, L., 2008. Adaptive
26 evolution of a lactose-consuming *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* recombinant. *Appl. Environ.*
27 *Microbiol.* 74, 1748–1756. <https://doi.org/10.1128/AEM.00186-08>
- 28 Guzmán, G.I., Sandberg, T.E., LaCroix, R.A., Nyerges, Á., Papp, H., de Raad, M., King, Z.A.,
29 Hefner, Y., Northen, T.R., Notebaart, R.A., Pál, C., Palsson, B.O., Papp, B., Feist, A.M.,
30 2019. Enzyme promiscuity shapes adaptation to novel growth substrates. *Mol. Syst. Biol.*
31 15, e8462. <https://doi.org/10.1525/msb.20188462>
- 32 Haft, R.J.F., Keating, D.H., Schwaegler, T., Schwalbach, M.S., Vinokur, J., Tremaine, M.,
33 Peters, J.M., Kotlajich, M.V., Pohlmann, E.L., Ong, I.M., Grass, J.A., Kiley, P.J., Landick,
34 R., 2014. Correcting direct effects of ethanol on translation and transcription machinery
35 confers ethanol tolerance in bacteria. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* 111, E2576–85.
36 <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1401853111>
- 37 Hansen, A.S.L., Lennen, R.M., Sonnenschein, N., Herrgård, M.J., 2017. Systems biology
38 solutions for biochemical production challenges. *Curr. Opin. Biotechnol.* 45, 85–91.
39 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copbio.2016.11.018>
- 40 Hawkins, G.M., Doran-Peterson, J., 2011. A strain of *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* evolved for
41 fermentation of lignocellulosic biomass displays improved growth and fermentative ability in
42 high solids concentrations and in the presence of inhibitory compounds. *Biotechnol.*
43 *Biofuels* 4, 49. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1754-6834-4-49>
- 44 Heer, D., Sauer, U., 2008. Identification of furfural as a key toxin in lignocellulosic hydrolysates
45 and evolution of a tolerant yeast strain. *Microb. Biotechnol.* 1, 497–506.
46 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1751-7915.2008.00050.x>
- 47 Henson, W.R., Campbell, T., DeLorenzo, D.M., Gao, Y., Berla, B., Kim, S.J., Foston, M., Moon,
48 T.S., Dantas, G., 2018. Multi-omic elucidation of aromatic catabolism in adaptively evolved
49 *Rhodococcus opacus*. *Metab. Eng.* 49, 69–83. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ymben.2018.06.009>
- 50 Herring, C.D., Raghunathan, A., Honisch, C., Patel, T., Applebee, M.K., Joyce, A.R., Albert,
51 T.J., Blattner, F.R., van den Boom, D., Cantor, C.R., Palsson, B.Ø., 2006. Comparative

- genome sequencing of *Escherichia coli* allows observation of bacterial evolution on a laboratory timescale. *Nat. Genet.* 38, 1406–1412. <https://doi.org/10.1038/ng1906>
- Hindré, T., Knibbe, C., Beslon, G., Schneider, D., 2012. New insights into bacterial adaptation through in vivo and in silico experimental evolution. *Nat. Rev. Microbiol.* 10, 352–365. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nrmicro2750>
- Hong, K.-K., Vongsangnak, W., Vemuri, G.N., Nielsen, J., 2011. Unravelling evolutionary strategies of yeast for improving galactose utilization through integrated systems level analysis. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* 108, 12179–12184. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1103219108>
- Ho, P.-W., Swinnen, S., Duitama, J., Nevoigt, E., 2017. The sole introduction of two single-point mutations establishes glycerol utilization in *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* CEN.PK derivatives. *Biotechnol. Biofuels* 10, 10. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13068-016-0696-6>
- Horinouchi, T., Minamoto, T., Suzuki, S., Shimizu, H., Furusawa, C., 2014. Development of an automated culture system for laboratory evolution. *J. Lab. Autom.* 19, 478–482. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2211068214521417>
- Horinouchi, T., Tamaoka, K., Furusawa, C., Ono, N., Suzuki, S., Hirasawa, T., Yomo, T., Shimizu, H., 2010. Transcriptome analysis of parallel-evolved *Escherichia coli* strains under ethanol stress. *BMC Genomics* 11, 579. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2164-11-579>
- Hua, Q., Joyce, A.R., Palsson, B.Ø., Fong, S.S., 2007. Metabolic characterization of *Escherichia coli* strains adapted to growth on lactate. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* 73, 4639–4647. <https://doi.org/10.1128/AEM.00527-07>
- Hughes, D., Andersson, D.I., 2015. Evolutionary consequences of drug resistance: shared principles across diverse targets and organisms. *Nat. Rev. Genet.* 16, 459–471. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nrg3922>
- Hutchison, C.A., 3rd, Chuang, R.-Y., Noskov, V.N., Assad-Garcia, N., Deerinck, T.J., Ellisman, M.H., Gill, J., Kannan, K., Karas, B.J., Ma, L., Pelletier, J.F., Qi, Z.-Q., Richter, R.A., Strychalski, E.A., Sun, L., Suzuki, Y., Tsvetanova, B., Wise, K.S., Smith, H.O., Glass, J.I., Merryman, C., Gibson, D.G., Venter, J.C., 2016. Design and synthesis of a minimal bacterial genome. *Science* 351, aad6253. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aad6253>
- Ibarra, R.U., Edwards, J.S., Palsson, B.O., 2002. *Escherichia coli* K-12 undergoes adaptive evolution to achieve in silico predicted optimal growth. *Nature* 420, 186–189. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature01149>
- Ingram, L.O., Doran, J.B., 1995. Conversion of cellulosic materials to ethanol. *FEMS Microbiol. Rev.* 16, 235–241. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0168-6445\(94\)00083-B](https://doi.org/10.1016/0168-6445(94)00083-B)
- Jansen, M.L.A., Daran-Lapujade, P., de Winde, J.H., Piper, M.D.W., Pronk, J.T., 2004. Prolonged maltose-limited cultivation of *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* selects for cells with improved maltose affinity and hypersensitivity. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* 70, 1956–1963.
- Jansen, M.L.A., Diderich, J.A., Mashego, M., Hassane, A., de Winde, J.H., Daran-Lapujade, P., Pronk, J.T., 2005. Prolonged selection in aerobic, glucose-limited chemostat cultures of *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* causes a partial loss of glycolytic capacity. *Microbiology* 151, 1657–1669. <https://doi.org/10.1099/mic.0.27577-0>
- Jantama, K., Haupt, M.J., Svoronos, S.A., Zhang, X., Moore, J.C., Shanmugam, K.T., Ingram, L.O., 2008. Combining metabolic engineering and metabolic evolution to develop nonrecombinant strains of *Escherichia coli* C that produce succinate and malate. *Biotechnol. Bioeng.* 99, 1140–1153. <https://doi.org/10.1002/bit.21694>
- Jensen, K., Broeken, V., Lærke Hansen, A.S., Sonnenschein, N., Herrgård, M.J., 2019. OptCouple: Joint simulation of gene knockouts, insertions and medium modifications for prediction of growth-coupled strain designs. *Metabolic Engineering Communications* e00087. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mec.2019.e00087>
- Jiang, L., Li, S., Hu, Y., Xu, Q., Huang, H., 2012. Adaptive evolution for fast growth on glucose and the effects on the regulation of glucose transport system in *Clostridium tyrobutyricum*.

- Biotechnol. Bioeng. 109, 708–718. <https://doi.org/10.1002/bit.23346>
- Jiang, L.-Y., Chen, S.-G., Zhang, Y.-Y., Liu, J.-Z., 2013. Metabolic evolution of *Corynebacterium glutamicum* for increased production of L-ornithine. BMC Biotechnol. 13, 47. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1472-6750-13-47>
- Ji, X.-J., Huang, H., Ouyang, P.-K., 2011. Microbial 2,3-butanediol production: a state-of-the-art review. Biotechnol. Adv. 29, 351–364. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biotechadv.2011.01.007>
- Jung, Y.H., Kim, S., Yang, J., Seo, J.-H., Kim, K.H., 2017. Intracellular metabolite profiling of *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* evolved under furfural. Microb. Biotechnol. 10, 395–404. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1751-7915.12465>
- Kao, K.C., Sherlock, G., 2008. Molecular characterization of clonal interference during adaptive evolution in asexual populations of *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*. Nat. Genet. 40, 1499–1504. <https://doi.org/10.1038/ng.280>
- Kawecki, T.J., Lenski, R.E., Ebert, D., Hollis, B., Olivieri, I., Whitlock, M.C., 2012. Experimental evolution. Trends Ecol. Evol. 27, 547–560. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2012.06.001>
- Kildegard, K.R., Hallström, B.M., Blicher, T.H., Sonnenschein, N., Jensen, N.B., Sherstyk, S., Harrison, S.J., Maury, J., Herrgård, M.J., Juncker, A.S., Forster, J., Nielsen, J., Borodina, I., 2014. Evolution reveals a glutathione-dependent mechanism of 3-hydroxypropionic acid tolerance. Metab. Eng. 26, 57–66. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ymben.2014.09.004>
- Kim, S.R., Ha, S.-J., Kong, I.I., Jin, Y.-S., 2012. High expression of XYL2 coding for xylitol dehydrogenase is necessary for efficient xylose fermentation by engineered *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*. Metab. Eng. 14, 336–343. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ymben.2012.04.001>
- King, Z.A., O'Brien, E.J., Feist, A.M., Palsson, B.O., 2017. Literature mining supports a next-generation modeling approach to predict cellular byproduct secretion. Metab. Eng. 39, 220–227. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ymben.2016.12.004>
- Klamt, S., Mahadevan, R., 2015. On the feasibility of growth-coupled product synthesis in microbial strains. Metab. Eng. 30, 166–178. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ymben.2015.05.006>
- Klimacek, M., Kirl, E., Krahulec, S., Longus, K., Novy, V., Nidetzky, B., 2014. Stepwise metabolic adaption from pure metabolization to balanced anaerobic growth on xylose explored for recombinant *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*. Microb. Cell Fact. 13, 37. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1475-2859-13-37>
- Koppram, R., Albers, E., Olsson, L., 2012. Evolutionary engineering strategies to enhance tolerance of xylose utilizing recombinant yeast to inhibitors derived from spruce biomass. Biotechnol. Biofuels 5, 32. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1754-6834-5-32>
- Kuyper, M., Toirkens, M.J., Diderich, J.A., Winkler, A.A., van Dijken, J.P., Pronk, J.T., 2005. Evolutionary engineering of mixed-sugar utilization by a xylose-fermenting *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* strain. FEMS Yeast Res. 5, 925–934. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.femsyr.2005.04.004>
- Kuyper, M., Winkler, A.A., van Dijken, J.P., Pronk, J.T., 2004. Minimal metabolic engineering of *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* for efficient anaerobic xylose fermentation: a proof of principle. FEMS Yeast Res. 4, 655–664. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.femsyr.2004.01.003>
- LaCroix, R.A., Palsson, B.O., Feist, A.M., 2017. A Model for Designing Adaptive Laboratory Evolution Experiments. Appl. Environ. Microbiol. 83. <https://doi.org/10.1128/AEM.03115-16>
- LaCroix, R.A., Sandberg, T.E., O'Brien, E.J., Utrilla, J., Ebrahim, A., Guzman, G.I., Szubin, R., Palsson, B.O., Feist, A.M., 2014. Discovery of key mutations enabling rapid growth of *Escherichia coli* K-12 MG1655 on glucose minimal media using adaptive laboratory evolution. Appl. Environ. Microbiol. <https://doi.org/10.1128/AEM.02246-14>
- Latif, H., Sahin, M., Tarasova, J., Tarasova, Y., Portnoy, V.A., Nogales, J., Zengler, K., 2015. Adaptive Evolution of *Thermotoga maritima* Reveals Plasticity of the ABC Transporter Network. Appl. Environ. Microbiol. 81, 5477–5485. <https://doi.org/10.1128/AEM.01365-15>
- Lauer, S., Avecilla, G., Spealman, P., Sethia, G., Brandt, N., Levy, S.F., Gresham, D., 2018.

- 1 Single-cell copy number variant detection reveals the dynamics and diversity of adaptation.
- 2 PLoS Biol. 16, e3000069. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.3000069>
- 3 Lee, D.-H., Feist, A.M., Barrett, C.L., Palsson, B.Ø., 2011. Cumulative number of cell divisions
- 4 as a meaningful timescale for adaptive laboratory evolution of *Escherichia coli*. PLoS One
- 5 6, e26172. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0026172>
- 6 Lee, D.-H., Palsson, B.Ø., 2010. Adaptive evolution of *Escherichia coli* K-12 MG1655 during
- 7 growth on a Nonnative carbon source, L-1,2-propanediol. Appl. Environ. Microbiol. 76,
- 8 4158–4168. <https://doi.org/10.1128/AEM.00373-10>
- 9 Lee, J.-Y., Seo, J., Kim, E.-S., Lee, H.-S., Kim, P., 2013. Adaptive evolution of *Corynebacterium*
- 10 *glutamicum* resistant to oxidative stress and its global gene expression profiling.
- 11 Biotechnol. Lett. 35, 709–717. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10529-012-1135-9>
- 12 Lee, S.H., Kim, M.-S., Lee, J.-H., Kim, T.W., Bae, S.S., Lee, S.-M., Jung, H.C., Yang, T.-J.,
- 13 Choi, A.R., Cho, Y.-J., Lee, J.-H., Kwon, K.K., Lee, H.S., Kang, S.G., 2016. Adaptive
- 14 engineering of a hyperthermophilic archaeon on CO and discovering the underlying
- 15 mechanism by multi-omics analysis. Sci. Rep. 6, 22896. <https://doi.org/10.1038/srep22896>
- 16 Lee, S.-M., Jellison, T., Alper, H.S., 2014. Systematic and evolutionary engineering of a xylose
- 17 isomerase-based pathway in *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* for efficient conversion yields.
- 18 Biotechnol. Biofuels 7, 122. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13068-014-0122-x>
- 19 Lee, S.Y., Kim, H.U., 2015. Systems strategies for developing industrial microbial strains. Nat.
- 20 Biotechnol. 33, 1061. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nbt.3365>
- 21 Lenski, R.E., Mongold, J.A., Sniegowski, P.D., Travisano, M., Vasi, F., Gerrish, P.J., Schmidt,
- 22 T.M., 1998. Evolution of competitive fitness in experimental populations of *E. coli*: what
- 23 makes one genotype a better competitor than another? Antonie Van Leeuwenhoek 73, 35–
- 24 47.
- 25 Lenski, R.E., Rose, M.R., Simpson, S.C., Tadler, S.C., 1991. Long-Term Experimental Evolution
- 26 in *Escherichia coli*. I. Adaptation and Divergence During 2,000 Generations. Am. Nat. 138,
- 27 1315–1341. <https://doi.org/10.1086/285289>
- 28 Lenski, R.E., Travisano, M., 1994. Dynamics of adaptation and diversification: a 10,000-
- 29 generation experiment with bacterial populations. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A. 91, 6808–
- 30 6814.
- 31 Lenski, R.E., Wiser, M.J., Ribbeck, N., Blount, Z.D., Nahum, J.R., Morris, J.J., Zaman, L., Turner,
- 32 C.B., Wade, B.D., Maddamsetti, R., Burmeister, A.R., Baird, E.J., Bundy, J., Grant, N.A.,
- 33 Card, K.J., Rowles, M., Weatherspoon, K., Papoulis, S.E., Sullivan, R., Clark, C., Mulka,
- 34 J.S., Hajela, N., 2015. Sustained fitness gains and variability in fitness trajectories in the
- 35 long-term evolution experiment with *Escherichia coli*. Proc. Biol. Sci. 282, 20152292.
- 36 <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2015.2292>
- 37 Leon, D., D'Alton, S., Quandt, E. M., Barrick, J. E., 2018. Innovation in an *E. coli* evolution
- 38 experiment is contingent on maintaining adaptive potential until competition subsides.
- 39 PLoS Genet. 14, e1007348.
- 40 Linville, J.L., Rodriguez, M., Jr, Land, M., Syed, M.H., Engle, N.L., Tschaplinski, T.J., Mielenz,
- 41 J.R., Cox, C.D., 2013. Industrial robustness: understanding the mechanism of tolerance for
- 42 the *Populus* hydrolysate-tolerant mutant strain of *Clostridium thermocellum*. PLoS One 8,
- 43 e78829. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0078829>
- 44 Lin, Y., Tanaka, S., 2006. Ethanol fermentation from biomass resources: current state and
- 45 prospects. Appl. Microbiol. Biotechnol. 69, 627–642. [https://doi.org/10.1007/s00253-005-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00253-005-0229-x)
- 46 [0229-x](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00253-005-0229-x)
- 47 Lind, P.A., Farr, A.D., Rainey, P.B., 2017. Evolutionary convergence in experimental
- 48 *Pseudomonas* populations. ISME J. 11, 589–600. <https://doi.org/10.1038/ismej.2016.157>
- 49 Liu, D., Evans, T., Zhang, F., 2015. Applications and advances of metabolite biosensors for
- 50 metabolic engineering. Metab. Eng. 31, 35–43.
- 51 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ymben.2015.06.008>

- 1 Liu, R., Bassalo, M.C., Zeitoun, R.I., Gill, R.T., 2015. Genome scale engineering techniques for
2 metabolic engineering. *Metab. Eng.* 32, 143–154.
3 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ymben.2015.09.013>
- 4 Lloyd, C.J., King, Z.A., Sandberg, T.E., Hefner, Y., Olson, C.A., Phaneuf, P.V., O'Brien, E.J.,
5 Sanders, J.G., Salido, R.A., Sanders, K., Brennan, C., Humphrey, G., Knight, R., Feist,
6 A.M., 2019. The genetic basis for adaptation of model-designed syntrophic co-cultures.
7 *PLoS Comput. Biol.* 15, e1006213. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pcbi.1006213>
- 8 Long, A., Liti, G., Luptak, A., Tenaillon, O., 2015. Elucidating the molecular architecture of
9 adaptation via evolve and resequence experiments. *Nat. Rev. Genet.* 16, 567–582.
10 <https://doi.org/10.1038/nrg3937>
- 11 Long, C.P., Antoniewicz, M.R., 2018. How adaptive evolution reshapes metabolism to improve
12 fitness: recent advances and future outlook. *Curr. Opin. Chem. Eng.* 22, 209–215.
13 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.coche.2018.11.001>
- 14 Long, C.P., Gonzalez, J.E., Feist, A.M., Palsson, B.O., Antoniewicz, M.R., 2018. Dissecting the
15 genetic and metabolic mechanisms of adaptation to the knockout of a major metabolic
16 enzyme in *Escherichia coli*. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* 115, 222–227.
17 <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1716056115>
- 18 Long, C.P., Gonzalez, J.E., Feist, A.M., Palsson, B.O., Antoniewicz, M.R., 2017. Fast growth
19 phenotype of *E. coli* K-12 from adaptive laboratory evolution does not require intracellular
20 flux rewiring. *Metab. Eng.* 44, 100–107. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ymben.2017.09.012>
- 21 Luan, G., Cai, Z., Li, Y., Ma, Y., 2013. Genome replication engineering assisted continuous
22 evolution (GREACE) to improve microbial tolerance for biofuels production. *Biotechnol.*
23 *Biofuels* 6, 137. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1754-6834-6-137>
- 24 Lu, L., Wei, L., Zhu, K., Wei, D., Hua, Q., 2012. Combining metabolic engineering and adaptive
25 evolution to enhance the production of dihydroxyacetone from glycerol by *Gluconobacter*
26 *oxydans* in a low-cost way. *Bioresour. Technol.* 117, 317–324.
27 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biortech.2012.03.013>
- 28 Luo, H., Hansen, A.S.L., Yang, L., Schneider, K., Kristensen, M., Christensen, U., Christensen,
29 H.B., Du, B., Özdemir, E., Feist, A.M., Keasling, J.D., Jensen, M.K., Herrgård, M.J.,
30 Palsson, B.O., 2019. Coupling S-adenosylmethionine-dependent methylation to growth:
31 Design and uses. *PLoS Biol.* 17, e2007050. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.2007050>
- 32 Maddamsetti, R., Lenski, R.E., Barrick, J.E., 2015. Adaptation, Clonal Interference, and
33 Frequency-Dependent Interactions in a Long-Term Evolution Experiment with *Escherichia*
34 *coli*. *Genetics* 200, 619–631. <https://doi.org/10.1534/genetics.115.176677>
- 35 Mahr, R., Gätgens, C., Gätgens, J., Polen, T., Kalinowski, J., Frunzke, J., 2015. Biosensor-
36 driven adaptive laboratory evolution of L-valine production in *Corynebacterium glutamicum*.
37 *Metab. Eng.* 32, 184–194. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ymben.2015.09.017>
- 38 Mans, R., Daran, J.-M.G., Pronk, J.T., 2018. Under pressure: evolutionary engineering of yeast
39 strains for improved performance in fuels and chemicals production. *Curr. Opin.*
40 *Biotechnol.* 50, 47–56. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copbio.2017.10.011>
- 41 Marques, W.L., Mans, R., Marella, E.R., Cordeiro, R.L., van den Broek, M., Daran, J.-M.G.,
42 Pronk, J.T., Gombert, A.K., van Maris, A.J.A., 2017. Elimination of sucrose transport and
43 hydrolysis in *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*: a platform strain for engineering sucrose
44 metabolism. *FEMS Yeast Res.* 17. <https://doi.org/10.1093/femsyr/fox006>
- 45 McCarthy, S., Ai, C., Blum, P., 2018. Enhancement of *Metallosphaera sedula* Bioleaching by
46 Targeted Recombination and Adaptive Laboratory Evolution. *Adv. Appl. Microbiol.* 104,
47 135–165. <https://doi.org/10.1016/bs.aambs.2018.03.002>
- 48 McCloskey, D., Xu, S., Sandberg, T.E., Brunk, E., Hefner, Y., Szubin, R., Feist, A.M., Palsson,
49 B.O., 2018. Evolution of gene knockout strains of *E. coli* reveal regulatory architectures
50 governed by metabolism. *Nat. Commun.* 9, 3796. [https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-018-](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-018-06219-9)
51 [06219-9](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-018-06219-9)

- 1 Merico, A., Ragni, E., Galafassi, S., Popolo, L., Compagno, C., 2011. Generation of an evolved
2 *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* strain with a high freeze tolerance and an improved ability to
3 grow on glycerol. *J. Ind. Microbiol. Biotechnol.* 38, 1037–1044.
4 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10295-010-0878-3>
- 5 Minty, J.J., Lesnfsky, A.A., Lin, F., Chen, Y., Zaroff, T.A., Veloso, A.B., Xie, B., McConnell,
6 C.A., Ward, R.J., Schwartz, D.R., Rouillard, J.-M., Gao, Y., Gulari, E., Lin, X.N., 2011.
7 Evolution combined with genomic study elucidates genetic bases of isobutanol tolerance in
8 *Escherichia coli*. *Microb. Cell Fact.* 10, 18. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1475-2859-10-18>
- 9 Mohamed, E.T., Wang, S., Lennen, R.M., Herrgård, M.J., Simmons, B.A., Singer, S.W., Feist,
10 A.M., 2017. Generation of a platform strain for ionic liquid tolerance using adaptive
11 laboratory evolution. *Microb. Cell Fact.* 16, 204. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12934-017-0819-1>
- 12 Moser, J.W., Prielhofer, R., Gerner, S.M., Graf, A.B., Wilson, I.B.H., Mattanovich, D., Dragosits,
13 M., 2017. Implications of evolutionary engineering for growth and recombinant protein
14 production in methanol-based growth media in the yeast *Pichia pastoris*. *Microb. Cell Fact.*
15 16, 49. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12934-017-0661-5>
- 16 Moysés, D.N., Reis, V.C.B., de Almeida, J.R.M., de Moraes, L.M.P., Torres, F.A.G., 2016.
17 Xylose Fermentation by *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*: Challenges and Prospects. *Int. J. Mol.*
18 *Sci.* 17, 207. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijms17030207>
- 19 Mundhada, H., Schneider, K., Christensen, H.B., Nielsen, A.T., 2016. Engineering of high yield
20 production of L-serine in *Escherichia coli*. *Biotechnol. Bioeng.* 113, 807–816.
- 21 Mundhada, H., Seoane, J.M., Schneider, K., Koza, A., Christensen, H.B., Klein, T., Phaneuf,
22 P.V., Herrgård, M., Feist, A.M., Nielsen, A.T., 2017. Increased production of L-serine in
23 *Escherichia coli* through Adaptive Laboratory Evolution. *Metab. Eng.* 39, 141–150.
24 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ymben.2016.11.008>
- 25 Notebaart, R.A., Kintsjes, B., Feist, A.M., Papp, B., 2018. Underground metabolism: network-
26 level perspective and biotechnological potential. *Curr. Opin. Biotechnol.* 49, 108–114.
27 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copbio.2017.07.015>
- 28 Notley-McRobb, L., Ferenci, T., 1999. The generation of multiple co-existing mal-regulatory
29 mutations through polygenic evolution in glucose-limited populations of *Escherichia coli*.
30 *Environ. Microbiol.* 1, 45–52.
- 31 Novick, A., Szilard, L., 1950. Experiments with the Chemostat on spontaneous mutations of
32 bacteria. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* 36, 708–719.
- 33 Novy, V., Krahulec, S., Wegleiter, M., Müller, G., Longus, K., Klimacek, M., Nidetzky, B., 2014.
34 Process intensification through microbial strain evolution: mixed glucose-xylose
35 fermentation in wheat straw hydrolyzates by three generations of recombinant
36 *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*. *Biotechnol. Biofuels* 7, 49. [https://doi.org/10.1186/1754-6834-](https://doi.org/10.1186/1754-6834-7-49)
37 7-49
- 38 Ochoa-Estopier, A., Lesage, J., Gorret, N., Guillouet, S.E., 2011. Kinetic analysis of a
39 *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* strain adapted for improved growth on glycerol: Implications for
40 the development of yeast bioprocesses on glycerol. *Bioresour. Technol.* 102, 1521–1527.
41 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biortech.2010.08.003>
- 42 Otero, J.M., Cimini, D., Patil, K.R., Poulsen, S.G., Olsson, L., Nielsen, J., 2013. Industrial
43 systems biology of *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* enables novel succinic acid cell factory.
44 *PLoS One* 8, e54144. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0054144>
- 45 Oud, B., Guadalupe-Medina, V., Nijkamp, J.F., de Ridder, D., Pronk, J.T., van Maris, A.J.A.,
46 Daran, J.-M., 2013. Genome duplication and mutations in ACE2 cause multicellular, fast-
47 sedimenting phenotypes in evolved *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S.*
48 *A.* 110, E4223–31. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1305949110>
- 49 Packer, M.S., Liu, D.R., 2015. Methods for the directed evolution of proteins. *Nat. Rev. Genet.*
50 16, 379–94. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nrg3927>
- 51 Palmer, A.C., Kishony, R., 2013. Understanding, predicting and manipulating the genotypic

- evolution of antibiotic resistance. *Nat. Rev. Genet.* 14, 243–248.
<https://doi.org/10.1038/nrg3351>
- Papapetridis, I., Verhoeven, M.D., Wiersma, S.J., Goudriaan, M., van Maris, A.J.A., Pronk, J.T., 2018. Laboratory evolution for forced glucose-xylose co-consumption enables identification of mutations that improve mixed-sugar fermentation by xylose-fermenting *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*. *FEMS Yeast Res.* 18. <https://doi.org/10.1093/femsyr/foy056>
- Papp, B., Notebaart, R.A., Pál, C., 2011. Systems-biology approaches for predicting genomic evolution. *Nat. Rev. Genet.* 12, 591–602. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nrg3033>
- Peabody, G.L., Winkler, J., Kao, K.C., 2014. Tools for developing tolerance to toxic chemicals in microbial systems and perspectives on moving the field forward and into the industrial setting. *Curr. Opin. Chem. Eng.* 6, 9–17. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.coche.2014.08.001>
- Peabody, G., Winkler, J., Fountain, W., Castro, D.A., Leiva-Aravena, E., Kao, K.C., 2016. Benefits of a Recombination-Proficient *Escherichia coli* System for Adaptive Laboratory Evolution. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* 82, 6736–6747. <https://doi.org/10.1128/AEM.01850-16>
- Pereira, S.R., Sánchez I Nogué, V., Frazão, C.J.R., Serafim, L.S., Gorwa-Grauslund, M.F., Xavier, A.M.R.B., 2015. Adaptation of *Scheffersomyces stipitis* to hardwood spent sulfite liquor by evolutionary engineering. *Biotechnol. Biofuels* 8, 50.
<https://doi.org/10.1186/s13068-015-0234-y>
- Pfeifer, E., Gätgens, C., Polen, T., Frunzke, J., 2017. Adaptive laboratory evolution of *Corynebacterium glutamicum* towards higher growth rates on glucose minimal medium. *Sci. Rep.* 7, 16780. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-017-17014-9>
- Phaneuf, P.V., Gosting, D., Palsson, B., Feist, A., 2018. ALEdb 1.0: A Database of Mutations from Adaptive Laboratory Evolution. *bioRxiv*. <https://doi.org/10.1101/320747>
- Pharkya, P., Burgard, A.P., Maranas, C.D., 2004. OptStrain: a computational framework for redesign of microbial production systems. *Genome Res.* 14, 2367–2376.
<https://doi.org/10.1101/gr.2872004>
- Plácido, J., Capareda, S., 2016. Conversion of residues and by-products from the biodiesel industry into value-added products. *Bioresources and Bioprocessing* 3, 23.
<https://doi.org/10.1186/s40643-016-0100-1>
- Pollard, M.O., Gurdasani, D., Mentzer, A.J., Porter, T., Sandhu, M.S., 2018. Long reads: their purpose and place. *Hum. Mol. Genet.* 27, R234–R241. <https://doi.org/10.1093/hmg/ddy177>
- Pontrelli, S., Fricke, R.C.B., Sakurai, S.S.M., Putri, S.P., Fitz-Gibbon, S., Chung, M., Wu, H.-Y., Chen, Y.-J., Pellegrini, M., Fukusaki, E., Liao, J.C., 2018. Directed strain evolution restructures metabolism for 1-butanol production in minimal media. *Metab. Eng.* 49, 153–163. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ymben.2018.08.004>
- Portnoy, V.A., Bezdan, D., Zengler, K., 2011/8. Adaptive laboratory evolution — harnessing the power of biology for metabolic engineering. *Curr. Opin. Biotechnol.* 22, 590–594.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copbio.2011.03.007>
- Qin, D., Hu, Y., Cheng, J., Wang, N., Li, S., Wang, D., 2016. An auto-inducible *Escherichia coli* strain obtained by adaptive laboratory evolution for fatty acid synthesis from ionic liquid-treated bamboo hydrolysate. *Bioresour. Technol.* 221, 375–384.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biortech.2016.09.024>
- Qi, Y., Liu, H., Chen, X., Liu, L., 2019. Engineering microbial membranes to increase stress tolerance of industrial strains. *Metab. Eng.* 53, 24–34.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ymben.2018.12.010>
- Quan, S., Ray, J.C.J., Kwota, Z., Duong, T., Balázsi, G., Cooper, T.F., Monds, R.D., 2012. Adaptive evolution of the lactose utilization network in experimentally evolved populations of *Escherichia coli*. *PLoS Genet.* 8, e1002444.
<https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pgen.1002444>
- Rabbers, I., van Heerden, J.H., Nordholt, N., Bachmann, H., Teusink, B., Bruggeman, F.J., 2015. Metabolism at evolutionary optimal States. *Metabolites* 5, 311–343.

- <https://doi.org/10.3390/metabo5020311>
- Radek, A., Tenhaef, N., Müller, M.F., Brüsseler, C., Wiechert, W., Marienhagen, J., Polen, T., Noack, S., 2017. Miniaturized and automated adaptive laboratory evolution: Evolving *Corynebacterium glutamicum* towards an improved d-xylose utilization. *Bioresour. Technol.* 245, 1377–1385. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biortech.2017.05.055>
- Rajaraman, E., Agarwal, A., Crigler, J., Seipelt-Thiemann, R., Altman, E., Eiteman, M.A., 2016. Transcriptional analysis and adaptive evolution of *Escherichia coli* strains growing on acetate. *Appl. Microbiol. Biotechnol.* 100, 7777–7785. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00253-016-7724-0>
- Rao, V.S.H., Rao, P.R.S., 2004. Global stability in chemostat models involving time delays and wall growth. *Nonlinear Anal. Real World Appl.* 5, 141–158. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1468-1218\(03\)00022-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1468-1218(03)00022-1)
- Ratcliff, W.C., Fankhauser, J.D., Rogers, D.W., Greig, D., Travisano, M., 2015. Origins of multicellular evolvability in snowflake yeast. *Nat. Commun.* 6, 6102. <https://doi.org/10.1038/ncomms7102>
- Remigi, P., Masson-Boivin, C., Rocha, E.P.C., 2019. Experimental Evolution as a Tool to Investigate Natural Processes and Molecular Functions. *Trends Microbiol.* <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tim.2019.02.003>
- Reyes, L.H., Abdelaal, A.S., Kao, K.C., 2013. Genetic determinants for n-butanol tolerance in evolved *Escherichia coli* mutants: cross adaptation and antagonistic pleiotropy between n-butanol and other stressors. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* 79, 5313–5320. <https://doi.org/10.1128/AEM.01703-13>
- Reyes, L.H., Almario, M.P., Winkler, J., Orozco, M.M., Kao, K.C., 2012. Visualizing evolution in real time to determine the molecular mechanisms of n-butanol tolerance in *Escherichia coli*. *Metab. Eng.* 14, 579–590. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ymben.2012.05.002>
- Reyes, L.H., Gomez, J.M., Kao, K.C., 2014. Improving carotenoids production in yeast via adaptive laboratory evolution. *Metab. Eng.* 21, 26–33. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ymben.2013.11.002>
- Riehle, M.M., Bennett, A.F., Lenski, R.E., Long, A.D., 2003. Evolutionary changes in heat-inducible gene expression in lines of *Escherichia coli* adapted to high temperature. *Physiol. Genomics* 14, 47–58. <https://doi.org/10.1152/physiolgenomics.00034.2002>
- Rodriguez-Verdugo, A., Carrillo-Cisneros, D., Gonzalez-Gonzalez, A., Gaut, B.S., Bennett, A.F., 2014. Different tradeoffs result from alternate genetic adaptations to a common environment. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* 111, 12121–12126. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1406886111>
- Rotem, A., Serohijos, A., Chang, C., Wolfe, J., Fischer, A., Mehoke, T., Zhang, H., Tao, Y., Ung, L., Choi, J.-M., Kolawole, A., Koehler, S., Wu, S., Thielen, P., Cui, N., Demirev, P., Giacobbi, N., Julian, T., Schwab, K., Lin, J., Smith, T., Pipas, J., Wobus, C., Feldman, A., Weitz, D., Shakhnovich, E., 2016. Tuning the course of evolution on the biophysical fitness landscape of an RNA virus. *bioRxiv*. <https://doi.org/10.1101/090258>
- Royce, L.A., Yoon, J.M., Chen, Y., Rickenbach, E., Shanks, J.V., Jarboe, L.R., 2015. Evolution for exogenous octanoic acid tolerance improves carboxylic acid production and membrane integrity. *Metab. Eng.* 29, 180–188. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ymben.2015.03.014>
- Rozen, D.E., Philippe, N., Arjan de Visser, J., Lenski, R.E., Schneider, D., 2009. Death and cannibalism in a seasonal environment facilitate bacterial coexistence. *Ecol. Lett.* 12, 34–44. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1461-0248.2008.01257.x>
- Rudolph, B., Gebendorfer, K.M., Buchner, J., Winter, J., 2010. Evolution of *Escherichia coli* for growth at high temperatures. *J. Biol. Chem.* 285, 19029–19034. <https://doi.org/10.1074/jbc.M110.103374>
- Rugbjerg, P., Feist, A.M., Sommer, M.O.A., 2018. Enhanced Metabolite Productivity of *Escherichia coli* Adapted to Glucose M9 Minimal Medium. *Front Bioeng Biotechnol* 6, 166.

- <https://doi.org/10.3389/fbioe.2018.00166>
- Rugbjerg, P., Sommer, M. O. A., 2019. Overcoming genetic heterogeneity in industrial fermentations. *Nature biotechnology*. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41587-019-0171-6>
- Sandberg, T.E., Lloyd, C.J., Palsson, B.O., Feist, A.M., 2017. Laboratory Evolution to Alternating Substrate Environments Yields Distinct Phenotypic and Genetic Adaptive Strategies. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* 83. <https://doi.org/10.1128/AEM.00410-17>
- Sandberg, T.E., Long, C.P., Gonzalez, J.E., Feist, A.M., Antoniewicz, M.R., Palsson, B.O., 2016. Evolution of *E. coli* on [U-13C]Glucose Reveals a Negligible Isotopic Influence on Metabolism and Physiology. *PLoS One* 11, e0151130. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0151130>
- Sandberg, T.E., Pedersen, M., LaCroix, R.A., Ebrahim, A., Bonde, M., Herrgard, M.J., Palsson, B.O., Sommer, M., Feist, A.M., 2014. Evolution of *Escherichia coli* to 42 °C and subsequent genetic engineering reveals adaptive mechanisms and novel mutations. *Mol. Biol. Evol.* 31, 2647–2662. <https://doi.org/10.1093/molbev/msu209>
- Sanderson, K., 2011. Lignocellulose: A chewy problem. *Nature* 474, S12–4. <https://doi.org/10.1038/474S012a>
- Sauer, U., 2001. Evolutionary engineering of industrially important microbial phenotypes. *Adv. Biochem. Eng. Biotechnol.* 73, 129–169.
- Scalcinati, G., Otero, J.M., Van Vleet, J.R.H., Jeffries, T.W., Olsson, L., Nielsen, J., 2012. Evolutionary engineering of *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* for efficient aerobic xylose consumption. *FEMS Yeast Res.* 12, 582–597. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1567-1364.2012.00808.x>
- Sehnem, N.T., Machado, A. da S., Leite, F.C.B., Pita, W. de B., de Moraes, M.A., Jr, Ayub, M.A.Z., 2013. 5-Hydroxymethylfurfural induces ADH7 and ARI1 expression in tolerant industrial *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* strain P6H9 during bioethanol production. *Bioresour. Technol.* 133, 190–196. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biortech.2013.01.063>
- Shao, X., Raman, B., Zhu, M., Mielenz, J.R., Brown, S.D., Guss, A.M., Lynd, L.R., 2011. Mutant selection and phenotypic and genetic characterization of ethanol-tolerant strains of *Clostridium thermocellum*. *Appl. Microbiol. Biotechnol.* 92, 641–652. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00253-011-3492-z>
- Shendure, J., Balasubramanian, S., Church, G.M., Gilbert, W., Rogers, J., Schloss, J.A., Waterston, R.H., 2017. DNA sequencing at 40: past, present and future. *Nature* 550, 345–353. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature24286>
- Shen, Y., Chen, X., Peng, B., Chen, L., Hou, J., Bao, X., 2012. An efficient xylose-fermenting recombinant *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* strain obtained through adaptive evolution and its global transcription profile. *Appl. Microbiol. Biotechnol.* 96, 1079–1091. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00253-012-4418-0>
- Shepelin, D., Hansen, A.S.L., Lennen, R., Luo, H., Herrgård, M.J., 2018. Selecting the Best: Evolutionary Engineering of Chemical Production in Microbes. *Genes* 9. <https://doi.org/10.3390/genes9050249>
- Shibai, A., Takahashi, Y., Ishizawa, Y., Motooka, D., Nakamura, S., Ying, B.-W., Tsuru, S., 2017. Mutation accumulation under UV radiation in *Escherichia coli*. *Sci. Rep.* 7, 14531. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-017-15008-1>
- Shiue, E., Brockman, I.M., Prather, K.L.J., 2015. Improving product yields on D-glucose in *Escherichia coli* via knockout of *pgi* and *zwf* and feeding of supplemental carbon sources. *Biotechnol. Bioeng.* 112, 579–587. <https://doi.org/10.1002/bit.25470>
- Sleight, S.C., Lenski, R.E., 2007. Evolutionary adaptation to freeze-thaw-growth cycles in *Escherichia coli*. *Physiol. Biochem. Zool.* 80, 370–385. <https://doi.org/10.1086/518013>
- Smith, J., van Rensburg, E., Görgens, J.F., 2014. Simultaneously improving xylose fermentation and tolerance to lignocellulosic inhibitors through evolutionary engineering of recombinant *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* harbouring xylose isomerase. *BMC Biotechnol.* 14, 41.

- 1 <https://doi.org/10.1186/1472-6750-14-41>
- 2 Smith, K.M., Liao, J.C., 2011. An evolutionary strategy for isobutanol production strain
3 development in *Escherichia coli*. *Metab. Eng.* 13, 674–681.
4 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ymben.2011.08.004>
- 5 Sniegowski, P.D., Gerrish, P.J., 2010. Beneficial mutations and the dynamics of adaptation in
6 asexual populations. *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. Lond. B Biol. Sci.* 365, 1255–1263.
7 <https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2009.0290>
- 8 Sonderegger, M., Sauer, U., 2003. Evolutionary engineering of *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* for
9 anaerobic growth on xylose. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* 69, 1990–1998.
- 10 Sprouffs, K., Aguilar-Rodriguez, J., Sniegowski, P., Wagner, A., 2018. High mutation rates
11 limit evolutionary adaptation in *Escherichia coli*. *PLoS Genet.* 14, e1007324.
12 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pgen.1007324>
- 13 Stella, R.G., Wiechert, J., Noack, S., Frunzke, J., 2019. Evolutionary engineering of
14 *Corynebacterium glutamicum*. *Biotechnol. J.* e1800444.
15 <https://doi.org/10.1002/biot.201800444>
- 16 Stoebe, D.M., Hokamp, K., Last, M.S., Dorman, C.J., 2009. Compensatory evolution of gene
17 regulation in response to stress by *Escherichia coli* lacking RpoS. *PLoS Genet.* 5,
18 e1000671. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pgen.1000671>
- 19 Strucko, T., Zirngibl, K., Pereira, F., Kafkia, E., Mohamed, E.T., Rettel, M., Stein, F., Feist, A.M.,
20 Jouhten, P., Patil, K.R., Forster, J., 2018. Laboratory evolution reveals regulatory and
21 metabolic trade-offs of glycerol utilization in *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*. *Metab. Eng.* 47,
22 73–82. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ymben.2018.03.006>
- 23 Summers, Z.M., Ueki, T., Ismail, W., Haveman, S.A., Lovley, D.R., 2012. Laboratory evolution
24 of *Geobacter sulfurreducens* for enhanced growth on lactate via a single-base-pair
25 substitution in a transcriptional regulator. *ISME J.* 6, 975–983.
26 <https://doi.org/10.1038/ismej.2011.166>
- 27 Szamecz, B., Boross, G., Kalapis, D., Kovács, K., Fekete, G., Farkas, Z., Lázár, V., Hrtan, M.,
28 Kemmeren, P., Groot Koerkamp, M.J.A., Rutkai, E., Holstege, F.C.P., Papp, B., Pál, C.,
29 2014. The genomic landscape of compensatory evolution. *PLoS Biol.* 12, e1001935.
30 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.1001935>
- 31 Szappanos, B., Fritzemeier, J., Csorgo, B., Lazar, V., Lu, X., Fekete, G., Balint, B., Herczeg, R.,
32 Nagy, I., Notebaart, R.A., Lercher, M.J., Pal, C., Papp, B., 2016. Adaptive evolution of
33 complex innovations through stepwise metabolic niche expansion. *Nat. Commun.* 7,
34 11607. <https://doi.org/10.1038/ncomms11607>
- 35 Tenailon, O., Rodríguez-Verdugo, A., Gaut, R.L., McDonald, P., Bennett, A.F., Long, A.D.,
36 Gaut, B.S., 2012. The molecular diversity of adaptive convergence. *Science* 335, 457–461.
37 <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1212986>
- 38 Thyer, R., Shroff, R., Klein, D.R., d'Oelsnitz, S., Cotham, V.C., Byrom, M., Brodbelt, J.S.,
39 Ellington, A.D., 2018. Custom selenoprotein production enabled by laboratory evolution of
40 recoded bacterial strains. *Nat. Biotechnol.* 36, 624–631. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nbt.4154>
- 41 Tilloy, V., Ortiz-Julien, A., Dequin, S., 2014. Reduction of ethanol yield and improvement of
42 glycerol formation by adaptive evolution of the wine yeast *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* under
43 hyperosmotic conditions. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* 80, 2623–2632.
44 <https://doi.org/10.1128/AEM.03710-13>
- 45 Tokuyama, K., Toya, Y., Horinouchi, T., Furusawa, C., Matsuda, F., Shimizu, H., 2018.
46 Application of adaptive laboratory evolution to overcome a flux limitation in an *Escherichia*
47 *coli* production strain. *Biotechnol. Bioeng.* <https://doi.org/10.1002/bit.26568>
- 48 Toprak, E., Veres, A., Yildiz, S., Pedraza, J.M., Chait, R., Paulsson, J., Kishony, R., 2013.
49 Building a morbidostat: an automated continuous-culture device for studying bacterial drug
50 resistance under dynamically sustained drug inhibition. *Nat. Protoc.* 8, 555–567.
51 <https://doi.org/10.1038/nprot.nprot.2013.021>

- 1 Utrilla, J., Licona-Cassani, C., Marcellin, E., Gosset, G., Nielsen, L.K., Martinez, A., 2012.
2 Engineering and adaptive evolution of *Escherichia coli* for D-lactate fermentation reveals
3 GatC as a xylose transporter. *Metab. Eng.* 14, 469–476.
4 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ymben.2012.07.007>
- 5 van Rossum, H.M., Kozak, B.U., Niemeijer, M.S., Dykstra, J.C., Luttik, M.A.H., Daran, J.-M.G.,
6 van Maris, A.J.A., Pronk, J.T., 2016. Requirements for Carnitine Shuttle-Mediated
7 Translocation of Mitochondrial Acetyl Moieties to the Yeast Cytosol. *MBio* 7.
8 <https://doi.org/10.1128/mBio.00520-16>
- 9 Van Vleet, J.H., Jeffries, T.W., 2009. Yeast metabolic engineering for hemicellulosic ethanol
10 production. *Curr. Opin. Biotechnol.* 20, 300–306.
11 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copbio.2009.06.001>
- 12 Vasi, F., Travisano, M., Lenski, R.E., 1994. Long-Term Experimental Evolution in *Escherichia*
13 *coli*. II. Changes in Life-History Traits During Adaptation to a Seasonal Environment. *Am.*
14 *Nat.* 144, 432–456. <https://doi.org/10.1086/285685>
- 15 Vilela, L. de F., de Araujo, V.P.G., Paredes, R. de S., Bon, E.P. da S., Torres, F.A.G., Neves,
16 B.C., Eleutherio, E.C.A., 2015. Enhanced xylose fermentation and ethanol production by
17 engineered *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* strain. *AMB Express* 5, 16.
18 <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13568-015-0102-y>
- 19 von Kamp, A., Klamt, S., 2017. Growth-coupled overproduction is feasible for almost all
20 metabolites in five major production organisms. *Nat. Commun.* 8, 15956.
21 <https://doi.org/10.1038/ncomms15956>
- 22 Wallace-Salinas, V., Gorwa-Grauslund, M.F., 2013. Adaptive evolution of an industrial strain of
23 *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* for combined tolerance to inhibitors and temperature.
24 *Biotechnol. Biofuels* 6, 151. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1754-6834-6-151>
- 25 Wang, L., Spira, B., Zhou, Z., Feng, L., Maharjan, R.P., Li, X., Li, F., McKenzie, C., Reeves,
26 P.R., Ferenci, T., 2010. Divergence involving global regulatory gene mutations in an
27 *Escherichia coli* population evolving under phosphate limitation. *Genome Biol. Evol.* 2,
28 478–487. <https://doi.org/10.1093/gbe/evq035>
- 29 Wang, S., Sun, X., Yuan, Q., 2018. Strategies for enhancing microbial tolerance to inhibitors for
30 biofuel production: A review. *Bioresour. Technol.* 258, 302–309.
31 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biortech.2018.03.064>
- 32 Wang, X., Khushk, I., Xiao, Y., Gao, Q., Bao, J., 2018. Tolerance improvement of
33 *Corynebacterium glutamicum* on lignocellulose derived inhibitors by adaptive evolution.
34 *Appl. Microbiol. Biotechnol.* 102, 377–388. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00253-017-8627-4>
- 35 Wang, Y., Tian, T., Zhao, J., Wang, J., Yan, T., Xu, L., Liu, Z., Garza, E., Iverson, A., Manow,
36 R., Finan, C., Zhou, S., 2012. Homofermentative production of D-lactic acid from sucrose
37 by a metabolically engineered *Escherichia coli*. *Biotechnol. Lett.* 34, 2069–2075.
38 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10529-012-1003-7>
- 39 Wannier, T.M., Kunjapur, A.M., Rice, D.P., McDonald, M.J., Desai, M.M., Church, G.M., 2018.
40 Adaptive evolution of genomically recoded *Escherichia coli*. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*
41 115, 3090–3095. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1715530115>
- 42 Weikert, C., Sauer, U., Bailey, J.E., 1997. Use of a glycerol-limited, long-term chemostat for
43 isolation of *Escherichia coli* mutants with improved physiological properties. *Microbiology*
44 143 (Pt 5), 1567–1574. <https://doi.org/10.1099/00221287-143-5-1567>
- 45 Wenger, J.W., Piotrowski, J., Nagarajan, S., Chiotti, K., Sherlock, G., Rosenzweig, F., 2011.
46 Hunger artists: yeast adapted to carbon limitation show trade-offs under carbon sufficiency.
47 *PLoS Genet.* 7, e1002202. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pgen.1002202>
- 48 Westphal, L.L., Lau, J., Negro, Z., Moreno, I.J., Ismail Mohammed, W., Lee, H., Tang, H.,
49 Finkel, S.E., Kram, K.E., 2018. Adaptation of *Escherichia coli* to long-term batch culture in
50 various rich media. *Res. Microbiol.* 169, 145–156.
51 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resmic.2018.01.003>

- Williams, T.C., Pretorius, I.S., Paulsen, I.T., 2016. Synthetic Evolution of Metabolic Productivity Using Biosensors. *Trends Biotechnol.* 34, 371–381. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tibtech.2016.02.002>
- Winkler, J.D., Garcia, C., Olson, M., Callaway, E., Kao, K.C., 2014. Evolved osmotolerant *Escherichia coli* mutants frequently exhibit defective N-acetylglucosamine catabolism and point mutations in cell shape-regulating protein MreB. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* 80, 3729–3740. <https://doi.org/10.1128/AEM.00499-14>
- Winkler, J.D., Kao, K.C., 2014. Recent advances in the evolutionary engineering of industrial biocatalysts. *Genomics* 104, 406–411. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ygeno.2014.09.006>
- Winkler, J., Kao, K.C., 2012. Harnessing recombination to speed adaptive evolution in *Escherichia coli*. *Metab. Eng.* 14, 487–495. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ymben.2012.07.004>
- Wiser, M.J., Lenski, R.E., 2015. A Comparison of Methods to Measure Fitness in *Escherichia coli*. *PLoS One* 10, e0126210. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0126210>
- Wisselink, H.W., Toirkens, M.J., del Rosario Franco Berriel, M., Winkler, A.A., van Dijken, J.P., Pronk, J.T., van Maris, A.J.A., 2007. Engineering of *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* for efficient anaerobic alcoholic fermentation of L-arabinose. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* 73, 4881–4891. <https://doi.org/10.1128/AEM.00177-07>
- Wong, B.G., Mancuso, C.P., Kiriakov, S., Bashor, C.J., 2018. A generalizable experimental framework for automated cell growth and laboratory evolution. *BioRxiv*.
- Wong, W.W., Liao, J.C., 2009. Microbial maximal specific growth rate as a square-root function of biomass yield and two kinetic parameters. *Metab. Eng.* 11, 409–414. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ymben.2009.08.004>
- Wright, J., Bellissimi, E., de Hulster, E., Wagner, A., Pronk, J.T., van Maris, A.J.A., 2011. Batch and continuous culture-based selection strategies for acetic acid tolerance in xylose-fermenting *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*. *FEMS Yeast Res.* 11, 299–306. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1567-1364.2011.00719.x>
- Xu, C., Sun, T., Li, S., Chen, L., Zhang, W., 2018. Adaptive laboratory evolution of cadmium tolerance in *Synechocystis* sp. PCC 6803. *Biotechnol. Biofuels* 11, 205. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13068-018-1205-x>
- Yim, H., Haselbeck, R., Niu, W., Pujol-Baxley, C., Burgard, A., Boldt, J., Khandurina, J., Trawick, J.D., Osterhout, R.E., Stephen, R., Estadilla, J., Teisan, S., Schreyer, H.B., Andrae, S., Yang, T.H., Lee, S.Y., Burk, M.J., Van Dien, S., 2011. Metabolic engineering of *Escherichia coli* for direct production of 1,4-butanediol. *Nat. Chem. Biol.* 7, 445–452. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nchembio.580>
- Yona, A.H., Manor, Y.S., Herbst, R.H., Romano, G.H., Mitchell, A., Kupiec, M., Pilpel, Y., Dahan, O., 2012. Chromosomal duplication is a transient evolutionary solution to stress. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* 109, 21010–21015. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1211150109>
- Yu, S., Zhao, Q., Miao, X., Shi, J., 2013. Enhancement of lipid production in low-starch mutants *Chlamydomonas reinhardtii* by adaptive laboratory evolution. *Bioresour. Technol.* 147, 499–507. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biortech.2013.08.069>
- Zelle, R.M., Harrison, J.C., Pronk, J.T., van Maris, A.J.A., 2011. Anaplerotic role for cytosolic malic enzyme in engineered *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* strains. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* 77, 732–738. <https://doi.org/10.1128/AEM.02132-10>
- Zha, J., Shen, M., Hu, M., Song, H., Yuan, Y., 2014. Enhanced expression of genes involved in initial xylose metabolism and the oxidative pentose phosphate pathway in the improved xylose-utilizing *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* through evolutionary engineering. *J. Ind. Microbiol. Biotechnol.* 41, 27–39. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10295-013-1350-y>
- Zhang, W., Cheng, Y., Li, Y., Du, G., Xie, G., Zou, H., Zhou, J., Chen, J., 2018. Adaptive Evolution Relieves Nitrogen Catabolite Repression and Decreases Urea Accumulation in Cultures of the Chinese Rice Wine Yeast Strain *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* XZ-11. *J. Agric.*

- Food Chem. 66, 9061–9069. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.jafc.8b01313>
- Zhang, X., El-Hajj, Z.W., Newman, E., 2010. Deficiency in L-serine deaminase interferes with one-carbon metabolism and cell wall synthesis in *Escherichia coli* K-12. *J. Bacteriol.* 192, 5515–5525. <https://doi.org/10.1128/JB.00748-10>
- Zhang, X., Jantama, K., Moore, J.C., Shanmugam, K.T., Ingram, L.O., 2007. Production of L -alanine by metabolically engineered *Escherichia coli*. *Appl. Microbiol. Biotechnol.* 77, 355–366. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00253-007-1170-y>
- Zhang, X., Newman, E., 2008. Deficiency in l-serine deaminase results in abnormal growth and cell division of *Escherichia coli* K-12. *Mol. Microbiol.* 69, 870–881. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2958.2008.06315.x>
- Zhao, J., Xu, L., Wang, Y., Zhao, X., Wang, J., Garza, E., Manow, R., Zhou, S., 2013. Homofermentative production of optically pure L-lactic acid from xylose by genetically engineered *Escherichia coli* B. *Microb. Cell Fact.* 12, 57. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1475-2859-12-57>
- Zhou, H., Cheng, J.-S., Wang, B.L., Fink, G.R., Stephanopoulos, G., 2012. Xylose isomerase overexpression along with engineering of the pentose phosphate pathway and evolutionary engineering enable rapid xylose utilization and ethanol production by *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*. *Metab. Eng.* 14, 611–622. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ymben.2012.07.011>
- Zhou, S., Shanmugam, K.T., Ingram, L.O., 2003. Functional replacement of the *Escherichia coli* D-(-)-lactate dehydrogenase gene (*ldhA*) with the L-(+)-lactate dehydrogenase gene (*ldhL*) from *Pediococcus acidilactici*. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* 69, 2237–2244.
- Zhou, S., Yomano, L.P., Shanmugam, K.T., Ingram, L.O., 2005. Fermentation of 10% (w/v) sugar to D: (-)-lactate by engineered *Escherichia coli* B. *Biotechnol. Lett.* 27, 1891–1896. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10529-005-3899-7>
- Zhu, L., Li, Y., Cai, Z., 2015. Development of a stress-induced mutagenesis module for autonomous adaptive evolution of *Escherichia coli* to improve its stress tolerance. *Biotechnol. Biofuels* 8, 93. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13068-015-0276-1>
- Zorraquino-Salvo, V., Quinones-Soto, S., Kim, M., Rai, N., Tagkopoulos, I., 2014. Deciphering the genetic and transcriptional basis of cross-stress responses in *Escherichia coli* under complex evolutionary scenarios. *bioRxiv*. <https://doi.org/10.1101/010595>

Highlights

- Rational approaches to strain design are frequently insufficient to achieve desired phenotypes and production capabilities.
- Adaptive Laboratory Evolution (ALE) leverages natural selection to optimize strain properties and obtain valuable phenotypes without necessary *a priori* knowledge.
- Studies utilizing ALE for metabolic engineering are collected and categorized.
- ALE experimental design, complementary technologies, and future directions are discussed.