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In the environment, microbes frequently experience lack of oxygen. In response, certain microorganisms produce enzymes that enable them to respire molecules other than O\textsubscript{2} (anaerobic respiration). One such mode of anaerobic respiration is denitrification: the step-wise reduction\textsuperscript{1} of nitrogen oxyanions (NO\textsubscript{3}/NO\textsubscript{2}, abbrev. NO\textsubscript{x}) to nitrogen oxides (NO/N\textsubscript{2}O, abbrev. NO\textsubscript{x}) and, finally, to molecular nitrogen (N\textsubscript{2}):

\[
\text{NO}_3^- \xrightarrow{\text{Nar/Nap}} \text{NO}_2^- \xrightarrow{\text{NirS/NirK}} \text{NO} \xrightarrow{\text{cNor/qNor}} \text{N}_2\text{O} \xrightarrow{\text{NosZ}} \text{N}_2
\]

where Nar/Nap, NirS/NirK, and cNor/qNor are the prominent variants of nitrate- (NO\textsubscript{3}\textsuperscript{-}), nitrite- (NO\textsubscript{2}\textsuperscript{-}), and nitric oxide (NO) reductase enzymes, respectively, and NosZ is nitrous oxide (N\textsubscript{2}O) reductase. As an alternative mode of respiration, denitrification generates energy (ATP) to sustain the life processes in the absence of O\textsubscript{2}. Denitrification is widespread in bacteria and also observed in archaea and fungi. Niches for denitrification are the sites where O\textsubscript{2} concentration fluctuates, such as biofilms, water columns, surface layers of sediments, wetlands, and drained soils.

Denitrification is of global significance being a key process in the nitrogen cycle (replenishing the atmosphere with N\textsubscript{2}) and a major source of atmospheric NO and N\textsubscript{2}O. NO plays a major role in producing the ‘bad’ (tropospheric) ozone, and N\textsubscript{2}O, in addition to being a powerful greenhouse gas, depletes the ‘good’ (stratospheric) ozone. Robust strategies to mitigate NO and N\textsubscript{2}O emissions from denitrification (e.g., in agricultural soils) demands thorough understanding of the physiology and regulatory biology of denitrifiers. The present thesis contributes to this knowledge, utilising dynamic modelling to test various assumptions and experiment-based hypotheses regarding the physiology of a prominent soil bacterium, Paracoccus denitrificans. The organism is significant, for it is used as a model in denitrification research.

\textsuperscript{1} Certain chemical reactions involve exchange of electrons (e\textsuperscript{-}); the reactant that loses e\textsuperscript{-} is said to be ‘oxidised’, whereas the one that gains e\textsuperscript{-} is termed ‘reduced’. Thus, when NO\textsubscript{3}\textsuperscript{-} accepts 2e\textsuperscript{-} and, thereby, is converted to NO\textsubscript{2}\textsuperscript{-}, the phenomenon is called the reduction of NO\textsubscript{3}\textsuperscript{-} to NO\textsubscript{2}\textsuperscript{-}, and the enzyme that catalyses this transformation (Nar or Nap) is termed ‘reductase’.
By modelling, we explored the regulation of 1) NirS (controlling the NO$_2^-$ - and N$_2$ kinetics$^2$), 2) NirS/cNor (homeostatic control of NO by *Pa. denitrificans*), 3) Nar, and 4) cNor/NosZ (N$_2$O kinetics). The first two are the subject of Paper I & II, respectively, and the last two are addressed in Paper III.

For Paper I, we started with a simple model designed to match the conditions used to provide the empirical data to be analysed: recruitment of batch cultures from aerobic to anaerobic respiration in response to O$_2$ depletion, monitored by frequent sampling. We developed this model further to address more specialised problems in Paper II & III. Each model simulates the respiratory metabolism (O$_2$ reduction followed by that of NO$_x$/NO$_2$), growth, and gas transport between the experimental vial’s liquid-phase and the headspace. The models also include estimation of gas loss and leaks due to sampling, so as to allow a direct comparison between experimental data and model simulations. The models use the Michaelis-Menten kinetics to simulate the activity of reductases involved, except that in the models for Papers II & III, the cooperative binding of two NO molecules with cNor to form N$_2$O is modelled by a dual substrate equation. All model parameters critical for our research questions were empirically determined under the same or similar experimental conditions as simulated. Each model is constructed in Vensim®, using techniques from the field of system dynamics.

**Paper I**

It is commonly assumed that all cells in pure cultures of denitrifiers switch to denitrification in response to O$_2$ depletion. The assumption has been challenged based on crude inspections of *Pa. denitrificans* respiration kinetics during the transition from aerobic to anaerobic respiration, suggesting that only a minor fraction of the cells is able to switch to anaerobic respiration and growth. The reason, we hypothesise, is that the transcriptional initiation of genes necessary for the synthesis of NO$_2^-$ reductase (NirS, functional gene: nirS) is stochastic, which then becomes autocatalytic within the cell due to NO production. With this hypothesis built into our model, it effectively simulates the observed N$_2$ kinetics for a range of experimental conditions by assuming an extremely low probability of nirS transcription.

---

$^2$ N$_2$ kinetics are controlled by NirS since, in *Pa. denitrificans*, NO$_2^-$ reduction is the rate-determining step of denitrification.
0.005 h$^{-1}$. As a result, the model estimates that only 3.8–16.1% of the cells were recruited to
denitrification prior to the complete depletion of O$_2$.

The phenomenon can be understood as a ‘bet-hedging strategy’: switching to denitrification
is a gain if anoxic spell lasts long, but is a waste of energy (consumed in the synthesis of
denitrification enzymes) if anoxia turns out to be a ‘false alarm’. Certainly, not all denitrifiers
are bet-hedgers; the exercise here indicates that distinct phenotypes exist in the regulatory
biology of denitrifiers, which need to be taken into account for correctly interpreting
experimental work on denitrification in general and *Pa. denitrificans* in particular.

**Paper II**

Homeostatic control of NO at nanomolar concentrations appears common among denitrifying
bacteria, ascribed to synchronised expression of nitrite- and nitric oxide reductase (Nir and
Nor). But we questioned whether this is a sufficient explanation: using the reported substrate
affinities for cNor, our dynamic model of the enzyme activities in batch cultures of *Pa.
denitrificans* predicted 1–3 orders of magnitude too high NO concentrations. A possible
explanation for the low NO concentrations measured could be a negative feedback by NO on
the activity of NirS. This was rejected, however, because the inclusion of such feedback
resulted in too slow anaerobic growth and N$_2$ production. We proceeded by determining the
kinetic parameters for cNor *in vivo*, which is a non-trivial task. The experiments were
carefully designed to allow estimation of the NO concentration at the cell surface while anoxic
cultures, in a NO$_3^-$/NO$_2^-$-free medium, depleted low doses of NO. With the new parameters
for cNor$^3$: $v_{\text{maxNO}} = 3.56$ fmol NO cell$^{-1}$ h$^{-1}$, $K_{1\text{NO}} < 1$ nM, and $K_{2\text{NO}} = 34$ nM, the model
predicted NO concentrations close to that measured.

This shows that the homeostatic control of NO at nanomolar concentrations can be understood
as a result of the enzyme kinetics alone and that the high affinity of cNor is essential. The

---

$^3$ Used in a dual substrate equation, developed by Girsch & de Vries (1997): $v_{\text{NO}} = \frac{v_{\text{maxNO}} \cdot [\text{NO}]_{\text{aq}}}{1 + K_{2\text{NO}} \cdot \left( \frac{1}{[\text{NO}]_{\text{aq}}} + \frac{K_{1\text{NO}}}{[\text{NO}]_{\text{aq}}} \right)}$,

where $v_{\text{maxNO}}$ (mol NO cell$^{-1}$ h$^{-1}$) is the maximum NO reduction rate, $[\text{NO}]_{\text{aq}}$ (mol L$^{-1}$) is the NO concentration
in the aqueous medium, and $K_{1\text{NO}}$ & $K_{2\text{NO}}$ are the steady state dissociation constants for cNor/NO- &
cNor/(NO)$_2$ complex, respectively.
result illustrates the importance of determining enzyme kinetic parameters \textit{in vivo}, rather than \textit{in vitro}, to understand and model denitrification phenotypes.

\textbf{Paper III}

In this work, the regulation of all four reductases (Nar, NirS, cNor and NosZ) was included in the model used to simulate batch cultivations supplemented with NO$_3^-$. The aim was to understand the observed NO$_2^-$ and N$_2$O kinetics.

Like that for \textit{nirS}, we assumed that the transcriptional activation of the \textit{nar} genes (encoding Nar) is stochastic, with a positive feedback by NO$_2^-$ produced, thus quickly turning the cell into a full-fledged NO$_3^-$ reducer. By fitting the model to the observed NO$_2^-$ and N$_2$ kinetics, we found that \textit{nar} transcription has a higher probability (0.035 h$^{-1}$) than that for \textit{nirS} (0.004 h$^{-1}$), resulting in the production of Nar in 23–43.3\% of all cells ‘in time’ (before depletion of NO$_3^-$).

For the N$_2$O kinetics, the model assumes that transcription of the \textit{nor} genes (encoding cNor) is coordinated with that of \textit{nirS} and that all cells produce NosZ, since the \textit{nosZ} genes are readily induced in response to O$_2$ depletion. This implies that the majority of cells have only NosZ, and this sub-population (A) grows by respiring N$_2$O produced by the sub-population with NirS and cNor (B). Since B grows faster than A, B makes up an increasing fraction of the total population. As a result, the model predicts extremely low but gradually increasing N$_2$O concentration throughout the anaerobic phase, exactly as observed.

In summary, the full-fledged model of \textit{Pa. denitrificans}, which includes a rather complex cell diversification owing to the nature of the regulatory network, can adequately simulate essential characteristics of the regulatory phenotype, as observed in batch cultures.

Natural denitrifying communities are mixtures of organisms with widely different denitrification regulatory phenotypes. The regulatory response of such mixtures is not necessarily equal to the ‘sum of its components’ because there will be interactions, not the least via the intermediates NO and NO$_2^-$. Hence, it is probably a mission impossible to predict the regulatory responses of complex communities based on the phenotypes of their members. Nevertheless, investigations of the regulation and physiology of denitrification in model
organisms like *Pa. denitrificans* provide us with essential concepts, enhancing our ability to understand the regulatory responses of mixed communities and to generate meaningful hypotheses.
I naturlige miljø er det ofte mangel på oksygen i kortere eller lengre perioder. Noen organismer takler dette ved å respirere andre stoffer enn oksygen. Dette kalles anaerob respirasjon, og denitrifikasjon er en av flere varianter. Denitrifiserende bakterier respirerer ved en stegvis reduksjon av nitrogen oksy-anioner (NO$_3^-$/NO$_2^-$, forkortet til NO$_x^-$) via nitrogen oksider (NO/N$_2$O, forkortet til NO$_x$) til molekylært nitrogen (N$_2$):

\[
\text{NO}_3^- \xrightarrow{\text{Nar/Nap}} \text{NO}_2^- \xrightarrow{\text{NirS/NirK}} \text{NO} \xrightarrow{\text{cNor/qNor}} \text{N}_2\text{O} \xrightarrow{\text{NosZ}} \text{N}_2
\]

hvor Nar/Nap, NirS/NirK, og cNor/qNor er de viktigste variantene av henholdsvis nitrat-, nitritt-, and nitrogen monoksid reduktase, og NosZ er dinitrogen oksid reduktase. Prosessen (denitrifikasjon) genererer energi som organismene (denitrifikanter; bakterier, arker og sopp) kan bruke for å opprettholde liv (vedlikehold og vekst) på tross av fravær av oksygen.

Denitrifikasjon er en nøkkelprosess i det globale nitrogenkreftsløpet; den tilbakefører nitrogenet til atmosfæren fra biosfæren, og den er en viktig kilde til atmosfærisk NO og N$_2$O. NO påvirker troposfærens kjemi og bidrar til dannelse av uønsket troposfærisk ozon. N$_2$O bidrar til global oppvarming og ødeleggelse av stratosfærisk ozon. For å utvikle robuste tiltak for å redusere stadig økende utslipp av NO og N$_2$O fra systemer skapt eller manipulert av menneskehånd, er det behov for god forståelse av denitrifiserende organismer fysiologi. Denne avhandlingen er et bidrag til slik forståelse. Hovedverktøyet har vært dynamisk modellering for å undersøke en rekke hypoteser vedrørende bakterien Paracoccus denitrificans, som i en årekkje har vært brukt som modellorganisme for undersøkelse av denitrifikasjons-fysiologi.

Utgangspunktet for studien var en rekke hypoteser, generert gjennom tidligere eksperimentelle arbeider, med vekt på fire regulatoriske og fysiologiske aspekter: 1) NirS, 2) NirS/cNor (homeostatisk kontroll av NO), 3) Nar, og 4) cNor/NosZ (N$_2$O kinetikk). De første to står i fokus for artikkel nr. 1 og 2, mens de to siste er sentrale i artikkel 3.

Vi startet med å konstruere en forholdsvis enkel modell (artikkel 1) for simulering av oksisk og anoksisk respirasjon og vekst. Modellen ble tilpasset de spesielle eksperimentelle

Felles for alle modellene er at de beregner respirasjon og vekst, reduksjon av $O_2$ og $NO_2^-/NO_3^-$, gasstransport mellom headspace og væskefase, og gasstapet via prøvetaking. Det siste er viktig for å tillate en direkte sammenligning mellom eksperimentelle data og simuleringer. Modellene benytter Michaelis-Menten kinetikk for alle enzymreaksjoner bortsett fra nitrogenmonoksid reduktase (cNor), hvor utgangspunktet var en «dual substrate model».

Modellene er laget med Vensim®, med teknikker hentet fra «system dynamics».

Artikkel I

Det har hittil vært vanlig å anta at alle celler i en populasjon av denitrifiserende bakterier skifter til anoksisk respirasjon når oksygenkonsentrasjonen faller under et kritisk nivå. Denne oppfatningen ble utfordret, basert på inspeksjon av respirasjonskinetikken under overgangen fra oksisk til anoksisk respirasjon, som antyder at bare en marginal andel av populasjonen skifter til anoksisk respirasjon. Hypotesen, som ble bygget inn i modellen, var at dette skyldes stokastisk initiering av nirS-transkripsjon, som så blir autokatalytisk i den enkelte celle via NO produksjon. Modelltilpasning viste at data for en rekke ulike eksperimentelle betingelser kunne simuleres ved å anta en ekstremt lav sannsynlighet for initiering av nirS transkripsjon: $0.005 \text{t}^{-1}$ (0.5 % pr time). Dette resulterte i at bare 3.6–16% av hele populasjonen skiftet til anoksisk respirasjon før oksygenet var fullstendig oppbrukt.

Artikkel II

Mange denitrifiserende bakterier viser en fabelaktig evne til å holde NO konsentrasjonen på et ekstremt lavt nivå, og dette tilskrives vanligvis synkronisert ekspresjon av nitritt- og nitrogen monoksid-reduktase. Denne forklaringen ble trukket i tvil, og en første eksplisitt simulering av NO kinetikk basert på litteraturverdi for substrataffinitet resulterte i NO konsentrasser *~100 ganger høyere enn det som ble målt. En mulig forklaring som ble testet var at den homeostatiske kontrollen av NO på ekstremt lavt nivå kunne skyldes at NO inhiberer NirS (negativ feedback). Denne forklaringen ble forkastet, fordi en slik mekanisme
resulterte i at modellen predikerte alt for langsom anoksisk respirasjon. Det ble derfor besluttet å gjøre et forsøk på å bestemme kinetiske parametre for cNor in vivo, hvilket er en ganske utfordrende oppgave. Eksperimentene ble utført slik at det var mulig å beregne NO-konsentrasjonen på celleoverflaten i en anoksisk batch med NO₃⁻-fritt medium tilført NO i headspace. Med de nye kinetikk-parametrene for cNor ($v_{max,NO} = 3.56$ fmol NO cell⁻¹ h⁻¹, $K_{1NO} < 1$ nM, and $K_{2NO} = 34$ nM) predikerte modellen NO konsentrasjoner i nærheten av det som ble målt.

Dette viser at homeostatisk kontroll av NO på ekstremt lave nivå kan forstås som et trivielt resultat av enzymkinetikk, og understreker at enzymkinetiske parameter må bestemmes in vivo, heller enn in vitro, for å forstå og modellere denitrifikasjonsfenotyper.

**Artikkel III**

I dette arbeidet ble regulering av alle fire reduktaseenzyme (Nar, NirS, cNor og NosZ) inkludert i modellen, som så ble brukt til å simulere batch-kulturer med NO₃⁻ i mediet. Transkripsjonen av nar ble antatt å følge samme stokastisk-autokatalytiske mønster som nirS: lav sannsynlighet for initiering av nar transkripsjon, som så forsterkes via NO₂⁻. Dette ble inkorporert i modellen, og tilpasning til observert NO₂⁻ kinetikk tilsier en sannsynlighet på 0.035 t⁻¹ for initiering av nar-transkripsjon, og at 23–43 % av alle celler uttrykker Nar «i tide», dvs før alt NO var redusert til NO₂⁻.

Transkripsjonen av nosZ antas å skje i alle celler, dvs at alle celler har NosZ etter at oksygenet er brukt opp, men en marginal andel har NirS og cNor. Dette betyr at majoriteten av celler bare har NosZ, og denne sub-populasjonen vokser anaerobt basert på reduksjon av N₂O som leveres av sub-populasjonen som har NirS og cNor. Siden den sistnevnte vokser raskest, vil dens andel av totalpopulasjonen øke gjennom den anoksiske fasen. Som et resultat av dette predikerer modellen svært lave N₂O konsentrasjoner i tidlig anoksisk fase, men økende med tiden (siden andelen N₂O produsenter øker). Dette er i overenstemmelse med observert N₂O.

Dette viser at den komplette modellen for *Pa. denitrificans*, som innebærer kompleks celledifferensiering på grunn av karakteristikker ved det genregulatoriske nettverket, kan gi
en adekvat simulering av de den regulatoriske fenotypen slik den kommer til uttrykk i en batchkultur.

Bakteriesamfunn i naturen inneholder en kompleks blanding av denitrifikasjonsbakterier. Den regulatoriske responsen av slike samfunn er ikke nødvendigvis lik «summen av delene». Grunnen til dette er at det vil forekomme utstrakt samspill, ikke minst via NO og NO$_2$ . Derfor er det liten grunn til å tro at man noen gang skal kunne predikere bakteriesamfunns’ regulatoriske respons ut fra de enkelte medlemmers regulatoriske fenotyper. Detaljerte undersøkelser av enkeltorganismer, som denne studien av Pa. denitrificans, er likevel meningsfulle fordi det frembringer nye konsepter og hypoteser, som øker våre muligheter til å forstå den regulatoriske responsen i bakteriesamfunn.
Introduction

Denitrification: a life-sustaining facultative trait. Many natural habitats have fluctuating O₂ availability, threatening the life functions and survival of microbes relying on respiration for energy (ATP). To adapt, certain microorganisms (facultative anaerobes) produce enzymes in response to impending anoxia, enabling them to respire molecules other than O₂ (anaerobic respiration). One such type of anaerobic respiration is denitrification⁴: the dissimilative reduction of nitrate (NO₃⁻) to nitrite (NO₂⁻) to gaseous nitric- and nitrous oxides (NO and N₂O) and finally to N₂, respectively (Zumft, 1997, p. 8).⁵ Thus, denitrification also defends denitrifying organisms against toxic NO₂⁻ and NO produced by themselves or by other organisms, such as ammonium- and ammonia oxidisers (emitting NO₂⁻ and NO, respectively).

Sites with fluctuating O₂: the niche for denitrification. Since permanently anoxic environments lack available nitrogen oxyanions/-oxides (NOₓ⁻/NOₓ⁻) and oxic environments provide bioenergetically the most preferable terminal electron (e⁻) acceptor (O₂), the niche for denitrification are the sites where O₂ concentration ([O₂]) fluctuates, such as biofilms, surface layers of sediments, water columns, wetlands, and drained soils (which become anoxic in response to flooding). In oxic environments, denitrification can occur in anoxic micro-niches, where it is typically coupled with nitrification⁶ (Bertrand et al., 2015, p. 576).

Denitrifiers (bacteria, archaea, and fungi). The organisms capable of producing NO or N₂O from NO₃⁻ or NO₂⁻ are considered denitrifiers, but not those that can only reduce NO₃⁻ to NO₂⁻ (Shapleigh, 2006). Denitrification is typically regarded as a prokaryotic trait, widespread

---

⁴ However, simultaneous aerobic respiration and denitrification are also reported at high O₂ concentrations. (For a critical review of the evidence thereof, see Chen & Strous, 2013.)

⁵ Although the process was discovered sometime in the middle of 1800s (Keeney & Hatfield, 2008), the first well-documented study of NO₃⁻ conversion to gas was carried out by Gayoon and Dupetit in 1882, who were also the first to isolate denitrifying bacteria. Because of the loss of nitrate in the process, they termed it denitrification (Shapleigh, 2006). Synonymously, the terms dissimilatory NO₃⁻ reduction and NO₃⁻ respiration are also found in the literature.

⁶ The microbial oxidation of ammonia to nitrate: NH₃ → NH₂OH → NO₂⁻ → NO₃⁻, where the first two steps are typically carried out by one group (e.g., *Nitrosomonas*) and the last one by another (e.g., *Nitrospira* or *Nitrobacter*). To conserve the energy produced, total ΔG° = -349 kJ mol⁻¹ NH₄⁺ (Muldera, van de Graafb, Robertsonb, & Kuenen, 1995), both the groups use an e⁻-transport chain with O₂ as the terminal e⁻-acceptor.
among bacteria (esp. within Proteobacteria) and also observed in halophilic and hyperthermophilic archaea (Zumft, 1997). However, many fungi (esp. within the genus *Fusarium*) are also denitrifiers (Arasimowicz-Jelonek & Floryszak-Wieczorek, 2013, p. 409; Shoun, Kim, Uchiyama, & Sugiyama, 1992).

Genetics and physiology of denitrification are largely identified through Proteobacteria: *Pseudomonas stutzeri*, *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*, *Ralstonia eutropha*, *Rhodobacter sphaeroides*, and *Paracoccus denitrificans*. Thus, these organisms are considered ‘models’ in denitrification research (Zumft, 1997).

*Moderating NO and N₂O emissions: the ‘end-point variables’ for the present thesis.* Although denitrification closes the loop of the N-cycle by replenishing the atmosphere with gaseous N₂, the process significantly emits NO and N₂O, both with serious consequences for the environment. Along with anthropogenic activities (esp. fossil fuel combustion), microbial nitrification and denitrification in soils are the main sources of NO emissions (Pilegaard, 2013). As for atmospheric N₂O, denitrification in soils is the most significant source thereof, and anthropogenic activities (esp. food production) contribute to accelerate denitrification rates, hence, N₂O emissions therefrom (Signor & Cerri, 2013; Syakila & Kroeze, 2011). The present research explores the regulation and physiology of denitrification at a population-level by testing various hypotheses and assumptions through dynamic modelling. The aim is to contribute to denitrification knowledge so that vigorous strategies may be devised to control the end-point variables: NO and N₂O emissions.

1. Biogeochemical role of denitrification

*Denitrification closes the loop of the N-cycle.* Denitrification is one of the two main processes⁷ that close the N-cycle by returning the fixed nitrogen (from the biosphere) to the atmosphere as relatively inert N₂ (see Fig. 1).

---

⁷ The other being anammox (anaerobic ammonium oxidation): \( \text{NH}_4^+ + \text{NO}_2^- \rightarrow \text{N}_2 + 2\text{H}_2\text{O} \). This energy yielding process (\( \Delta G^\circ = -357 \text{ kj mol}^{-1} \text{NH}_4^+ \)) is stepwise carried out by aquatic bacteria (Planctomycetes) and generates ATP most likely via proton-motive force (Kartal et al., 2011). Intriguingly, an intermediate product of anammox, hydrazine \((\text{N}_2\text{H}_4)\), is used as a rocket-fuel and as a precursor for various pesticides and pharmaceuticals.
Fig. 1. The N-cycle (Based on Ward, 2012). The earth is a closed system with a limited amount of the elements that are precursors for life. Nitrogen is one of them as a building block of amino acids (proteins), nucleotides (making up DNA), and various chemicals exploited by living organisms to generate energy (ATP) for survival and growth. The recycling of N between the atmosphere and living organisms is summarised here: Starting from the left, the atmospheric nitrogen ($N_2$) is converted to $NH_4^+$ by lightning and bacteria (nitrogen fixation), and the N contained within the fauna and flora is converted to $NH_4^+$ by detritus-decomposing bacteria and fungi (ammonification or mineralisation). $NH_4^+$ is further transformed to $NO_2^-$ and $NO_3^-$ mainly by bacteria (nitrification). The N as $NH_4^+$, $NO_2^-$, and $NO_3^-$ is 1) absorbed back by the flora and, thereby, is also regained therefrom directly (herbivores) or indirectly (carnivores) by the fauna or 2) returned to the atmosphere as $N_2$ mainly by bacteria (anammox and denitrification).
1.1. Removal of $\text{NO}_3^-$ and $\text{NO}_2^-$: a useful characteristic for the fauna, but not always for the flora

From an agricultural perspective, denitrification is unfavourable because $\text{N}_2$ released therefrom cannot be readily utilised by plants, as opposed to $\text{NO}_3^-$/$\text{NO}_2^-$ (Madigan et al., 2014, pp. 412-413). However, removal of the excess nitrogen-oxyanions by denitrification is highly advantageous for humans and animals: $\text{NO}_3^-$ causes infant methemoglobinemia and a higher risk of birth defects (Knobeloch, Salna, Hogan, Postle, & Anderson, 2000; Sparacino-Watkins, Stolz, & Basua, 2014, respectively), and $\text{NO}_2^-$ is indirectly linked with carcinogenesis (Sparacino-Watkins et al., 2014). Therefore, the US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA, 2014) and the World Health Organisation (WHO, 2011) have set an upper limit of 10 and 50 mg L$^{-1}$ of $\text{NO}_3^-$, respectively, in the drinking water.$^8$ $\text{NO}_3^-$ and $\text{NO}_2^-$ are toxic for a wide variety of aquatic and terrestrial animals (Bruning-Fann & Kaneene, 1993; Camargo, Alonso, & Salamanca, 2005; Kroupova, Machova, & Svobodova, 2005). Furthermore, nutrients like $\text{NO}_3^-$ promote algal bloom in fresh waters, providing abundant substrates for bacteria. In turn, the bacteria proliferate so much as to critically decrease the dissolved oxygen in water, leading to the death of aquatic animals and plants. To remove $\text{NO}_3^-$/$\text{NO}_2^-$ from potable water and sewage, effluent, and industrial wastewater, biological denitrification is employed as an effective technique$^9$ (Jensen, Darby, Seidel, & Gorman, 2012, p. 8; Sapavatu & Setty, 2012).

1.2. NO and $\text{N}_2\text{O}$ emissions: the most alarming consequence of denitrification

$\text{NO}$, substantially emitted by denitrification, plays a major role in producing ‘bad’ (tropospheric) ozone. NO is highly reactive and forms nitrogen dioxide (NO$_2$) in the

---

$^8$ Vegetables, fruits, grains, dairy products, and meat also contain $\text{NO}_3^-$, with vegetables being a major source thereof. $\text{NO}_3^-$/$\text{NO}_2^-$ are required for the biosynthesis and regulation of NO, an important biological messenger. Therefore, it is clear that $\text{NO}_3^-$ is only harmful above a certain threshold. Interestingly, $\text{NO}_3^-$/$\text{NO}_2^-$ have been recently reported to be useful in pulmonary hypertension, cardiovascular diseases, ischemia/reperfusion injury, and in mucus-production as part of immune system. (Sparacino-Watkins et al., 2014, pp. 4-6)

$^9$ However, as compared to denitrification, a less laborious and much more eco-friendly technique has been developed, known as the Sharon–anammox process (Madsen, 2008, pp. 383-384). The process is in use on the industrial scale in Europe.
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troposphere, which is broken down by the sunlight to NO and O. The O then reacts with the atmospheric O$_2$ to produce most of O$_3$ (ozone) present in the troposphere (Wuebbles, 2010, pp. 201-202). Ozone is unfavourable in the troposphere being a greenhouse gas (global warming) and a pollutant, known for its adverse effects on humans, animals, and plants (McKee, 1993). Reduced crop yield due to tropospheric ozone in the US alone is estimated to cost $500 million each year (EPA, 2011). Most of the global NO emissions are ascribed, more or less with equal importance, to nitrification and denitrification in soils; however, non-enzymatic abiotic processes in soils are also likely to be an important source (Medinets, Skiba, Rennenberg, & Butterbach-Bahl, 2014).

$N_2O$, substantially emitted by denitrification, is a powerful greenhouse gas and a dominant depleter of ‘good’ (stratospheric) ozone. Per molecule, nitrous oxide has a global warming potential (heat-trapping capacity) 298 times that of carbon dioxide (Ussiri & Lal, 2013, p. 20); hence, although the atmosphere contains a thousand times less N$_2$O than CO$_2$, still N$_2$O is estimated to contribute ~10% to the anthropogenic climate forcing (Bryson Bates et al., 2008). Although ~80% of N$_2$O reaching the stratosphere is photolysed to N$_2$, the rest by other reactions is converted to either N$_2$O or NO, where NO reacts with and depletes stratospheric ozone (Schlesinger & Bernhardt, 2013, p. 81). Thus, N$_2$O contributes to removing the natural umbrella that protects life on the earth from the radiation-induced DNA damage. N$_2$O emissions are, and predicted to be throughout the 21st century, the most substantial anthropogenic source of ozone depletion (Ravishankara, Daniel, & Portmann, 2009). Data available since 1950s show an almost linear increase in the atmospheric N$_2$O; alarmingly, on average, an N$_2$O molecule persists for ~120 years in the troposphere before undergoing photolysis in the stratosphere (Lasley & Harvey, 2007, p. 10). ~70% of global N$_2$O emissions are tentatively attributed to microbial nitrification and denitrification in soils (Butterbach-Bahl, Baggs, Dannenmann, Kiese, & Zechmeister-Boltenstern, 2013, p. 2; Lassey & Harvey, 2007). The transportation of ozone from the stratosphere to the troposphere is also a major source of tropospheric ozone (ibid).

10 The transportation of ozone from the stratosphere to the troposphere is also a major source of tropospheric ozone (ibid).

11 Under oxic conditions (dry soils), nitrification is a more dominant source of NO (70%), whereas under anoxic conditions (wet soils), denitrification takes the lead (87%) (Medinets, Skiba, Rennenberg, & Butterbach-Bahl, 2014; Pilegaard, 2013).

12 Commonly known as the laughing gas, since it induces euphoria (and hallucination) when inhaled.

13 NO is highly reactive in the troposphere; hence, only traces of it reach the stratosphere. Almost all of the NO present in the stratosphere is produced via N$_2$O.
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2007, p. 10), where denitrification, generally, is considered a more dominant source (Signor & Cerri, 2013; Syakila & Kroeze, 2011).

2. Exploring the physiology of denitrification with the ultimate aim to help mitigate global NO and N$_2$O emissions

2.1. Physiology of denitrification is the ‘boiling soup’ with its ‘steam’ containing NO and N$_2$O.

In devising any robust mitigation strategy for global NO and N$_2$O emissions, we ought to consider genetics, physiology, and the regulatory biology of denitrifiers. A major task in NO and N$_2$O research has been to develop strategies for reducing the fraction of N returned to the atmosphere as NO and N$_2$O. The emissions are orchestrated by a) physical and chemical conditions in the environment: soil’s N- and organic C-content and water-holding capacity; copper (Cu) availability; and temperature, pH, and moisture ([O$_2$]) and b) the physiological response of nitrifying and denitrifying organisms to environmental conditions (Bakken, Bergaust, Liu, & Frostegård, 2012; D. Richardson, Felgate, Watmough, Thomson, & Baggs, 2009; Skiba, Fowler, & Smith, 1997). Any robust mitigation strategy must be based on understanding causalities, i.e., a thorough understanding of causes and effects within the network of factors controlling the emissions. Unfortunately, the biogeochemical research on NO and N$_2$O emissions has been dominated by empirical approaches, i.e., emission measurements and attempts to correlate emissions with other factors. Further, the simulation models used in this research are rather crude imitations of the physiology of the organisms involved (Bakken & Dörsch, 2007). Perpetuating these efforts will probably not result in much progress, but amalgamating basic research on the biology with the studies of gas emissions may possibly pave the way for novel approaches.

A natural denitrifying community comprises various denitrification regulatory phenotypes (DRPs) that require consideration. Generally, the biogeochemical models aiming at understanding NO and N$_2$O emissions simplify away soil microbial communities as one homogeneous unit with certain characteristic responses to O$_2$ and NO$_3^-$ concentrations$^{14}$

$^{14}$Another typical shortcoming of such models is the use of relatively older, crude parametric values for enzyme and growth kinetics (ibid).
(Bakken et al., 2012; Bakken & Dörsch, 2007). However, denitrifying communities in soils are composed of a mixture of organisms with widely different denitrification regulatory phenotypes (DRPs): the [O$_2$] in response to which denitrification genes are expressed; accumulation and rates of NO$_2^-$, NO, and N$_2$O reduction; relative growth and e-flow rates during aerobic and anaerobic respiration; cell yield from NO$_x$/NO$_x$-based respiration; effect of fluctuating [O$_2$] and [NO$_x$] and pH on denitrification; and the fraction of the population switching to denitrification in response to anoxic conditions (ibid; Bergaust, Bakken, & Frostegård, 2011; B. Liu, Mao, Bergaust, Bakken, & Frostegård, 2013). Therefore, in our search for mitigation strategies, it is of utmost importance to understand and appreciate DRPs, particularly the potential of ecologically relevant denitrifiers to produce and consume NO and N$_2$O and the factors controlling that.

**The role of dynamic modelling in understanding DRPs.** Dynamic models, from their development and testing to final simulations, improve the mechanistic understanding of the underlying processes governing the empirical data (e.g., gas kinetics), make it possible to test what is otherwise impossible or difficult to investigate in the laboratory, generate new hypotheses, guide the experimental work by highlighting discrepancies and deficiencies in our assumptions and theories and, thence, yield new knowledge. To understand DRPs, however, dynamic modelling has been employed rather scantily. Examples include the development of such models to analyse NO$_2^-$ and NO$_2^+$ reduction and gas-kinetic data for individual and a mixture of selected phenotypes (Betlach & Tiedje, 1981; Vasiliadou et al., 2006); to understand competition for electrons among NO$_x$/NO$\_x$ by simulating the NO$_x$/NO$\_x$ kinetics in pure cultures (Almeida, Reis, & Carrondo, 1997; Thomsen, Geest, & Cox, 1994); and to scrutinise the hypotheses that O$_2$ inactivates denitrification enzymes (affirmed) and NO inhibits cytochrome c oxidase and NO$_x$ reductase in Agrobacterium tumefaciens (affirmed and rejected, respectively) (Kampschreur et al., 2012). Recently, a simple model based on the Michaelis-Menten kinetics is developed for Paracoccus denitrificans to analyse negative correlation between the Cu availability and N$_2$O emissions (Woolfenden et al., 2013).

**Using dynamic modelling, the present thesis contributes to the understanding of DRP of a prominent model organism, Paracoccus denitrificans.** In the present thesis, we employ dynamic modelling to contribute to the DRP knowledge of the α-Proteobacterium Paracoccus
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denitrificans, a prominent model organisms in denitrification research. By modelling and simulating the organism’s growth and the O\(_2\) and NO\(_x\)/NO\(_x\) kinetics in batch cultures, we explicated our implicit mental model, assumptions, and hypotheses regarding the underlying DRP to test our knowledge, propose new testable hypotheses, and refine important parametric values for future simulations. The knowledge gained is also expected to help understand the physiology of denitrification in other ecologically important denitrifiers.

2.2. The significance of model organisms in denitrification research

In this section, we discuss reasons for proceeding with a model organism to explore the physiology of denitrification.

Model organisms – the primary source of physiological knowledge of denitrification – allow stringent experimentation and robust modelling. Most of the physiological knowledge of denitrification is derived from the exploration of a few model organisms, particularly Rhodobacter sphaeroides, Pseudomonas stutzeri, Pseudomonas aeruginosa, and Pa. denitrificans (B. Liu et al., 2013). That is understandable because it takes years, if not decades any longer, of collective hard work to significantly unveil physiology of an organism; the progress would have been much slower had a simultaneous investigation of individual denitrifiers (a plethora of which is out there) was targeted. As compared to newly isolated strains, well-characterised model organisms lend themselves to stringent and more reliable experimentation. With most of their metabolic and transcriptional nuts and bolts unravelled, these organisms also allow us to construct robust mathematical models that help enhance the physiological understanding of denitrification and pave the way to specialised experiments for testing new hypotheses. The papers in the present thesis are an example thereof.

A model organism is a source of new knowledge – a story of pH and N\(_2\)O emissions. A model organism serves as a source of new knowledge that, to avoid the problem of induction, needs to be tested for its general applicability. For example, it has long been known that

15 Pa. denitrificans is an interesting organism. Because of its extraordinary genomic, structural, and functional resemblance with the mitochondrion, it is hypothesised to be closely related to some \(\alpha\)-proteobacterial ancestor of the mitochondrion (For a recent review of the story, see Gray, 2012). Another interesting aspect of Pa. denitrificans is recently discovered where the organism, along with E. coli, showed robust proliferation at extreme hypergravity, such as found on gigantic stars or in a supernova (Deguchi et al., 2011). The finding has positive implications for the panspermia hypothesis or the possibility of extra-terrestrial life.
denitrification in acidic soils emits more N\textsubscript{2}O than in alkaline ones, but reasons for that were poorly understood. Bergaust et al. (2010) shed some light on the phenomenon through batch culture experiments with \textit{Pa. denitrificans}: the cultures accumulated miniscule transient N\textsubscript{2}O at the neutral pH but as pH was lowered, a negative correlation was observed, where N\textsubscript{2}O became the end product of denitrification at pH 6.0. Earlier, Thomsen et al. (1994) had demonstrated a similar inhibitory effect of low pH on N\textsubscript{2}O reductase (NosZ) in \textit{Pa. denitrificans} and hypothesised that low pH interfered with NosZ at the functional level. Bergaust et al. (2010), however, showed that NosZ synthesised at pH 7.0 was fully functional at pH 6.0, but the cells were unable to make functional NosZ at this low pH, despite substantial transcription of the \textit{nosZ} genes. This led them to hypothesise that low pH actually interfered with the enzyme assembly in the periplasm, where pH is not as controlled as in the cytoplasm. When tested on bacterial cells extracted from soils (Binbin Liu, Frostegård, & Bakken, 2014), the hypothesis was confirmed: the cells could not produce any appreciable amounts of functional Nos at pH $\leq$ 6.1 despite significant gene transcription, but the enzyme produced at pH 7.0 remained functional even at pH as low as 5.7. The story neatly demonstrates how insight provided by a model organism may be effectively utilised to gain new knowledge applicable to a wide range of organisms. The story has to offer a couple of other important lessons as well:

The undesirable effect of soil acidity on N\textsubscript{2}O emission has been known for over half a century (Nömmik, 1956; Wijler & Delwiche, 1954). Despite that, subsiding the acidity of soils through liming, as a mitigation option for N\textsubscript{2}O emissions, has largely been ignored in the global change research. A major reason for that seems to be the lack of insight into the underlying mechanisms governing the pH and N\textsubscript{2}O relationship (Binbin Liu et al., 2014). Most studies have focused on the short-term effects of liming, where it may actually boost N\textsubscript{2}O emissions. But that is temporary due to a surge in the denitrification rate as a result of liming transiently increasing the carbon and nitrogen mineralisation and nitrification (Baggs, Smales, & Bateman, 2010; Clough, Kelliher, Sherlock, & Ford, 2004). In the wake of the evidence suggesting that the Nos synthesis is strongly constricted by the soil acidity, maintaining the alkalinity of agricultural soils most likely would help minimise N\textsubscript{2}O emissions in the long run (Binbin Liu et al., 2014). The story, in contrast to a cursory understanding of denitrification, highlights the importance of mechanistic understanding, both at the environmental as well as at the microbial level. It also illustrates how insight gained through a model organism may help control the end-point variable: NO and N\textsubscript{2}O emissions.
Model organisms provide insight into denitrification as a fitness trait. A detailed exploration of the model organisms is also fruitful since it provides clues to how the regulation of denitrification contributes to the prokaryotes’ fitness for survival. For example, in Paper I we have demonstrated that in response to O$_2$ depletion, the measured denitrification may be achieved by only 4–16% of all cells switching to denitrification. In terms of fitness, this can be viewed as a ‘bet-hedging’ regulation ‘strategy’ (Veening, Smits, & Kuipers, 2008): the fraction switching to denitrification benefits if the anoxic spell is long-lasting and NO$_x$/NO remains available, whereas the non-switching fraction benefits by saving energy required for synthesising denitrification enzymes if the anoxic spell is short.

To put the present thesis in context, the next three sections comprehensively introduce the apparatus, enzymology, bioenergetics, and the regulatory biology of denitrification.

3. The respiratory apparatus and functional enzymes of denitrification

3.1 The e$^-$-transport machinery of denitrification

Aerobic respiration and denitrification utilise the same basic e$^-$-transport machinery. The machinery includes the two membrane bound enzyme-complexes NADH dehydrogenase (complex I) and the cytochrome bc$_1$ complex (complex III), the periplasmic cytochrome c, and the hydrophobic quinone/hydroquinone$^{16}$ (Q/QH$_2$) pool$^{17}$ present in the membrane (Fig. 2) (see Chen & Strous, 2013, pp. 136-140). Organic carbon catabolised through glycolysis and the TCA cycle provides strong e$^-$-donors, such as C$_4$H$_4$O$_4$ (succinate) and NADH. NADH is oxidised to NAD$^+$ by complex I, and succinate is oxidised to fumarate$^{18}$ by the membrane-bound succinate hydrogenase (complex II, not shown in Fig. 2). The e$^-$ scavenged therefrom are utilised by the same complexes to reduce Q to QH$_2$. In turn, QH$_2$ is oxidised to Q by nitrate

$^{16}$ Hydroquinone is also called quinol.

$^{17}$ There can be different types of hydroquinones involved (for example, menahydroquinones or ubihydroquinones). Here we simply use Q and QH$_2$ to represent the e$^-$-poor quinone and the e$^-$-rich hydroquinone, respectively. Interestingly, ubiquinone is the famous coenzyme Q$\text{_{10}}$ used as an anti-oxidant and an anti-ageing agent in dietary supplements and skin (cosmetic) products.

$^{18}$ HO$_2$CCH=CHCO$_2$H
reductase (Nar) and complex III\(^{19}\). Nar utilises the e\(^-\) captured therefrom to reduce NO\(_3^-\) to NO\(_2^-\), and complex III further relays them to cytochrome c and/or some other copper-based e\(^-\)-transporter\(^{20}\) (see Nicholls & Ferguson, 2013, pp. 108-146). From here, the aerobic respiration and denitrification pathways branch off to their own specific modules: for aerobic respiration, e\(^-\) are drawn by a terminal oxidase(s) to reduce O\(_2\) to H\(_2\)O (complex IV, not shown), whereas for denitrification, e\(^-\) are captured by NO\(_x^-\)/NO\(_x\) reductases.

**Fig. 2. The e\(^-\)-transport model of denitrification** (Based on Chen & Strous, 2013; Nicholls & Ferguson, 2013, pp. 106-146; D. Richardson et al., 2009, p. 390; van Spanning, Richardson, & Ferguson, 2007, pp. 4-6, 7-9). The figure and the text assume a gram-negative bacterium. A general e\(^-\)-transport model is difficult to present, since variants of each reductase exist, and denitrifiers harbour various combinations thereof. The model presented fits *Pa. denitrificans* except that complex II and Nap (periplasmic nitrate reductase) are omitted. The most energy-conserving e\(^-\)-pathway of this chain involves complex I, III, and any one of the three NO\(_x^-\)/NO\(_x\) reductases: NirS, cNor, or NosZ, where per 2e\(^-\) passing through the chain, 6H\(^+\) are translocated (by complex I and III) against the electrochemical gradient.

\(^{19}\) Besides Nar and complex III, other proteins in the membrane (not discussed here) can also oxidise QH\(_2\) to Q.

\(^{20}\) In addition, complex III also utilises the e\(^-\) to reduce Q back to QH\(_2\), completing the so-called Q-cycle. The mechanism is discussed in Sec. 4.1.
Electrogenic enzyme-complexes of the e-transport chain. Complex I, III, IV, and Nar are electrogenic, for they harness the energy released by the redox reactions, as e\(^-\) are relayed ‘downhill’\(^{21}\) from an initial e\(^-\)-donor (NADH/C\(_4\)H\(_6\)O\(_4\)) towards a final e\(^-\)-acceptor (O\(_2\)/NO\(_X\)/NO\(_3\)), to translocate H\(^+\) from the cytoplasm to the periplasm\(^{22}\) (see Chen & Strous, 2013, pp. 137-140). This develops an electrochemical potential difference (\(\Delta p\)H + \(\Delta \psi\)) between the cytoplasmic (-ve) and the periplasmic (+ve) vicinities of the membrane, which drives the diffusion of H\(^+\) into the membrane (towards the cytoplasm)\(^{23}\), for which the ATP synthase is the major gateway. Every ~3.3H\(^+\) passing through the ATP synthase generate enough energy for the complex to produce one ATP molecule from ADP and P (D. Richardson et al., 2009, p. 390). To store energy as thus\(^{24}\), aerobic respiration is more efficient than denitrification (see Sec. 4.2 for a detailed comparison).

3.2 Denitrification-specific enzyme complexes

The step-wise dissimilatory reduction of NO\(_3^-\) to N\(_2\) is carried out by four core enzyme-complexes:

\[
\text{NO}_3^- \xrightarrow{\text{Nar/Nap}} \text{NO}_2^- \xrightarrow{\text{NirS/NirK}} \text{NO} \xrightarrow{\text{cNor/qNor}} \text{N}_2\text{O} \xrightarrow{\text{cNosZ/NosZ}} \text{N}_2
\]  
(R1)

where Nar/Nap, NirS/NirK, cNor/qNor, and cNosZ/NosZ are the most commonly discussed variants of nitrate reductase, nitrite reductase, nitric oxide reductase, and nitrous oxide reductase, respectively. Considering the diversity of organisms, many other variants are expected in nature; some others are mentioned below.

\(^{21}\) I.e., the e\(^-\) taking part in spontaneous reactions that produce usable energy, since the energy of reactants is greater than that of the products.

\(^{22}\) And/or to move e\(^-\) within the cell membrane in the opposite direction (see Nicholls & Ferguson, 2013, pp. 106-108).

\(^{23}\) Generating the so-called proton-motive force: \(\Delta \text{pmf} = \Delta \psi - 61\Delta \text{pH}\), where \(\Delta \psi\) is the electrical potential-and \(\Delta \text{pH}\) is the pH-difference across the membrane (Nicholls & Ferguson, 2013, p. 44).

\(^{24}\) The mechanism is formally known as the chemiosmotic theory of oxidative phosphorylation.
3.2.1. Nitrate reductase

Denitrification begins with the reduction of nitrate to nitrite by nitrate reductase, a member of molybdopterin oxidoreductases with, at least, one 4Fe-4S cluster (Nicholls & Ferguson, 2013, pp. 139-140; D. J. Richardson, van Spanning, & Ferguson, 2007, p. 21):

$$\text{NO}_3^- + 2e^- + 2H^+ \xrightarrow{\text{NarGH/Nap}} \text{NO}_2^- + H_2O$$  \hspace{1cm} \text{(R2)}

There are four known variants of nitrate reductase: prokaryotic Nar (NarGHI/NarGH), Nap (NapABC), Nas (NasBGC), and plant/fungal eukNR (see D. J. Richardson et al., 2007; Sparacino-Watkins et al., 2014). The cytoplasmic NasBGC system\(^{25}\) and eukNR, however, are assimilatory nitrate reductases and, therefore, will not be discussed here.

**NarGH.** The complex is membrane-bound with its nitrate-reducing site (NarG) in either the cytoplasm or the periplasm:

**NarGHI.** The cytoplasmic NarGHI\(^{26}\) is an electrogenic complex, functioning according to the so-called redox loop model (see Nicholls & Ferguson, 2013, pp. 106-108): The complex acquires $2e^-$ and $2H^+$ when its NarI subunit oxidises $QH_2$ to $Q$ near the periplasmic face of the membrane (Fig. 2). The $2H^+$ are thrust into the periplasm, whereas the $2e^-$ are transferred via NarH down to NarG, where they are utilised to reduce $\text{NO}_3^-$ to $\text{NO}_2^-$ in the cytoplasm (D. J. Richardson et al., 2007, pp. 23-25). The $2H^+$ required for the reaction (see Eq. R2) are drawn from the cytoplasm, which contribute to the charge separation (Chen & Strous, 2013, p. 139). The rest of the charge separation occurs mainly due to the inward movement of the $2e^-$ from the periplasmic end of the membrane to the active site in the cytoplasm, whereas a little contribution comes from the movement of the $2H^+$ (from $QH_2$) against the electrochemical gradient (Nicholls & Ferguson, 2013, pp. 108, 139).

\(^{25}\) $\text{NO}_3^- \xrightarrow{\text{NasC}} \text{NO}_2^- \xrightarrow{\text{NasB}} \text{NH}_3^+$ (see Gates et al., 2011).

\(^{26}\) Also called nNar, due to NarG being in the negatively charged (cytoplasmic) face of the membrane.
For NarGHI to function, the import of $\text{NO}_3^-$ into the cytoplasm is imperative, and the resulting $\text{NO}_2^-$ must be excreted to avoid toxicity. Both the functions are aptly performed by a membrane-bound protein, NarK, with two sub-units: NarK1 and NarK2. Genetics and biochemical studies indicate that NarK1 is an electroneutral $\text{NO}_3^-/\text{H}^+$ symporter, responsible for channelling the first molecules of $\text{NO}_3^-$ into the cytoplasm, while NarK2 is an electroneutral $\text{NO}_2^-/\text{NO}_3^-$ antiporter which, in the steady state, would excrete $\text{NO}_2^-$ produced in exchange for an equal amount of $\text{NO}_3^-$ into the cytoplasm (Goddard, Moir, Richardson, & Ferguson, 2008; van Spanning et al., 2007, pp. 4-5; Nicholas J. Wood, Alizadeh, Richardson, Ferguson, & Moir, 2002).

*NarGHI*. The periplasmic NarGHI is widespread in bacteria and takes part in fermentation, phototrophy, or denitrification (Chen & Strous, 2013, p. 139). Historically, however, the complex is considered a part of archaeal nitrate reductase system. The system indirectly contributes to the pmf with the reduction of NarGHI coupled to an electrogenic complex (Martinez-Espinosa et al., 2007).

*NapABC*. The enzyme-complex is membrane-bound with its nitrate-reducing site (NapA) in the periplasm\(^{27}\). It acquires the $2e^-$ required for reducing $\text{NO}_3^-$ (Eq. R2) by oxidising $\text{QH}_2$ to $\text{Q}^2$, plunging the $2\text{H}^+$ removed therefrom to the periplasm. It is likely that these $2\text{H}^+$ were, in the first place, pulled from the cytoplasm as, e.g., complex III reduced $\text{Q}$ to $\text{QH}_2$.\(^{29}\) In that case, a contribution to the pmf will be made; otherwise, NapABC itself is electroneutral. The complex, however, functions as part of energy-conserving denitrification and ammonification pathways (see D. J. Richardson et al., 2007, pp. 28-31). Many organisms containing Nar (including *Pa. denitrificans*) also contain NapABC, where the latter is active during aerobic respiration and is hypothesised to function as a scavenger of excess redox equivalents (Nicholls & Ferguson, 2013, pp. 139-140; ibid., p. 29).

\(^{27}\) Hence, the complex is also referred to as pNar.

\(^{28}\) Nap, Nir, Nor, and Nos extract the $2\text{H}^+$ required for the individual reactions they catalyse from the periplasm (Fig. 2). This, however, does not affect the pmf because these reductases consume almost equal number of $e^-$ from the periplasm (van Spanning et al., 2007). Another argument is that for a single cell, the environmental $\text{H}^+$ concentration is considered constant [Per. comm., Jianwei Chen, (Chen & Strous, 2013), Feb. 5, 2015]; hence, the periplasmic $\text{H}^+$ consumed by NO$_x$ reductases can be compensated from other sources, ready to diffuse into the membrane once its cytoplasmic side is made negative (by the $\text{H}^+$ uptake therefrom).

\(^{29}\) That is likely but not guaranteed, since the $\text{QH}_2$ might have been formed by one of a few membrane-enzymes known to extract $2\text{H}^+$ from the periplasm (see Simon, van Spanning, & Richardson, 2008).
3.2.2. Nitrite reductase

The next step of denitrification is catalysed by nitrite reductase, which produces the first gaseous intermediate of denitrification by reducing nitrite to nitric oxide (Nicholls & Ferguson, 2013, pp. 140-141):

\[
\text{NO}_2^- + \text{e}^- + 2\text{H}^+ \xrightarrow{\text{NirS/NirK}} \text{NO} + \text{H}_2\text{O}
\]

(R3)

\textbf{NirK vs. NirS.} The dissimilatory enzymatic complex has two structurally divergent variants\(^{30}\): the copper-type NirK and the cytochrome \(cd_1\)-type NirS (see Rinaldo & Cutruzzolà, 2007). The latter is generally a homodimer, with each sub-unit containing a \(c\) heme and a \(d_1\) heme. To our knowledge, only one bacterial strain has been identified so far containing both these variants together (Philippot & Hallin, 2006).

In the Gram-negative bacteria, NirK or NirS is generally found in the periplasm\(^{31}\) (Fig. 2) and receives e\(^-\) from cytochrome \(c\) (NirS: cytochrome \(c_{550}, c_{551}\), or \(c_{554}\); NirK: \(c_2\) or \(c_{553}\)) and/or small copper-proteins, like azurin or pseudoazurin (Rinaldo & Cutruzzolà, 2007, pp. 39-42, 49, 51; van Spanning et al., 2007, pp. 4-7). In the Gram-positive bacteria, the reductase complex is membrane-bound but with its \(\text{NO}_2^-\) reducing site in the periplasm-like space. In addition to a membrane-bound cytochrome \(c_{550}\), the NirK of the Gram-positive bacterium \textit{Bacillus azotoformans} has been proposed to receive e\(^-\) by reducing menahydroquinone\(^{32}\) (MQH\(_2\)) to menaquinone\(^{33}\) (MQ) (Suharti & de Vries, 2005, pp. 132-133).

Both NirS and NirK are electroneutral but indirectly contribute to the pmf by drawing e\(^-\) from cytochrome \(c\) and/or Cu-proteins, which are reduced by the electrogenic complex III (van Spanning et al., 2007, pp. 7-9). Furthermore, complex III itself is proposed to be reduced by QH\(_2\) originating from the electrogenic complex I (Madigan et al., 2014, p. 92; Nicholls & Ferguson, 2013, pp. 56, 131-132). The NirK of \textit{B. azotoformans} also indirectly contributes to

\(^{30}\) Assimilatory plant and bacterial nitrite reductases are beyond the scope of this thesis.

\(^{31}\) However, the Gram-negative bacterium \textit{Thiobacillus denitrificans} contains both the periplasmic and the membrane-bound NirS (Hole et al., 1996).

\(^{32}\) Also called menaquinol.

\(^{33}\) Popularly known as vitamin K\(_2\).
the charge separation by accepting e\textsuperscript{−} from cytochrome $c_{550}$ and MQH\textsubscript{2}: MQ is reduced to MQH\textsubscript{2} by complex I, which is then oxidised back by the electrogenic cytochrome $b_{6f}$ complex to reduce cytochrome $c_{550}$ (Suharti & de Vries, 2005, pp. 132-133).

### 3.2.3. Nitric oxide reductase

The haem-copper oxidase, with its catalytic site containing non-heme iron, reduces two molecules of nitric oxide to nitrous oxide (see de Vries, Suharti, & Pouvreau, 2007):

$$2\text{NO} + 2\text{e}^- + 2\text{H}^+ \xrightarrow{c\text{Nor}/q\text{Nor}/q\text{Cu_ANor}} \text{N}_2\text{O} + \text{H}_2\text{O}$$

(R4)

Since NO is a free radical and highly toxic, Nor (along with other such enzymes) is crucial for the fitness of an organism producing NO or encountering cytotoxic levels of environmental NO\textsuperscript{34}. In archaea, detoxification seems to be the main function of Nor, rather than energy conservation (ibid., p. 57). Three main variants of this integral membrane-complex are known: cNor, qNor, and qCu\textsubscript{A}Nor. In addition, a fungal NO reductase, cytochrome P450nor, is also proposed to be involved in denitrification and co-denitrification\textsuperscript{35} (see Shoun, Fushinobu, Jiang, Kim, & Wakagi, 2012).

**cNor.** This cytochrome $bc$ complex is typical for Gram-negative denitrifying bacteria and is the most well-studied of the three (de Vries et al., 2007, pp. 58-60). As mentioned above, it is an integral membrane-complex (Fig. 2) and belongs to the haem-copper superfamily of the most commonly found bacterial terminal oxidases\textsuperscript{36}, which are electrogenic (see Sec. 3.3 and 4.2). Considering this and the reduction of NO being more energetic than that of O\textsubscript{2} (Berks, Ferguson, Moir, & Richardson, 1995, p. 101), one would expect cNor to be electrogenic. But electrochemical, biochemical, and flow-flash experiments conducted over the last thirty years strongly suggest that the complex cannot pump H\textsuperscript{+} across the membrane nor does it extract

\begin{itemize}
  \item NO molecules can easily diffuse across the cell membrane.
  \item Simultaneous use of NO\textsubscript{2}− and O\textsubscript{2}-respiration, also known as aerobic denitrification or co-respiration (see Chen & Strous, 2013).
  \item Conspicuously similar to the $cbb_{3}$-type cytochrome $c$ oxidase but with Fe\textsubscript{b} replacing the Cu\textsubscript{b} subunit (Forte et al., 2001, p. 6486). It is not surprising then that both can reduce NO as well as O\textsubscript{2} (de Vries et al., 2007, p. 58).
\end{itemize}
2H+ required for the formation of N2O (see Eq. R4) from the cytoplasm (Berks et al., 1995, pp. 146-147; Blomberg & Siegbahn, 2013; Hino, Nagano, Sugimoto, Tosha, & Shiro, 2012, p. 681; Reimann, Flock, Lepp, Honigmann, & Ådelroth, 2007). Recent studies based on structural biochemistry are interesting in this regard: The crystal structure solved for cNor in 2010 seemingly lacks the H+-pathways identified in the haem-copper oxidases between their catalytic sites and the cytoplasm (Lee, Reimann, Huang, & Ådelroth, 2012). On the contrary, several periplasmic H+-pathways have been proposed, and a specific one is confirmed to be used by *Pa. denitrificans* (ter Beek, Krause, Reimann, Lachmann, & Ådelroth, 2013). Molecular dynamic simulations of cNor’s crystal structure have also suggested two possible periplasmic H+-pathways to the active site, but none from the cytoplasm (Pisliakov, Hino, Shiro, & Sugita, 2012). Interestingly, quantum chemical energy calculations have indicated that it is impossible for cNor to be electrogenic (Blomberg & Siegbahn, 2013). Nonetheless, since cNor most likely acquires e- either from cytochrome c (c550)37 or Cu-proteins (azurin, pseudoazurin), it indirectly contributes to the pmf for the same reasons as for Nir (de Vries et al., 2007, pp. 58-59; van Spanning et al., 2007, pp. 7-9).

qNor. In contrast to c in cNor, q in qNor indicates that this single-subunit variant utilises QH2 or MQH2 as the e'-donor (de Vries et al., 2007, pp. 60-61). The structure-based mutagenesis and molecular dynamic simulations of the crystal structure solved for qNor in 2011 have suggested a water channel between the enzyme’s active site and the cytoplasm (Matsumoto et al., 2012). The channel is hypothesised to serve as a H+-pathway from the cytoplasm and, hence, has raised speculations about the electrogenicity of qNor; however, no pathway has yet been identified between the catalytic site and the periplasm for H+ to permeate through the complex (ibid., pp. 1911-1912). In addition to denitrifying bacteria and archaea, qNor is also found in non-denitrifying bacteria, including pathogens that invade mammalian cells. In these organisms, the primary function of the enzyme seems to be detoxification, which is crucial for pathogens to tackle the cytotoxic levels of NO produced by the defence system of the host (Hendriks et al., 2000).

qCuANor. To our knowledge, the two-subunit complex has only been found in *B. azotoformans* (de Vries et al., 2007, pp. 59, 62). qCuANor is electroneutral but indirectly contributes to the pmf by accepting e' via a specific membrane-bound cytochrome c551 and by

---

37 Hence a c in the name cNor.
oxidising MQH$_2$ to MQ: MQH$_2$ is formed by complex I, which in the process pumps 4H$^+$ against the electrochemical gradient, and c$_{551}$ is reduced by the electrogenic cytochrome b$_{0f}$ complex (Suharti & de Vries, 2005, pp. 132-133). The main function of the e$^-$-pathway via MQH$_2$ is proposed to be a rapid NO detoxification, since the pathway’s maximum e$^-$-delivery rate is found to be four times higher than that via c$_{551}$ (Suharti, Heering, & de Vries, 2004). Hence, B. azotoformans is more NO tolerant than, for instance, Pa. denitrificans that acquires e$^-$ from cytochrome c$_{550}$ or Cu-proteins for cNor.

### 3.2.4. Nitrous oxide reductase

The enzyme-complex catalyses the last step of denitrification by reducing nitrous oxide to dinitrogen:

\[
N_2O + 2e^- + 2H^+ \xrightarrow{\text{NosZ}/c\text{NosZ}} N_2 + H_2O
\]  
(R5)

Nos$^{38}$ is found in a wide variety of denitrifying and non-denitrifying archaea and bacteria, belonging to diverse taxonomic groups (see Zumft & Körner, 2007). Like Nir, the enzyme is either located in the periplasm as a water-soluble protein or is membrane-bound not only in Gram-positives but some Gram-negatives$^{39}$ as well (ibid., p. 77; Suharti & de Vries, 2005, p. 132). The catalytic-site of the reductase, however, is oriented towards the extracellular space (van Spanning et al., 2007, p. 6).

**Two variants and their potentially deceptive names.** Two variants of the enzymatic complex are known: the so-called typical NosZ and atypical NosZ or, synonymously, Z-type Nos and cNosZ, respectively. First, both the set of names require some clarification: cNosZ, when first found in the non-denitrifying Epsilonproteobacterium Wolinella succinogenes$^{40}$, appeared to be atypical as compared to the typical NosZ known for denitrifiers (Simon, Einsle, Kroneck,

---

$^{38}$ Also known as N$_2$OR.

$^{39}$ *Flexibacter canadensis, Thiosphaera pantotropha, Pyrobaculum aerophilum,* and *Thiobacillus denitrificans.*

$^{40}$ The organism relies on NO$_4^-$ and NO$_2^-$ ammonification and N$_2$O respiration, with each process depending on formate dehydrogenase for e$^-$. 
& Zumft, 2004). However, in a recent study, 142 full-length prokaryotic nosZ gene sequences were examined\(^{41}\), indicating that the genes encoding cNosZ is as abundant as that for the typical Z-type (Jones, Graf, Bru, Philippot, & Hallin, 2013). In another study, 126 bacterial and seven archaeal nosZ-carrying genomes were screened, revealing that 44% of the genomes with atypical nosZ clusters were denitrifiers (Sanford et al., 2012).

The names Z-type Nos and cNosZ (or sometimes simply cNos) are also unintuitive: both the variants have copper-sulphide centres (Cu\(_Z\)) and a head-to-tail configuration (Fig. 3) for which the first is called Z-type\(^{42}\) (as explained by Zumft & Körner, 2007, p. 68), and both may accept e\(^{-}\) from cytochrome c for which the second has a c in its name. It may be argued that the c in cNosZ refers to an additional cytochrome c domain, covalently bound to the reductase. Genetic analyses, however, have revealed that such a domain, typical of W. succinogenes, is missing even in the two bacteria with their cNosZ sequences most similar to that of W. succinogenes (Simon et al., 2004, p. 10).

**Z-type Nos vs. cNosZ.** Both the complexes have the same primary structure (Kern & Simon, 2009, pp. 652-653): a homodimer with its monomers bound together in a head-to-tail configuration, which is critical for the adequate functioning of the complex (see Fig. 3). Each monomer has a C-terminal with a copper centre (Cu\(_A\)), receiving and transporting e\(^{-}\), and an N-terminal with a catalytic copper-sulphide centre (Cu\(_Z\)). The structure of cNosZ differs in that it typically\(^{43}\) has an extended C-terminal with (e.g., W. succinogenes) or without (e.g., Dechloromonas aromatica and M. magnetotacticum) a covalently-bound monohaem cytochrome c domain\(^{44}\) (Simon et al., 2004, p. 10).

The two variants differ in their translocation pathways from the cytoplasm to the periplasm: Z-type Nos, like Nap and periplasmic NarGH, is exported through Tat, whereas cNosZ, with

\(^{41}\) Out of total 216 found in the NCBI microbes database. 216 – 142 = 74 nosZ sequences were disregarded as practically redundant.

\(^{42}\) ‘Z-type’ may also mislead one to assume as if the variant is named after the nosZ gene, responsible for exclusively encoding this type. But cNosZ is also encoded by the gene called nosZ. [The two genes are evolutionarily related but not the same (Sanford et al., 2012, p. 1)].

\(^{43}\) But not always [Per. comm., Jörg Simon (Simon et al., 2004), Mar. 3, 2015].

\(^{44}\) The domain is thought to deliver e\(^{-}\) to Cu\(_A\) in W. succinogenes.
a few exceptions, is most likely transported through the Sec pathway (Jones et al., 2013, p. 420; Zumft & Körner, 2007, pp. 77-78).

Although the reduction of N₂O to N₂ is highly exergonic (ΔG° = -339.5 kJ mol⁻¹), both the catalytic variants are electroneutral. Nonetheless, since certain bacteria are known to grow via N₂O respiration, the energy must somehow be conserved:

Regarding Z-type Nos, the energy is proposed to be conserved in the same way as for Nir and cNor: the complex accepts e⁻ from cytochrome c and/or Cu-proteins that, in turn, are reduced by electrogenic complexes III (directly) and, possibly, I (indirectly, see Fig. 2) (Nicholls & Ferguson, 2013, pp. 131-132, 140-141; Zumft & Körner, 2007, pp. 67-68). Similarly, the membrane-bound Z-type Nos of P. aerophilum and B. azotoformans is described to contribute indirectly to the pmf by oxidising MQH₂, which was reduced by complex I (MQ → MQH₂).
with the pumping of $4H^+$ across the membrane (Suharti & de Vries, 2005, pp. 132-133). A Nos-specific membrane-bound protein, NosR, is also suggested to participate in the $e^-$-transport to Z-type Nos in *Pseudomonas stutzeri* (Wunsch & Zumft, 2005). It is, however, not clear how this pathway contributes to the charge separation.

On the other hand, a typical epsilonproteobacterial $N_2O$ respiration model is recently deduced from genetic studies (Kern & Simon, 2009, pp. 652-653). In this model, $c$NosZ is hypothesised to accept $e^-$ from a $c$NosZ-specific NosGH complex, directly or possibly via intermediary $c$-type cytochromes, NosC1 and NosC2. The membrane-bound NosGH acquires $e^-$ by oxidising $QH_2$ to $Q$ and deposits the $2H^+$ extracted therefrom into the periplasm. Like for NapABC, the contribution to the pmf depends on whether the $QH_2$ oxidised was, in the first place, formed by the $2H^+$ originating from the cytoplasm.

### 3.3. Enzyme-complexes of *Pa. denitrificans* $e^-$-transport chain

*NarGHI, NapABC, NirS, cNor, and NosZ.* The $e^-$-transport chain of *Pa. denitrificans* is as depicted in Fig. 2; however, in addition to NarGHI, NirS, cNor, and NosZ, the organism also has NapABC (not shown). But the genes encoding Nap are predominantly expressed under oxic- rather than anoxic conditions, suggesting that Nar takes over the role of reducing $NO_3^-\rightarrow NO_2^-$ during anoxic conditions (Qu, Bergaust, & Bakken, 2014, Paper IV, p. 19). The function of Nap during aerobic respiration is hypothesised to be that of dissipating excess redox equivalents (Sears, Spiro, & Richardson, 1997). Hence, we did not consider the activity of Nap while modelling the reduction of $NO_3^-\rightarrow NO_3^-\rightarrow NO_2^-$ (Paper III).

**Complex II.** In the core $e^-$-transport machinery, *Pa. denitrificans* also harbours the electroneutral succinate hydrogenase, feeding the machinery (by oxidising succinate to fumarate) with $2e^-$ (see Madigan et al., 2014, pp. 91-92), which are passed on to complex III. Since the $e^-$-pathway commencing from complex II bypasses the highly electrogenic complex I, a lower charge separation is achieved per $e^-$-pair, compared to the pathway involving complex I.
**Terminal oxidases (complex IV).** *Pa. denitrificans* is a metabolically diverse organism with multiple haem-copper terminal oxidoreductases: cytochrome c oxidases\(^{45}\) (\(aa_3\), \(cbb_3\), and \(b\)-containing) and hydroquinone oxidases (\(ba_3\) or \(bb_3\)) (de Gier et al., 1994; Raitio & Wikström, 1994; Richter, Tao, Turba, & Ludwig, 1994). All these oxidases are proton pumps, at least, in *Pa. denitrificans* (de Gier et al., 1996; García-Horsman, Barquera, Rumbley, Ma, & Gennis, 1994, p. 5589). The role of \(cbb_3\)-type as a proton-pump long remained controversial, but recent studies suggest that this high-affinity oxidase, functional at low \(O_2\) concentrations, does pump \(H^+\) with a stoichiometry of 0.4–1\(H^+\) translocation per \(e^-\) received (Murali, Yildiz, Daldal, & Gennis, 2012; Rauhamäki, Bloch, & Wikström, 2012). This \(H^+\)-pumping efficiency, however, is much lower than that of a typical mitochondrial-type \(aa_3\) oxidase of *Pa. denitrificans* (discussed below).

### 4. Bioenergetics of aerobic respiration vs. denitrification

As discussed above, the free energy released by redox reactions in the \(e^-\)-transport chain is coupled to the ATP generation through the proton-motive force (pmf). In conserving energy as such, aerobic respiration is more efficient than denitrification, since its \(e^-\)-transport machinery pumps 1.33–7.5 times more \(H^+\) from the cytoplasm to the periplasm per \(e^-\)-pair (van Spanning et al., 2007, pp. 7-9). The number of \(H^+\) translocation per \(e^-\) depends on the enzyme-complexes involved.\(^{46}\) Here, energetically the most favourable \(e^-\)-transport chain of aerobic respiration is compared with the counterpart from denitrification, both functioning under optimal conditions. Such chain for aerobic respiration involves NADH hydrogenase (complex I), cytochrome \(bc_1\) complex (complex III), and \(aa_3\)-type cytochrome \(c\) oxidase as complex IV, whereas the denitrification counterpart involves complex I, complex III, NirS, cNor, and NosZ\(^{47}\). Interestingly, *Pa. denitrificans* is diverse enough to harbour both these \(e^-\)-transport chains. We proceed by discussing complex I and III utilised by both the modes of respiration.

---

\(^{45}\) Usually abbreviated as CcO.

\(^{46}\) For the charge-separation capacity of various combinations of denitrification reductases versus aerobic respiration involving \(aa_3\)- or \(ba_3\)-type cytochrome \(c\) oxidases, see van Spanning et al., 2007, p. 8.

\(^{47}\) A pathway including NirK, qCuANor, and cNosZ will be equally energetic. qNor is hypothesised to acquire 2\(H^+\) to convert NO to N\(_2\)O from the cytoplasm (Matsumoto et al., 2012), but further investigations are required to establish this.
4.1. Bioenergetics of complex I and III

**Complex I.** The complex is peculiarly large, comprising up to 44 subunits in eukaryotes and 14 in bacteria. At the extreme-end of its cytoplasmic (hydrophilic) module, NADH + H\(^+\) is oxidised to NAD\(^+\) + 2H\(^+\) (Fig. 2). The oxidation induces conformational change in the complex, resulting in the translocation of 4H\(^+\) from the cytoplasm to the periplasm. The complex uses the 2H\(^+\) and 2e\(^-\) produced from the oxidation of NADH to reduce Q to QH\(_2\), where the 2e\(^-\) reach the Q-reduction site via flavin mononucleotide (FMN) and Fe-S centres of the hydrophilic module.\(^{48}\) The reduction of Q takes place at the NuoH subunit on the verge of the hydrophilic and hydrophobic modules, entailing that the 2e\(^-\) moving within complex I do not travel through the membrane, hence not having any implication for the charge separation. The 2H\(^+\) obtained by the oxidation of NADH in the cytoplasm are inconsequential for the charge separation since, in steady state, the production and uptake of such H\(^+\) is equal.\(^{49}\)

Thus, overall, the electrogenic complex I deposits \(\frac{4\text{H}^+}{2\text{e}^-}\) against the electrochemical gradient (Nicholls & Ferguson, 2013, pp. 56, 108-111, 131-132).

**Complex III (the Q-cycle).** While performing its electrogenic function, the complex runs the so-called Q-cycle, which I describe here in two-steps (see Nicholls & Ferguson, 2013, pp. 118-125):

1) The complex binds a Q molecule (Q\(_c\)) near the cytoplasmic face and a QH\(_2\) molecule near the periplasmic face of the membrane (Fig. 2). The QH\(_2\) is oxidised to Q (Q\(_p\)), and the 2H\(^+\) therefrom are forced to the periplasm. One of the 2e\(^-\) from the QH\(_2\) is relayed, via Fe\(_2\)-S\(_2\) centre of the so-called Rieske protein, to the cytochrome c\(_1\) subunit in the periplasm, which eventually reduces cytochrome c. The other e\(^-\) is transferred, via cytochrome b\(_L\) to b\(_H\), against the electrochemical gradient to the bound Q\(_c\).

---

\(^{48}\) As mentioned in Sec. 3.3, 2e\(^-\) can also enter the e\(^-\)-transport chain by complex II (succinate dehydrogenase) or a few other reductases, bypassing complex I and directly delivering e\(^-\) to the Q/QH\(_2\) pool (Nicholls & Ferguson, 2013, p. 7).

\(^{49}\) The cytoplasmic H\(^+\) extracted by the e\(^-\)-transport complexes are either generated by the oxidation of NADH or dissociation of H\(_2\)O into H\(^+\) + OH\(^-\) (Madigan et al., 2014, p. 91). The translocation of the latter H\(^+\) to the periplasm will result in the build-up of negative charge (OH\(^-\)) in the cytoplasmic vicinity of the membrane, contributing to the electrochemical potential difference across the membrane.
reducing it to semiquinone (Q\textsuperscript{−}). Q\textsubscript{p} is released from the complex, whereas Q\textsubscript{c} remains tightly bound.

2) Complex III oxidises another QH\textsubscript{2} molecule near the periplasmic face. Like in step 1, the 2H\textsuperscript{+} therefrom are pushed to the periplasm, one of the 2e\textsuperscript{−} reduces cytochrome c, and the other reaches b\textsubscript{H} (via b\textsubscript{L}). b\textsubscript{H} loses its e\textsuperscript{−} to the free-radical Q\textsuperscript{−} bound nearby, which is released by the complex as QH\textsubscript{2}; the 2H\textsuperscript{+} required are drawn from the cytoplasm. Q\textsubscript{p} (produced by the oxidation of QH\textsubscript{2}) is also released.

During the Q-cycle, complex III oxidises 2QH\textsubscript{2} and reduces 1Q to QH\textsubscript{2}, depositing 4H\textsuperscript{+} to the periplasm but extracting only 2H\textsuperscript{+} from the cytoplasm. If we look closely, however, there is no discrepancy in the H\textsuperscript{+}-stoichiometry here because one of the 2QH\textsubscript{2} molecules oxidised by complex III was, in the first place, formed by complex I or II by extracting 2H\textsuperscript{+} from the cytoplasm (see Fig. 2). Regarding the 4e\textsuperscript{−} involved, 2e\textsuperscript{−} reach the periplasm whereas 2e\textsuperscript{−} are deposited back to the membrane through the reduction of Q to QH\textsubscript{2}. Hence, per 2e\textsuperscript{−} delivered at the periplasmic side, complex III deposits 4H\textsuperscript{+} to the periplasm. But the net charge transfer is not equivalent to 4H\textsuperscript{+} because a) the effect of the 2H\textsuperscript{+} deposited to the periplasm will be cancelled out against the deposition of the 2e\textsuperscript{−} to the periplasm by complex III that eventually came from the cytoplasm (as complex I or II reduced Q to QH\textsubscript{2}), and b) none of the 4H\textsuperscript{+} travel all the way as charged entities from the cytoplasmic- to the periplasmic side of the membrane. Most of the charge separation comes from the transfer of the 2e\textsuperscript{−} from b\textsubscript{L} at one hydrophobic end of the membrane to b\textsubscript{H} at the other; the effect is equivalent to the movement of 2H\textsuperscript{+} in the opposite direction. Thus, altogether, complex III’s activity is equivalent to depositing \( \frac{2H^+}{2e^{-}} \) against the electrochemical gradient (Nicholls & Ferguson, 2013, pp. 59-60, 122, 131-132).

4.2. Bioenergetics of complex IV vs. NirS/cNor/NosZ

For aerobic respiration, e\textsuperscript{−} are shuttled from complex III to IV (aα3-type cytochrome c oxidase), whereas for denitrification, e\textsuperscript{−} are transported from complex III to NirS, cNor, and NosZ (Fig. 2, complex IV not shown).

**Complex IV.** For reducing O\textsubscript{2} to 2H\textsubscript{2}O, complex IV picks up 4H\textsuperscript{+} from the cytoplasm and receives 4e\textsuperscript{−} from complex III via cytochrome c (periplasm) (Chen & Strous, 2013, p. 140).
The 4H⁺ and 4e⁻ move against the electrochemical gradient within the complex and meet halfway through the membrane at the catalytic site of the complex, producing an effect equivalent to the translocation of 4H⁺ from the cytoplasm to the periplasm. In addition, the complex couples the energy released by the reduction of O₂ to pump 4H⁺ across the membrane. Thus, overall, complex IV’s activity is equivalent to the translocation of \( \frac{8H^+}{4e^-} \) or \( \frac{4H^+}{2e^-} \) against the electrochemical gradient (Nicholls & Ferguson, 2013, pp. 126-132).

**Nir/cNor/NosZ.** In contrast, NirS, cNor, and NosZ are electroneutral, extracting e⁻ and H⁺, required for their catalytic activity, from the periplasm (Fig. 2). Nonetheless, each indirectly contributes to the charge separation by accepting e⁻ from the electrogenic complex III \( \left( \frac{2H^+}{2e^-} \right) \), via cytochrome c or Cu-proteins (Nicholls & Ferguson, 2013, pp. 139-141).

**Nir/cNor/NosZ vs. NarGHI.** If we compare the activity of NirS, cNor, or NosZ with that of NarGHI (Fig. 2), the latter consumes 2H⁺ from the cytoplasm, deposits 2H⁺ to the periplasm, and relays 2e⁻ to the site of NO₂⁻-formation against the electrochemical gradient, yielding a net stoichiometry equivalent to \( \frac{2H^+}{2e^-} \) (Nicholls & Ferguson, 2013, pp. 106-108, 139-141). Therefore, although the reactions performed by Nor and Nos are much more exergonic than that catalysed by Nar (Berks et al., 1995, p. 101), the amount of energy conserved turns out to be the same. However, Nir, Nor, and Nos play a critical role as alternative e⁻-sinks in the absence of O₂; without such sinks, complex I and III cannot function (Nicholls & Ferguson, 2013, p. 141).

**Aerobic respiration vs. denitrification.** Overall, aerobic respiration, via complex I \( \left( \frac{4H^+}{2e^-} \right) \), III \( \left( \frac{2H^+}{2e^-} \right) \), and IV \( \left( \frac{4H^+}{2e^-} \right) \), translocates \( \frac{10H^+}{2e^-} \) across the membrane, whereas denitrification only \( \frac{6H^+}{2e^-} \), via complex I and III. This provides energetic-basis to explain why all known denitrifiers down-regulate denitrification in the presence of O₂ (Chen & Strous, 2013, pp. 137-140; van Spanning et al., 2007, pp. 7-9).
5. Transcriptional regulation of denitrification genes

*O₂ controls denitrification at transcriptional as well as metabolic level.* Typically, denitrifiers are facultative anaerobes, expressing the genes encoding denitrification-specific reductases in response to O₂ depletion. When a denitrifying population is exposed to full aeration, the typical response is a) an immediate transcriptional inactivation of denitrification genes and b) diversion of the e⁻-route from Q/QH₂ pool–NOₓ/NO₃ reductases to Q/QH₂–complex IV (van Spanning et al., 2007, p. 10). Thus, O₂ controls denitrification at transcriptional as well as metabolic level, and both have a plausible fitness value. The metabolic control maximises the ATP yield, since the ATP per mole e⁻ transferred to complex IV is 1.33–7.5 times higher than to Nir, Nor, or Nos (van Spanning et al., 2007, p. 8). The transcriptional control, on the other hand, minimises the energy cost of producing denitrification enzymes.

*Denitrification proteome is diluted by aerobic growth and its re-synthesis costs ATP.* The denitrification proteome produced in response to an anoxic spell is likely to linger within the cells under subsequent oxic conditions⁵⁰, ready to be used if O₂-limitation reoccurs. However, the proteome will be diluted by aerobic growth, since the transcription of denitrification genes is effectively inactivated by O₂. Hence, a population growing through many generations under fully oxic conditions will probably be dominated by the cells without intact denitrification proteome. When confronted with O₂ depletion, such a population will have to start from scratch, i.e., transcribe the relevant genes, translate mRNA into peptide chains (protein synthesis by ribosomes) and secure that these chains are correctly folded by the chaperones, transport the enzymes to their correct locations in the cell, and insert necessary co-factors (e.g., Cu, Fe, or Mo). In *E. coli* grown under optimal conditions, the entire process from the transcriptional activation to a functional enzyme takes ≤20 minutes (Proshkin, Rahmouni, Mironov, & Nudler, 2010) and is likely to cost significant ATP.

With a variety of NOₓ/NO₃ reductases and O₂- and NOₓ/NO₃-sensing mechanisms operating in various denitrifiers, there is no single apparatus of regulation of denitrification. Nonetheless, each regulatory network can be seen to function as to keep NO₂⁻ and NO under

---

⁵⁰ This, however, has not been studied in detail.
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cytotoxic levels (van Spanning et al., 2007, p. 11). Here we will confine our discussion to the regulatory network of *Pa. denitrificans*.

*Transcriptional regulation of denitrification genes in Pa. denitrificans.* Nar, NirS, cNor, and NosZ are encoded by *narKGHJI, nirSECF, norCBQDEF* and *nosRZDFYLX* gene clusters, respectively51 (Spiro, 2012, p. 1222; van Spanning et al., 2007, pp. 9-10). Transcriptional regulation of these genes involves, at least, three FNR-type proteins acting as sensors for O$_2$, NO$_2^-$, and NO: FnrP, NarR, and NNR, respectively. FnrP contains a 4Fe-4S cluster for O$_2$-sensing, and NNR harbours a NO-sensing haem; NarR, however, is poorly characterised, and its role as a NO$_2^-$-sensor is hypothetical (Bouchal et al., 2010, pp. 1350-1351). All the three sensors remain completely inactive during aerobic growth conditions (ibid., pp. 1355-1356). NarR and FnrP self-regulate their concentrations by repressing their own synthesis (van Spanning et al., 2007, p. 16).

Low O$_2$ activates FnrP, which in an interplay with NarR induces *nar* transcription. NarR, most probably, is activated by NO$_2^-$; thus, once a cell starts producing traces of NO$_2^-$, *nar* expression becomes autocatalytic (Fig. 4, see P$_1$). Transcription of *nirS* is suppressed in the presence of O$_2$ (Bergaust et al., 2010; Qu et al., 2014, Paper III), but the exact inactivation mechanism is unknown. Probably, O$_2$ supresses NNR (Spiro, 2007, p. 198), required to induce *nirS* transcription. Nonetheless, under anoxic/micro-oxic conditions, the expression of *nirS* also becomes autocatalytic via positive feedback by NO-NNR (Fig. 4, P$_2$). In contrast, NO-NNR facilitate a substrate-induced transcription of *nor* (Fig. 4, see the negative feedback N) (Bouchal et al., 2010; van Spanning et al., 2007, pp. 10-16). Finally, *nosZ* is equally and independently induced by NNR and FnrP (Bergaust et al., 2012).

Increasing [NO] constraints *nar* transcription by inactivating FnrP (van Spanning et al., 2007, p. 16) and, like O$_2$, renders NosZ dysfunctional by inactivating the complex’s CuZ subunit (D. Richardson et al., 2009, p. 391). These observations, however, are ignored for our modelling because *Pa. denitrificans* restricts [NO] to very low levels.

---

51 For briefness, we will refer to these gene clusters as *nar, nirS, nor* and *nosZ*, respectively.
Fig. 4. The regulatory network of denitrification in *Pa. denitrificans* (Based on Bergaust, van Spanning, Frostegård, & Bakken, 2012; Bouchal et al., 2010; van Spanning et al., 2007, pp. 10-16; N. J. Wood et al., 2001, pp. 3611-3612). Nar, NirS, cNor, and NosZ are encoded by the *narG*, *nirS*, *norBC* and *nosZ* genes, respectively. Transcription of these genes is regulated by, at least, three FNR-type proteins, which are sensors for O\textsubscript{2} (FnrP), NO\textsuperscript{2−} (NarR), and NO (NNR). In response to O\textsubscript{2} depletion, FnrP in coaction with NarR facilitates a product-induced transcription of the *nar* genes (see the positive feedback P\textsubscript{1}), and NNR activates a product-induced transcription of *nirS* (P\textsubscript{2}).\textsuperscript{52} NNR further induces *nor* transcription, thereby counteracting the NO accumulation (the negative-feedback N). Finally, NNR induces *nosZ* transcription, but that is also equally and independently induced by FnrP.\textsuperscript{53}

6. Simulated experiments, research problems, modelling, and the outcome

The present thesis takes advantage of refined experiments with *Pa. denitrificans*, providing us with challenging datasets for testing whether we could simulate the observed denitrification

\textsuperscript{52} NNR also controls transcription of the genes encoding NirI (not shown), a transmembrane protein required for a fine-tuned regulation of NirS concentration (Saunders et al., 1999; van Spanning et al., 2007).

\textsuperscript{53} For *nosZ* expression, a transmembrane Fe-S flavoprotein, NosR (not shown), is also mandatory (Wunsch & Zumft, 2005).
phenotype based on existing knowledge of the regulatory network and enzymology of this organism. First, an overview of the simulated experiments is presented, followed by an introduction of each paper’s research problem, model and, finally, the outcome and its implications.

### 6.1. A synopsis of the simulated experiments

**Batch incubation.** *Pa. denitrificans* (DSM413) was incubated at 20 °C, using 50 mL Sistrom’s (1960) medium in 120 mL gas-tight vials. Either succinate or butyrate (5 mM) was used as the main carbon source, enough to secure consumption of all available e⁻-acceptors. After distribution of the medium, each vial was loaded with a magnetic stirring bar, sterilised through autoclaving, supplemented with 2 mM KNO₃ or KNO₂, and tightly sealed. To remove O₂ and N₂ from the headspace, the headspace air was evacuated and replaced by helium through several cycles of evacuation and He-filling (He-washing). Either 0, 1 or 7 headspace-vol.% O₂ was injected into the vials, where treatments pragmatically labelled as 0% contained detectable traces of O₂. All the vials were then equilibrated at 20 °C while being continuously stirred. Finally, the over-pressure was released, and each vial was inoculated with aerobically grown cells.

**Gas measurement.** O₂ injected into the headspace diffused to the aqueous-phase, where it was consumed for aerobic respiration before the cells initiated denitrification. Gases diffused to the headspace, where CO₂, O₂, NO, N₂O, and N₂ were monitored by frequent sampling. For sampling of the headspace, an automated incubation system was used (see Molstad, Dörsch, & Bakken, 2007). The system sequentially takes samples through the rubber septa of the incubation vials, which were constantly stirred while being placed in a thermostatic water bath at 20 °C. The auto-sampler, connected to a gas chromatograph (GC) and a NO analyser, performs peristaltic pumping that removes a fraction of all headspace gases (3–3.4%) and replaces that fraction by an equal amount of He by reversing the pumping. The reverse pumping helps maintain ~1 atm pressure inside the vials. Each sampling also results in a marginal leakage of O₂ and N₂ through tubing and membranes of the injection system.

**NO₂⁻ measurement** *(Paper III)*. To extract samples for measuring NO₂⁻ without tampering the original vials, identical (parallel) vials were prepared for each treatment. Using sterile
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syringes, samples of 0.1 mL were regularly drawn from the aqueous-phase of the parallel vials. From each extracted sample, 0.001 mL was injected into a vessel containing acetic acid with 1 vol.% sodium iodide, which converted the sampled NO$_2^-$ to NO. Using N$_2$, the NO produced was pumped from the vessel into a NO analyser, enabling us to infer the initial NO$_2^-$ concentration.

6.2. Research problems, modelling, and the outcome

By modelling, we explored the regulation of 1) NirS (controlling the NO$_2^-$ and N$_2$ kinetics$^{54}$), 2) NirS/cNor (homeostatic control of NO by Pa. denitrificans), 3) Nar, and 4) cNor/NosZ (N$_2$O kinetics). The first two are the subject of Paper I & II, respectively, and the last two are addressed in Paper III. We started with a simple model for Paper I and further developed it to address more specialised problems in Papers II & III. Each model simulates the respiratory metabolism (O$_2$ reduction followed by that of NO$_2^-$/NO$_x$), growth, and gas transport between the aqueous-phase and the headspace. The models also include estimation of gas loss and leaks due to sampling, so as to allow a direct comparison between experimental data and model simulations. The models use the Michaelis-Menten kinetics to simulate the activity of the reductases involved, except that in Models II & III the cooperative binding of the two NO molecules with cNor to form N$_2$O is modelled by an equation developed by Girsch & de Vries (1997, pp. 210-211). All model parameters critical for our research questions were empirically determined under the same or similar experimental conditions as simulated. Each model is constructed in Vensim® DSS 6.2 Double Precision$^{55}$ using techniques from the field of system dynamics (see Hannon & Ruth, 2014).

PAPER I

6.2.1. In response to anoxia, do all cells in batch cultures switch to denitrification?

General assumption that the entire population switches to denitrification challenged by recent experiments. It is commonly assumed that in response to O$_2$ deprivation, all cells in a

---

$^{54}$ N$_2$ kinetics are controlled by NirS since, at least in Pa. denitrificans, NO$_2^-$ reduction is the rate-determining step in the denitrification pathway.

$^{55}$ Ventana Systems inc., http://vensim.com/
culture will switch to denitrification. But in recent batch culture experiments with *Pa. denitrificans*, as the cells transited from oxic to anoxic conditions, a severe depression was observed in the total e-flow rate (i.e., to \( O_2 + NO_x/NO_x \)) even in the presence of ample \( NO_2^- \) or \( NO_2^\cdot \) (Bergaust et al., 2011, pp. 208-210; Bergaust et al., 2010, p. 6394; Nadeem, Dörsch, & Bakken, 2013, pp. 5-7). This was taken to indicate that a large fraction of the population did not switch to denitrification; otherwise, the total e-flow rate would have carried on increasing as \( NO_x/NO_x \) replaced \( O_2 \) as the terminal e-acceptor. The depression was followed by an exponential increase in the e-flow rate, which was tentatively ascribed to anaerobic growth of a small fraction recruited to denitrification (\( F_{den} \)).

**Need of modelling.** In the aforementioned empirical studies, the e-flow rate and \( F_{den} \) were inferred from rates of consumption and production of gases (\( O_2 \), \( NO_x \), and \( N_2 \)), and a clear hypothesis as to the underlying cause of the low \( F_{den} \) was also lacking. To fill these gaps, we formulated a refined hypothesis, addressing the regulatory mechanism responsible for cell diversification in response to \( O_2 \) depletion. On its basis, we constructed a dynamic model and explicitly simulated the kinetics of recruitment of cells to denitrification.

**Hypothesis.** According to the formulated hypothesis, the low \( F_{den} \) is due to a low probability of initiating *nirS* transcription, which in response to anoxia is possibly mediated through a minute pool of intact NNR, crosstalk with other factors (such as FnrP), unspecific reduction of \( NO_2^- \) to NO by Nar, and/or through non-biologically formed traces of NO found in a \( NO_2^\cdot \)-supplemented medium. Regardless of the exact mechanism(s), once *nirS* transcription is initiated, the positive feedback via NO-NNR (Fig. 4, see \( P_2 \)) would allow the product of a single transcript of *nirS* to induce a subsequent burst of *nirS* transcription. The activated positive feedback will also help induce *nor* and *nosZ* transcription via NNR, facilitating the synthesis of a full-fledged denitrification proteome. We further hypothesised that such stochastic recruitment to denitrification will only be possible as long as a minimum of \( O_2 \) is available because, since *Pa. denitrificans* is non-fermentative, the synthesis of first molecules of NirS will depend on energy from aerobic respiration.

**Modelling.** The above hypothesis is modelled by segregating the culture into two pools (subpopulations): one for the cells without and the other with denitrification enzymes (\( N_D^- \) \& \( N_D^+ \), respectively, see Fig. 5). Both are assumed to equally consume \( O_2 \) (if present), but
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only N_{D+} reduces NO_2^- to N_2. Initially, only the N_{D-} cells were present (inoculum), which grew by consuming O_2. As O_2 was depleted below a certain threshold, recruitment of the cells from N_{D-} to N_{D+} initiated as N_{D-} \times r_{den}(O_2) (cells h^{-1}). r_{den}(O_2) is a constant probability (h^{-1}) of initiating nirS transcription, triggering as O_2 is consumed below a critical threshold (empirically determined) and reinstating to zero as O_2 is completely exhausted (assuming the energy limitation for protein synthesis). Hence, the function assumes a limited time-window available for the recruitment to denitrification.

The recruitment is modelled ignoring the time-lag from the initiation of gene transcription till the cell is fully equipped with denitrification enzymes. That is because the lag observed between the emergence of denitrification gene transcripts and the subsequent gas products suggests that the synthesis of denitrification proteome takes less than half an hour (Bergaust et al., 2010; Qu et al., 2014), which is negligible for the purpose of this and the subsequent models (presented in Figs. 6 and 7).

Outcome and implications. With a specific probability of recruitment to denitrification = 0.005 h^{-1}, the model robustly simulated the observed N_2 kinetics for a range of culture conditions (Bergaust et al., 2010), with the resulting fraction recruited to denitrification (F_{den}) = 3.8–16.1% (average = 8.2%). In contrast, as we forced our model to achieve F_{den} = 100% within an hour, the simulated N_2 accumulation grossly overestimated that measured.

The phenomenon can be understood as a ‘bet-hedging’ regulation ‘strategy’ (Veening et al., 2008): the fraction switching to denitrification benefits if the anoxic spell is long-lasting and NO_2^-/NO_x remains available, whereas the non-switching fraction benefits, by saving the energy required for producing denitrification proteome if the anoxic spell is short. The strategy has important implications for understanding the physiology of denitrification in general and that of Pa. denitrificans in particular and, not the least, for correctly interpreting various experiments on Pa. denitrificans and other denitrifying organisms (such as Pseudomonas denitrificans, see Paper I for details).
**Introduction**

**Fig. 5. An overview of Model I.** *Initial Conditions.* $O_{2HS}$: 0, 1, or 7 headspace-vol.% (model units: mol); $N_{D-}$: inoculum (model units: cells); $NO_2^-$: 0.2, 1, or 2 mM (model units: mol). **A. O$_2$ Kinetics:** Transport of O$_2$ between the headspace and liquid is modelled as $k_t \times (K_{H(O_2)} \times P_{O_2} - [O_2]_{LP})$, where $k_t$ (L h$^{-1}$) is an empirically determined transport coefficient, $K_{H(O_2)}$ (mol L$^{-1}$ atm$^{-1}$) the solubility, $P_{O_2}$ (atm) the partial pressure in the headspace, and $[O_2]_{LP}$ (mol L$^{-1}$) is the O$_2$ concentration in the liquid-phase. The reduction of $O_{2LP}$ (mol h$^{-1}$) is modelled as a function of all cells ($N_{D-} + N_{D+}$) and a cell-specific velocity of O$_2$ reduction ($v_{O_2}$, mol O$_2$ cell$^{-1}$ h$^{-1}$), where $v_{O_2}$ is calculated as a Michaelis-Menten function of $[O_2]_{LP}$ with an empirically determined $v_{max}$ and an estimated $K_m$. Net effect of sampling (dilution and leakage) is included in the simulation of $O_{2HS}$ at the reported sampling times. **B. Population Dynamics:** Initially, $N_{D-}$ grows according to an empirically determined cell yield per mol O$_2$. As $[O_2]_{LP}$ is depleted below a certain threshold, $N_{D-}$ initiates recruitment to the pool of denitrifying cells ($N_{D+}$) with a constant specific probability (h$^{-1}$), and the recruitment continues until O$_2$ is exhausted (see the text for the underlying hypotheses). $N_{D-}$ grows by reducing $NO_2^-$ according to an empirically determined cell yield per mol $NO_2^-$. **C. Denitrification kinetics:** The reduction of $NO_2^-$ to N$_2$ (mol h$^{-1}$) is modelled as a product of $N_{D+}$ and a cell-specific velocity of $NO_2^-$ reduction ($v_{NO_2^-}$, mol $NO_2^-$ cell$^{-1}$ h$^{-1}$), where $v_{NO_2^-}$ is simulated as a Michaelis-Menten function of $[NO_2^-]$ with an empirically determined $v_{max}$ (mol cell$^{-1}$ h$^{-1}$) and a literature-based $K_m$. 
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6.2.2. How do denitrifying bacteria, like *Pa. denitrificans*, maintain homeostatic control of NO at nanomolar concentrations?

**Diverse phenotypes regarding NO emission.** Denitrifying bacteria show diverse phenotypes with regard to NO production: *Agrobacterium tumefaciens* and strains within the genus *Bradyrhizobium* may produce detrimentally high (µM) NO concentrations when grown as pure cultures (Bergaust, Shapleigh, Frostegård, & Bakken, 2008; K. W. Jillo et al., unpublished, respectively). In contrast, the model organism *Paracoccus denitrificans* and various strains within the genus *Thauera* demonstrate a robust homeostatic control of NO ([NO]$_{ss}$) at nM concentrations (Bergaust et al., 2010; B. Liu et al., 2013, respectively). Thus, some denitrifiers have evolved the ability to restrict NO to extremely low concentrations, while others are clearly at risk of killing themselves by NO toxicity when grown in pure cultures.

**Discrepancy in the current understanding.** Homeostatic control of NO would require a coordinated expression of *nir* and *nor* (van Spanning et al., 2007). Current understanding of the regulatory network of denitrification in *Pa. denitrificans* does indicate such a coordination, i.e., *nirS* and *nor* transcription via a common regulator, NNR (Fig. 4). But we were not convinced that this alone could explain the observed homeostasis of NO at nM levels because the reported half saturation constants ($K_m$) for cNor are too high, i.e., in the µM range. This led us to consider a hypothesis that the homeostasis could be due to a negative feedback of NO on the activity of NirS (Kuňák, Kučera, & van Spanning, 2004). To explore this option and improve our overall understanding of the homeostatic control, we constructed a model and simulated the NO kinetics observed in batch cultures of *Pa. denitrificans* (Bergaust et al., 2010).
Fig. 6. An overview of Model II. **Initial Conditions.** \(O_2\) : 0, 1, or 7 headspace vol.\% (model units: mol); \(Z\) : inoculum (model units: cells); \(NO_2^-\) : 0.2, 1, or 2 mM (model units: mol). The model is an extension of Model I (Fig. 5), with NO and N\(_2\)O kinetics explicitly simulated here (Sector C). Like for \(O_2\) in Model I, the transport of each gas between the aqueous-phase (\(X_{aq}\)) and headspace (\(X_g\)) along with the headspace sampling-losses are included (Sectors A and C). In Sector B, \(Z^-\) & \(Z^{Ni}\) are the counterparts of the Model I’s sub-populations \(N_{D^-}\) & \(N_{D^+}\), respectively. Like in Model I, \(Z^-\) first grows by aerobic respiration, but as \(O_2\) is depleted below a critical concentration, the recruitment to \(Z^{Ni}\) is initiated according to a low probabilistic function. The function represents the stochastic transcriptional activation of nirS, leading to the autocatalytic production of NirS and a coordinated expression of nor (Fig. 4). Once triggered, the recruitment continues as long as a minimum of respiratory metabolism is sustained by the e^-flow to the available e^-acceptors (\(O_2 + N_2O\)), assumed to generate a minimum of ATP required for synthesising denitrification enzymes. \(N_2O\) is produced by \(Z^{Ni}\) only but is assumed to be respired equally by all cells (\(Z^- + Z^{Ni}\)) because the nosZ genes are readily expressed by the \(O_2\)-sensor FnrP (Bergaust et al., 2012) (Fig. 4). In Sector C, the
reduction of each $\text{NO}_{\text{aq}}$ (molN h$^{-1}$) is modelled as a function of $Z^{\text{Ni}}$ (cells) and a cell-specific rate of the individual $\text{NO}_{\text{aq}}$ reduction (molN cell$^{-1}$ h$^{-1}$), calculated using the Michaelis-Menten kinetics. However, the cell-specific reduction of $\text{NO}_{\text{aq}}$ is modelled according to a dual substrate kinetics equation (Girsch & de Vries, 1997) and, as indicated above, the reduction of $\text{N}_2\text{O}$ to $\text{N}_2$ is carried out by all cells ($Z^{-} + Z^{\text{Ni}}$).

**Modelling.** Model I (Fig. 5) is extended here to incorporate the explicit modelling of the NO and $\text{N}_2\text{O}$ kinetics (Fig. 6). The reduction of $\text{NO}_2$ and $\text{N}_2\text{O}$ is simulated as a function of the cells with the relevant reductase and cell-specific rates of $\text{NO}_2^-$/$\text{N}_2\text{O}$ reduction (molN cell$^{-1}$ h$^{-1}$). The latter are modelled using the Michaelis-Menten kinetics with empirically determined maximum reduction velocities ($v_{\text{max}}$, molN cell$^{-1}$ h$^{-1}$), and a reported and an estimated half-saturation constant ($K_{\text{m}}$, mol L$^{-1}$) for $\text{NO}_2^-$ and $\text{N}_2\text{O}$ reduction, respectively. In the version of the model with a negative feedback by NO on NirS activity, the cell specific reduction of $\text{NO}_2^-$ is modelled using the Michaelis-Menten kinetics for non-competitive inhibition. As for NO, since two molecules participate in the production of $\text{N}_2\text{O}$, the cell-specific NO reduction is modelled according to a dual substrate kinetics equation (Girsch & de Vries, 1997):

$$v_{\text{NO}} = \frac{v_{\text{maxNO}}}{1 + K_{2\text{NO}} \left( \frac{1}{[\text{NO}]_{\text{aq}}} + \frac{K_{1\text{NO}}}{[\text{NO}]_{\text{aq}}^2} \right)}$$

where $v_{\text{maxNO}}$ (mol cell$^{-1}$ h$^{-1}$) is the maximum velocity of NO reduction, $[\text{NO}]_{\text{aq}}$ (mol L$^{-1}$) is the NO concentration in the aqueous-phase, and $K_{1\text{NO}}$ & $K_{2\text{NO}}$ (mol L$^{-1}$) are the steady state dissociation constants for the binding of two NO molecules to $c\text{Nor}$.

**Outcome and implications.** For the NO kinetics, critical parameters are the maximum velocities of $\text{NO}_2^-$ and NO reduction ($v_{\text{maxNO}_2^-}$ and $v_{\text{maxNO}}$)$^{56}$ and the two dissociation constants for $c\text{Nor}$ ($K_{1\text{NO}}$ & $K_{2\text{NO}}$), determining the effective affinity for NO. $v_{\text{maxNO}_2^-}$ is estimated as 1.83 fmol cell$^{-1}$ h$^{-1}$, deduced from the empirically determined anaerobic growth rate (= 0.106 h$^{-1}$) and yield (= $5.79 \times 10^{13}$ cells mol$^{-1}$ $\text{NO}_2^-$) (Bergaust et al., 2010). Regarding

---

$^{56}$ Note that $v_{\text{maxNO}_x}$ (molN cell$^{-1}$ h$^{-1}$) = $ve_{\text{maxNO}_x}$ (mol electrons cell$^{-1}$ h$^{-1}$), since $1 \frac{\text{molN NO}_x}{\text{mol e}^-}$, where NO$_x$ is $\text{NO}_2^-$, NO, and $\text{N}_2\text{O}$. 

36
Introduction

$v_{\text{maxNO}}$, however, no estimates were available. Unless assuming unrealistically high $v_{\text{maxNO}}$ or values for substrate-$c$Nor affinities ($K_{\text{1NO}}$ & $K_{\text{2NO}}$) much lower than reported in the literature, the model predicted $[\text{NO}]_{\text{ss}}$ (the steady state $[\text{NO}]$ in the liquid) much higher than that measured. Negative feedback by NO on NirS activity could effectively bring the predicted $[\text{NO}]_{\text{ss}}$ down, but resulted in a much too slow anaerobic growth rate (hence, too slow $\text{N}_2$ production). We suspected that the reason for the failure of the model could be that the true substrate affinity of $c$Nor is much higher than commonly reported in the literature, where many parameters are based on $\text{in vitro}$ measurements. We investigated this in detail by activity measurements $\text{in vivo}$, using chemiluminescence-based detection of NO in the headspace of anoxic batch cultures. The measurements were conducted with very low cell density to minimise headspace–liquid transport limitations, and the molecular diffusion from the bulk liquid to the cell surface was taken into account to calculate $[\text{NO}]$ at the cell surface. With the new kinetic parameters for $c$Nor, $v_{\text{maxNO}} = 3.56 \times 10^{-15}$ mol cell$^{-1}$ h$^{-1}$, $K_{\text{1NO}} < 1$ nM, and $K_{\text{2NO}} = 34$ nM, the model is able to simulate $[\text{NO}]_{\text{ss}}$ in reasonable agreement with the measurements.\(^{57}\)

Thus, the observed NO homeostasis can be understood as a result of simple enzyme kinetics, without any feedback inhibition. Such determinations of enzyme kinetic parameters $\text{in vivo}$ appears essential to understand denitrification phenotypes and to adequately model the NO kinetics in soils and aquatic environments.

**Paper III**

Recently, a neat dataset was generated from $\text{NO}_2^-$-supplemented batch incubations of $\text{Pa. denitrificans}$, with frequently measured $\text{NO}_2^-$ and $\text{N}_2\text{O}$ (Qu et al., 2014). In the data-set previously available for comparison with simulations (Bergaust et al., 2010), the $\text{NO}_2^-$ kinetics were not measured, and $\text{N}_2\text{O}$ was measured by a thermal conductivity detector with a rather high detection limit. Qu et al. (2014), however, measured $\text{N}_2\text{O}$ by an electron capture detector, providing accurate measurements at very low concentrations. That encouraged us to extend Model II and simulate the cell diversification during transition from oxic to anoxic conditions,

\(^{57}\) $v_{\text{maxNO}}$ was also empirically re-estimated, corroborating the value estimated by Bergaust et al. (2010) (\(= 1.83\) fmol $\text{NO}_2^-$ cell$^{-1}$ h$^{-1}$).
focusing on the regulation of Nar (NO\textsubscript{2} production) (6.2.3) and cNor/NosZ (N\textsubscript{2}O emission) (6.2.4).

**6.2.3. Like for nirS, can the expression of nar be explained as an autocatalytic phenomenon in *Pa. denitrificans*, with a stochastic initiation of nar transcription?**

It is commonly assumed that all cells in a batch culture produce Nar in response to impending anoxia. We investigated this by exploring whether, like for *nirS*, the initiation of *nar* transcription could also be explained as a probabilistic phenomenon. If so, we were interested to estimate what fraction of the cells is required to adequately simulate the measured NO\textsubscript{2}\textsuperscript{−} production.

**Modelling.** To answer this question, we split the incubated population into four subpopulations (Fig. 7B):

1. \(Z^{-}\): cells without Nar & NirS+cNor
2. \(Z^{Na}\): cells with Nar
3. \(Z^{NaNi}\): cells with Nar & NirS+cNor
4. \(Z^{Ni}\): cells with NirS+cNor

All the subpopulations are assumed to scavenge O\textsubscript{2} (if available) and produce NosZ likewise in response to impending anoxia. The latter because the *nosZ* genes are equally induced by NNR or FnrP (Bergaust et al., 2012), where, at least, FnrP is readily activated in response to O\textsubscript{2} depletion (van Spanning et al., 2007). \(Z^{-}\) (Fig. 7) contains the inoculum that grows by aerobic respiration. As \([O_2]\) falls below a critical threshold (empirically determined, Qu et al., 2014, Paper IV), the cells within \(Z^{-}\) are assumed to start synthesising Nar with a rate described by a probabilistic function: \(Z^{-} \times r_{Na}(O_2,N_2O)\), where the second term is a constant conditional probability (h\textsuperscript{−1}), assumed to be that of the transcriptional activation of *nar*, quickly differentiating a cell into a full-fledge NO\textsubscript{3}\textsuperscript{−} scavenger through product (NO\textsubscript{2}\textsuperscript{−}) induced transcription via NarR (Fig. 4, see P\textsubscript{1}). \(r_{Na}(O_2,N_2O)\) triggers when \([O_2]_{aq} < [O_2]_{na} \textbf{AND} [\nu e_{O_2} + (0.5 \times \nu e_{N_2O})] > \nu e_{min}\), where the first condition represents the depletion of \([O_2]\) in the aqueous-phase below a critical threshold \([O_2]_{na}\), empirically determined as the \([O_2]_{aq}\) at the outset of NO\textsubscript{2}\textsuperscript{−} accumulation (Qu et al., 2014). The second condition is the velocity of
e-flow to O₂ + N₂O (the two terminal e-acceptors Z⁻ can utilise) above a critical minimum ($v_{e_{\text{min}}}$). That is because the energy required to produce Nar is assumed to depend on a minimum of functional respiratory metabolism. $v_{e_{\text{N}_2O}}$ in this comparison is weighted down by half because mole ATP per mole e⁻ transferred to NO₃⁻/NO₂⁻ is lower for denitrification than for aerobic respiration (Bergaust et al., 2010; van Spanning et al., 2007).

Fig. 7. An overview of Model III. 

**Initial Conditions.** O₂ᵥ: 0 or 7 headspace-vol.% (model units: mol); Z⁻: inoculum (model units: cells); NO₃⁻: 2 mM (model units: mol).

**A. O₂ Kinetics:** Transport of O₂ between the headspace (O₂ᵥ) and aqueous-phase (O₂ₐq) is modelled as in Model I (Fig. 5), and the reduction of O₂ₐq (mol h⁻¹) is modelled as a function of all cells (Z⁻ + Zₐ + Zₐₐ + Zₐₐ) and a Michaelis-Menten based cell-specific rate of O₂ consumption (mol cell⁻¹ h⁻¹). Net effect of sampling (dilution and leakage) is included in the simulation of O₂ᵥ.

**B. Population Dynamics:** Z⁻ contains the inoculum that grows according to an empirically estimated cell yield per mol O₂. As [O₂]ₐq is depleted below a certain threshold (empirically determined), Z⁻ initiates recruitment to the pool of cells with Nar (Zₐ) with a constant specific-probability (h⁻¹, assumed to be that of the transcriptional activation...
of nar). The recruitment continues as long as the velocity of e-flow to O₂ + N₂O (the two terminal e-acceptors accessible to Z⁻) remains above a critical minimum (assumed to sustain a minimum respiratory metabolism to provide energy for Nar production). Next, as [O₂]ₐq is further depleted below another critical concentration (empirically determined), the cells within ZNa and Z⁻ are recruited to ZNaNi and ZNi, respectively, as they are assumed to stochastically initiate nirS transcription (paving the way for NO-NNR mediated expression of nirS+nor, Fig. 4). The recruitment to ZNaNi & ZNi continues as long as a minimum of e-flow to the relevant terminal e-acceptor is possible, sustaining the respiratory metabolism to generate ATP for protein synthesis. After bulk of O₂ is depleted by Z⁻, the cells within Z⁻ (with NosZ), ZNa (with Nar & NosZ), ZNaNi (with Nar, NirS+cNor & NosZ), and ZNi (with NirS+cNor & NosZ) grow by reducing the relevant NO⁻/NOₓ according to an empirically determined cell yield per mol of e-flow to NO⁻/NOₓ. C. Denitrification kinetics: The reduction of each NO⁻/NOₓ in aqua is modelled as a function of the relevant sup-population(s) and a per-cell NO⁻/NOₓ consumption rate (molN cell⁻¹ h⁻¹), calculated using the Michaelis-Menten kinetics. However, as in Model II, the cell-specific reduction of NO is modelled according to Girsch & de Vries (1997). Like for O₂, the aqua/headspace transport of each gas and the headspace dilution (due to sampling) are taken into account.

Outcome and implications. The NO⁻ data of Qu et al. (2014, Paper IV), with various culture conditions, are adequately simulated by assuming a stochastic transcriptional activation of nar with an average probability = 0.035 h⁻¹, resulting in 23–43.3% of all cells with Nar. In contrast, simulations assuming ~100% of the population producing Nar within an hour grossly overestimate the measured NO⁻ accumulation. Thus, our model corroborates the hypothesis that nar expression is autocatalytic in Pa. denitrificans with a low probability of transcriptional activation, albeit much higher than that for the transcriptional activation of nirS (0.004 h⁻¹, see Sec. 6.2.4).

The findings are important for understanding the regulation of denitrification in bacteria: product-induced transcription of denitrification genes is common (van Spanning et al., 2007, p. 15); thus, we surmise that diversification in response to anoxia is widespread.
6.2.4. Can N₂O kinetics be explained by assuming N₂O production by a sub-population but equal consumption by the entire population?

The aim was to explore whether the measured N₂O kinetics could be explained assuming N₂O production by Z^{NaNi} (cells with Nar & NirS+ cNor) and Z^{Ni} (cells with NirS+cNor) but consumption by the entire population (Z⁻ + Z^{Na} + Z^{NaNi} + Z^{Ni}, Fig. 7), as suggested by Bergaust et al. (2011; 2010; 2012).

**Modelling.** NirS+cNor production (recruitment to Z^{NaNi} & Z^{Ni}) is assumed to be a) coordinated because the transcription of both nirS and nor is induced by NO via the NO-sensor NNR (Fig. 4) and b) stochastic because the initial transcription of nirS (paving the way for the autocatalytic- and substrate-induced expression of NirS and cNor, respectively) happens in the absence of NO or at too low [NO] to be sensed by NNR. Following these assumptions, the recruitments from Z^{Na} to Z^{NaNi} and from Z⁻ to Z^{Ni} are modelled as $Z^X \times r_{Ni}(O_2, NO_x)$, where $Z^X$ represents Z^{Na} or Z⁻, and $r_{Ni}(O_2, NO_x)$ is a constant conditional probability (h⁻¹, assumed to be that of transcriptional activation of nirS). $r_{Ni}(O_2, NO_x)$ triggers when $[O_2]_{aq} < [O_2]_{ni AND}[ve_{O_2} - (0.5 \times ve_{NO_x})] > ve_{min}$, where the first condition represents the depletion of $O_2$ in the liquid below a critical threshold ($[O_2]_{ni}$), empirically determined as the $[O_2]_{aq}$ at the outset of NO accumulation (Qu et al., 2014). The second condition is the velocity of e⁻-flow to $O_2$ and the relevant NO$_2$ / NO$_x$ (for Z^{Na}: NO$_3$⁻ & N$_2$O and for Z⁻: N$_2$O) above a critical minimum ($ve_{min}$), assumed to keep a minimum respiratory metabolism intact to provide energy for protein synthesis.

**Outcome and implications.** The empirical data of Qu et al. (2014) (NO$_2$ depletion and N$_2$ production) are effectively simulated by assuming a very low probabilistic transcriptional-activation of nirS (= 0.004 h⁻¹), resulting in the recruitment of 7.7–22.1% of all cells to Z^{NaNi} & Z^{Ni} (i.e., the pools of NirS+cNor positive cells, Fig. 7). The result corroborates the findings of Paper I, where we amply simulated Bergaust et al.’s (2010) experiments, assuming a similarly low probability of nirS transcription.

Assuming that 7.7–22.1% of the population producing N₂O whereas the entire population equally consuming it, our model neatly simulates the peculiar shape of the measured N₂O kinetics: 1) abrupt initial accumulation to very low levels due to the recruitment of relatively
small numbers to the N₂O producing pools (Z⁰NaNi & Z¹Ni) and 2) increasing N₂O concentration due to the recruitment and faster cell-specific growth of Z⁰NaNi + Z¹Ni (reducing NO₂⁻, NO, and N₂O) than that of N₂O consumers (Z⁻ + Z¹Na + Z²NaNi + Z³Ni with N₂O being the only available e⁻-acceptor for the majority: Z⁻ + Z¹Na). On the other hand, if the model is simulated assuming that only the N₂O producers (Z⁰NaNi & Z¹Ni) are able to consume it, the predicted N₂O shows a quasi-equilibrium throughout the entire anoxic phase, which contradicts the available data. No parameterisation could force the model to reproduce the observed N₂O kinetics other than the differential expression of nirS+nor and nosZ.

The modelling exercise sheds some light on the possible role of the regulatory biology of denitrification in controlling N₂O emissions. If all cells in soils had the same regulatory phenotype as Pa. denitrificans, their emissions of N₂O would probably be miniscule, and soils could easily become strong net sinks for N₂O because the majority of cells would be ‘truncated denitrifiers’ with only N₂O reductase expressed. It remains to be tested, however, if the regulatory phenotype of Pa. denitrificans is a rare or a common phenomenon among full-fledged denitrifiers. We foresee that further exploration of denitrification phenotypes will unravel a plethora of response patterns.

7. Concluding remarks

Models can only provide hypothetical explanations to observed phenomena or reasons to reject hypotheses/assumptions, if there is a notorious discrepancy between model and observations. Thus, the model exercises here provide strong reasons to reject the common assumption that all cells in a culture of Pa. denitrificans switch to denitrification in response to impending anoxia. A new hypothesis of cell diversification, based on the stochastic initiation of nar and nirS transcription, was built into the model, enabling it to robustly simulate NO₂⁻, N₂O, and N₂ kinetics for a range of experimental conditions. This agreement between the simulations and observations is no proof for the validity of the model but simply a demonstration that we have no reasons to reject it. Verification is clearly needed by novel experiments that put the core assumptions to a stringent test. Measurement of Nar and NirS in single cells within a population would be one such approach; such experiments are in the making by the NMBU Nitrogen Group.
**Introduction**

*Pa. denitrificans* is a model organism, used extensively for studying bioenergetics and regulatory biology of denitrification. Although originally isolated from soil, the organism is an unlikely representative for the denitrifying microbes in soils. Thus, phenomena observed in *Pa. denitrificans* cannot directly be projected onto natural ecosystems to explain observations therein. Nevertheless, model organisms represent a ‘fast track’ to new concepts and hypotheses, and experiments with model organisms can be much more stringent than those with natural populations. A good example is the studies regarding the effect of soil pH on N$_2$O emission. More than 50 years of research with intact soils provided not more than a correlation (increasing $\frac{\text{N}_2\text{O}}{\text{N}_2}$ product ratio at low pH), whereas the experiments with *Pa. denitrificans* (Bergaust et al., 2010) indicated the mechanism involved, i.e., post translatorial problems with the assembly of Nos in the periplasm. Based on this, careful experiments with bacteria extracted from soils demonstrated the same phenomenon (Binbin Liu et al., 2014). Much biochemical research is needed to fully understand how low pH interferes with the making of Nos, and model organisms are expected to be our guides in this journey.

The present thesis provides a hypothetical explanation to the observed denitrification kinetics in *Pa. denitrificans*, and the kneejerk reaction of many microbial ecologists would be that this lacks ecological relevance. This may be true, if relevance is taken to depend on direct extrapolations. In fact, we do not know to which extent indigenous denitrifying prokaryotes display similar regulatory responses and apparent cell diversification as *Pa. denitrificans*. But it is worth a study, since it could have major implications for the interpretation of ecological observations. Microbial ecological research on denitrification and N$_2$O emission is dominated by ‘correlation research’; ‘phenotypic phenomena’ such as variations in denitrification and N$_2$O emissions are tentatively explained by correlations with the denitrification community composition and the number of functional genes and their transcripts (a recent example is Jones et al., 2014). The present model-based analyses of *Pa. denitrificans* serves as a cautionary tale: a population of potentially full-fledged denitrifiers (such as *Pa. denitrificans*) may in reality be dominated by cells whose only denitrification enzyme is N$_2$O reductase.
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Abstract

In response to impending anoxic conditions, denitrifying bacteria sustain respiratory metabolism by producing enzymes for reducing nitrogen oxyanions/-oxides (NOx) to N2 (denitrification). Since denitrifying bacteria are non-fermentative, the initial production of denitrification proteome depends on energy from aerobic respiration. Thus, if a cell fails to synthesise a minimum of denitrification proteome before O2 is completely exhausted, it will be unable to produce it later due to energy-limitation. Such entrapment in anoxia is recently claimed to be a major phenomenon in batch cultures of the model organism Paracoccus denitrificans on the basis of measured e⁻-flow rates to O2 and NOx. Here we constructed a dynamic model and explicitly simulated actual kinetics of recruitment of the cells to denitrification to directly and more accurately estimate the recruited fraction (F_{rec}). Transcription of nirS is pivotal for denitrification, for it triggers a cascade of events leading to the synthesis of a full-fledged denitrification proteome. The model is based on the hypothesis that nirS has a low probability (r_{den}, h⁻¹) of initial transcription, but once initiated, the transcription is greatly enhanced through positive feedback by NO, resulting in the recruitment of the transcribing cell to denitrification. We assume that the recruitment is initiated as [O2] falls below a critical threshold and terminates (assuming energy-limitation) as [O2] exhausts. With r_{den} = 0.005 h⁻¹, the model robustly simulates observed denitrification kinetics for a range of culture conditions. The resulting F_{rec} (fraction of the cells recruited to denitrification) falls within 0.038–0.161. In contrast, if the recruitment of the entire population is assumed, the simulated denitrification kinetics deviate grossly from those observed. The phenomenon can be understood as a ‘bet-hedging strategy’: switching to denitrification is a gain if anoxic spell lasts long but is a waste of energy if anoxia turns out to be a ‘false alarm’.

Introduction

A complete denitrification pathway includes the dissimilatory reduction of nitrate (NO₃⁻) through nitrite (NO₂⁻), nitric oxide (NO), and nitrous oxide (N₂O) to di-nitrogen (N₂). Typically, the genes encoding reductases for these nitrogen oxyanions/-oxides (NOx) are not expressed constitutively but only in response to O2 depletion, making denitrification a facultative trait [1]. Hence, during anoxic spells, the process enables denitrifying bacteria to sustain respiratory metabolism, replacing O2 by NOx as the terminal electron (e⁻) acceptors. Since permanently anoxic environments lack available NOx, denitrification is confined to sites where O2 concentration fluctuates, such as biofilms, surface layers of sediments, and drained soil (which turns anoxic in response to flooding).

From modelling denitrifying communities as a homogenous unit to a model of regulation of denitrification in an individual strain

Denitrification is a key process in the global nitrogen cycle and is also a major source of atmospheric N₂O [2]. A plethora of biogeochemical models have been developed for understanding the ecosystem controls of denitrification and N₂O emissions [3]. A common feature of these models is that the denitrifying community of the system (primarily soils and sediments) in question is treated as one homogenous unit with certain characteristic responses to O2 and NOx concentrations. This simplification is fully legitimate from a pragmatic point of view, but in reality any denitrifying community is composed of a mixture of organisms with widely different denitrification regulatory phenotypes [4]. Modelling has been used to a limited extent to analyse kinetic data for various phenotypes (See [5] and references therein) and for understanding the accumulation of intermediates [6]. To our knowledge, however, no attempts have been made to model the regulation during transition from aerobic to anaerobic respiration in individual strains, despite considerable progress in the understanding of their regulatory networks. It would be well worth the effort, since the regulatory phenomena at the cellular level provide clues as to how denitrification and NO and N₂O emissions therefrom are regulated in intact soils [7]. Explicit modelling of the entire denitrification regulatory network,
In these studies, however, the entire population appears to successfully switch to denitrification. The model adequately matches batch cultivation kinetics of recruitment of the cells from aerobic respiration to denitrification. The model adequately simulates experimental data. The result challenges conventional outlook on the regulation of denitrification in general and that of *Pa. denitrificans* in particular.

### Author Summary

In response to oxygen-limiting conditions, denitrifying bacteria produce a set of enzymes to convert NO$_3^-$ /NO$_2^-$ to N$_2$ via NO and N$_2$O. The process (denitrification) helps generate energy for survival and growth during anoxia. Denitrification is imperative for the nitrogen cycle and has far-reaching consequences including contribution to global warming and destruction of stratospheric ozone. Recent experiments provide circumstantial evidence for a previously unknown phenomenon in the model denitrifying bacterium *Paracoccus denitrificans*: as O$_2$ depletes, only a marginal fraction of its population appears to switch to denitrification. We hypothesise that the low success rate is due to a) low probability for the cells to initiate the transcription of genes (*nirS*) encoding a key denitrification enzyme (NirS), and b) a limited time-window in which NirS must be produced. Based on this hypothesis, we constructed a dynamic model of denitrification in *Pa. denitrificans*. The simulation results show that, within the limited time available, a probability of 0.005 h$^{-1}$ for each cell to initiate *nirS* transcription (resulting in the recruitment of 3.8–16.1% cells to denitrification) is sufficient to adequately simulate experimental data. The result challenges conventional outlook on the regulation of denitrification in general and that of *Pa. denitrificans* in particular.

However, would take us beyond available experimental evidence, with numerous parameters for which there are no empirical values. Considering this limitation, here we have constructed a simplified model to investigate if a stochastic transcriptional initiation of key denitrification genes (*nirS*) could possibly explain peculiar kinetics of e$^-$flow as *Paracoccus denitrificans* switch from aerobic to anaerobic respiration [4,8].

Although denitrification is widespread among bacteria, the α-proteobacterium *Pa. denitrificans* is the ‘paradigm’ model organism in denitrification research. Recent studies [4,8,9] have indicated a previously unknown phenomenon in this species that, in response to O$_2$ depletion, only a marginal fraction (F$_{den}$) of its entire population appears to successfully switch to denitrification. In these studies, however, F$_{den}$ is inferred from rates of consumption and production of gases (O$_2$, NO$_x$, and N$_2$), and a clear hypothesis as to the underlying cause of the low F$_{den}$ is also lacking. To fill these gaps, we formulated a refined hypothesis addressing the underlying regulatory mechanism of the cell differentiation in response to O$_2$ depletion. On its basis, we constructed a dynamic model and explicitly simulated the actual kinetics of recruitment of the cells from aerobic respiration to denitrification. The model adequately matches batch cultivation data for a range of experimental conditions [4,8] and provides a direct and refined estimation of F$_{den}$. The exercise is important for understanding the physiology of denitrification in general and of *Pa. denitrificans* in particular and carries important implications for correctly interpreting various denitrification experiments.

### Regulation of denitrification in terms of relevance to fitness

Generally, the transcription of genes encoding denitrification enzymes is inactivated in the presence of O$_2$. A population undertaking denitrification typically responds to full aeration by completely shutting down denitrification and immediately initiating aerobic respiration [10]. Thus, O$_2$ controls denitrification at transcriptional as well as metabolic level, and both have a plausible fitness value. The transcriptional control minimises the energy cost of producing denitrification enzymes, and the metabolic control maximises ATP (per mole electrons transferred) because the mole ATP per mole electrons transferred to the terminal e$^-$acceptor is –50% higher for aerobic respiration than for denitrification [10].

Denitrification enzymes produced in response to an anoxic spell are likely to linger within the cells under subsequent oxic conditions (although, this has not been studied in detail), ready to be used if O$_2$ should become limiting later on. However, these enzymes will be diluted by aerobic growth, since the transcription of their genes is effectively inactivated by O$_2$. Hence, a population growing through many generations under fully oxic conditions will probably be dominated by the cells without intact denitrification proteome. When confronted with O$_2$ depletion, such a population will have to start from scratch, i.e., transcribe the relevant genes, translate mRNA into peptide chains (protein synthesis by ribosomes) and secure that these chains are correctly folded by the chaperones, transport the enzymes to their correct locations in the cell, and insert necessary co-factors (e.g., Cu, Fe, or Mo). In *E. coli* grown under optimal conditions, the whole process from the transcriptional activation to a functional enzyme takes ≤20 minutes [11] and costs significant amount of energy (ATP).

Synthesis of denitrification enzymes is rewarding if anoxia lasts long and NO$_x$ remains available, but it is a waste of energy if anoxia is brief. Since the organisms cannot sense how long an impending anoxic spell will last, a ‘bet-hedging strategy’ [12] where one fraction of a population synthesises denitrification enzymes while the other does not may increase overall fitness.

### A delayed response to O$_2$ depletion may lead to entrapment in anoxia

Most, if not all, denitrifying bacteria are non-fermentative and completely rely on respiration to generate energy [13,14]. This implies that their metabolic machinery will run out of energy whenever deprived of terminal e$^-$acceptors. When [O$_2$] falls below some critical threshold, the cells will ‘sense’ this and start synthesising denitrification proteome, utilising energy from aerobic respiration [10]. However, if O$_2$ is suddenly exhausted or removed, the lack of a terminal e$^-$acceptor will create energy limitation, restraining the cells from enzyme synthesis, hence, entrapping them in anoxia. This was clearly demonstrated by Højberg et al. [15], who used silicone immobilised cells to transfer them from a completely oxic to a completely anoxic environment. Such a rapid transition is unlikely to occur in nature; however, the experiment illustrates one of the apparent perils in the regulation of denitrification: the cells that respond too late to O$_2$ depletion will be entrapped in anoxia, unable to utilise alternative electron acceptors for energy conservation and growth.

Højberg et al.’s [15] observations have largely been ignored in the research on the regulation of denitrification, and it is implicitly assumed that, in response to O$_2$ depletion, all cells in cultures of denitrifying bacteria will switch to denitrification. Contrary to this, however, Bergaust et al. [4,8,16] followed by Nadeem et al. [9] proposed that in batch cultures of *Pa. denitrificans*, only a small fraction of all cells is able to switch to denitrification. During transition from oxic to anoxic conditions, they observed a severe depression in the total e$^-$flow rate (i.e., to O$_2$ +NO$_x$, see Fig. 1), which was estimated on the basis of measured gas kinetics. Had all of the cells switched to denitrification as O$_2$ exhausted, the total e$^-$flow rate would have carried on increasing, without such a depression. The depression was followed by an exponential increase in the e$^-$flow rate, which was tentatively ascribed to anaerobic growth of a small F$_{den}$ (fraction recruited to denitrification). It was postulated that this fraction escaped entrapment in
anoxia by synthesising initial denitrification proteins within the
time-window when O\textsubscript{2} was still present, whereas the majority of
the cells (1 – F\textsubscript{dan}) failed to do so, thus remained unable to utilise
NO\textsubscript{2}.

The core hypothesis: A low probability of initiating nirS
transcription seems to drive the cell differentiation

**Autocatalytic transcription of denitrification genes.** In
*Pa. denitrificans*, denitrification is driven by four core enzymes:
Nar (membrane-bound nitrate reductase), NirS (cytochrome
*cd* nitrite reductase), cNor (nitric oxide reductase), and NosZ (nitrous
oxide reductase, see Fig. 2). The transcriptional regulation of
genes encoding these enzymes (*nar*, *nirS*, *nor* and *nosZ*,
respectively) involves, at least, three FNR-type proteins acting as
sensors for O\textsubscript{2} (FnrP, NO\textsubscript{2} / NO\textsubscript{3} (NarR), and NO (NNR)
[10,17,18]). NarR and NNR facilitate product-induced transcription
of the *nar* and *nirS* genes: When anoxia is imminent, the low
[O\textsubscript{2}] is sensed by FnrP, which in interplay with NarR induces *nar*
transcription. NarR is activated by NO\textsubscript{2} (and/or probably by
NO\textsubscript{3}\textsuperscript{−}); thus once a cell starts producing traces of NO\textsubscript{2}, *nar*
expression becomes autocatalytic. The transcription of *nirS*
is induced by NNR, which requires NO for activation; thus traces
of NO are produced, the expression of *nirS* also becomes
autocatalytic. In contrast, the transcription of *nor* is substrate (NO)
induced via NNR, while *nosZ* is equally but independently
induced by NNR and FnrP [19]. Here we are concerned with the
dynamics that start with the transcription of *nirS*, since the
experimental treatments that we simulated were not supplemented
with NO\textsubscript{2} but various concentrations of NO\textsubscript{3}\textsuperscript{−} only (Table 1).

**Low probability of initiating nirS transcription.** The
transcription of *nirS* is known to be suppressed by O\textsubscript{2} [4,8],
but the exact mechanism remains unclear. Circumstantial evidence
suggests that it is due to O\textsubscript{2} inactivating NNR [20] (dashed link in
Fig. 2), but this is not necessary to explain the repression of NirS.
There are several mechanisms through which high O\textsubscript{2}
concentrations may restrain NirS activity, i.e., through post-transcrip-
tional regulation, direct interaction with the enzyme, or due to
competition for electrons. Regardless of the exact mechanism(s),

\[\text{Figure 1. Data generated by batch cultivation of } \text{Pa. denitrificans} [4] (\text{redrawn}). \text{As the cells transited from oxic to anoxic conditions (Panel A), Bergaust et al. [4] observed a severe depression in the total e}^-\text{-flow rate (i.e., to } \text{O}_2 + \text{NO}_x \text{, Panel B), which was taken to indicate that only a fraction of the cells switched to anaerobic respiration (denitrification). Had all of the cells switched, the total e}^-\text{-flow would have carried on increasing without such a depression. The depression was followed by an exponential increase in the e}^-\text{-flow rate, which was ascribed to anaerobic growth of a small fraction (F}_{\text{dan}} \text{) of the cells that escaped entrapment in anoxia and carried on growing by denitrification.}
\]

doi:10.1371/journal.pcbi.1003933.g001

\[\text{Figure 2. The regulatory network of denitrification in Pa. denitrificans. In Pa. denitrificans, denitrification is driven by four core enzymes: Nar (nitrate reductase encoded by the } \text{nar} \text{ genes), NirS (nitrite reductase encoded by } \text{nirS}, \text{Chor (NO reductase encoded by nor), and NosZ (N}_2\text{O reductase encoded by nosZ). The transcription of these genes is regulated by, at least, three FNR-type proteins, which are sensors for O}_2 \text{ (FnrP), NO}_2 / \text{NO}_3 (\text{NarR}), \text{and NO (NNR) [10,17,18]). NarR and NNR facilitate product-induced transcription of the } \text{nar} \text{ and } \text{nirS} \text{ genes: When anoxia is imminent, the low } \text{[O}_2] \text{ is sensed by FnrP, which in interplay with NarR induces } \text{nar} \text{ transcription. NarR is activated by NO}_2 (\text{and/or probably by NO}_3^-); \text{thus once a cell starts producing traces of NO}_2, \text{nar expression becomes autocatalytic. The transcription of } \text{nirS} \text{ is induced by NNR, which requires NO for activation; thus traces of NO are produced, the expression of } \text{nirS} \text{ also becomes autocatalytic. In contrast, the transcription of nor is substrate (NO) induced via NNR, while } \text{nosZ} \text{ is equally but independently induced by NNR and FnrP [19]. Here we are concerned with the dynamics that start with the transcription of } \text{nirS}, \text{since the experimental treatments that we simulated were not supplemented with NO}_2 \text{ but various concentrations of NO}_3^- \text{ only (Table 1).}
\]

\[\text{Low probability of initiating nirS transcription.} \text{ The transcription of } \text{nirS} \text{ is known to be suppressed by O}_2 [4,8], \text{but the exact mechanism remains unclear. Circumstantial evidence suggests that it is due to O}_2 \text{ inactivating NNR [20] (dashed link in Fig. 2), but this is not necessary to explain the repression of NirS. There are several mechanisms through which high O}_2 \text{ concentrations may restrain NirS activity, i.e., through post-transcriptional regulation, direct interaction with the enzyme, or due to competition for electrons. Regardless of the exact mechanism(s),}
\]

\[\text{doi:10.1371/journal.pcbi.1003933.g002}
\]
the ultimate consequence is the elimination of the positive feedback via NO and NNR. When O2 falls below a critical threshold, facilitating NirS activity, this positive feedback would allow the product of a single transcript of nirS to induce a subsequent burst of nirS transcription in response to NO. Such ‘switches’ in gene expression by positive-feedback loops are not uncommon in prokaryotes, and they have been found to result in cell differentiation because the initial transcription is stochastic with a relatively low probability [21].

Our model assumes such stochastic recruitment to denitrification, triggered by an initial nirS transcription occurring with a low probability. This initial transcription is possibly mediated by a minute pool of intact NNR and/or through crosstalk with other factors, such as FnP. A NO2-supplemented medium contains non-biologically formed traces of NO which, once diffused into the cells while O2 is low, will activate background levels of NNR and, thereby, may also increase the probability of triggering nirS transcription.

For this modelling exercise, we do not need a full clarification of the mechanisms involved but only to assume that the probability of an autocatalytic transcriptional activation of nirS would be practically zero as long as O2 concentration is above a certain threshold. This assumption is backed by empirical data indicating that NO is not produced to detectable levels before O2. Once oxygen concentration in the liquid ([O2]LP) falls below a critical level (O2trigger) [22], the cells within ND− are assumed to initiate nirS transcription (and thereby ensure recruitment to ND+) with a rate described by a probabilistic function: ND− × rden(2)(cells h−1), where rden(O2) is assumed to be an [O2]LP dependent probability (h−1) for any cell within ND− to initiate nirS transcription (leading to a full denitrification capacity). When [O2]LP falls below O2trigger, tden(O2) triggers and holds a constant value as long as [O2]LP is above a critical minimum (O2min). For [O2]LP > O2trigger, tden(O2) is zero (assuming the inactivation of NNR by O2); tden(O2) is also zero for [O2]LP < O2min (assuming the lack of energy for protein synthesis).

The recruitment of ND− to ND+ is simulated as an instantaneous event; thus, the model does not take into account the time-lag between the initiation of nirS transcription and the time when the transcribing cell has become a fully functional denitrifier. This simplification is based on the evidence that this lag is rather short. Experiments with E. coli [11] under optimal conditions suggest lags of ~20 minutes between the onset of transcription and the emergence of a functional enzyme. In Pa. denitrificans [8,22], the lag observed between the emergence of denitrification gene transcripts and the subsequent gas products suggests that the time required for synthesising the enzymes is within the same range.

**Modelling the cell differentiation**

To represent the batch cultivation conducted by Bergaust et al. [4,8], the model explicitly simulates growth of two sub-populations, one with denitrification enzymes (ND+) and the other without (ND−); both equally consume O2, but ND− cannot reduce NO2 to N2. Once oxygen concentration in the liquid ([O2]LP) falls below a critical level (O2trigger) [22], the cells within ND− are assumed to initiate nirS transcription (and thereby ensure recruitment to ND+) with a rate described by a probabilistic function: ND− × rden(O2) (cells h−1), where rden(O2) is assumed to be an [O2]LP dependent probability (h−1) for any cell within ND− to initiate nirS transcription (leading to a full denitrification capacity). When [O2]LP falls below O2trigger, tden(O2) triggers and holds a constant value as long as [O2]LP is above a critical minimum (O2min). For [O2]LP > O2trigger, tden(O2) is zero (assuming the inactivation of NNR by O2); tden(O2) is also zero for [O2]LP < O2min (assuming the lack of energy for protein synthesis).

The recruitment of ND− to ND+ is simulated as an instantaneous event; thus, the model does not take into account the time-lag between the initiation of nirS transcription and the time when the transcribing cell has become a fully functional denitrifier. This simplification is based on the evidence that this lag is rather short. Experiments with E. coli [11] under optimal conditions suggest lags of ~20 minutes between the onset of transcription and the emergence of a functional enzyme. In Pa. denitrificans [8,22], the lag observed between the emergence of denitrification gene transcripts and the subsequent gas products suggests that the time required for synthesising the enzymes is within the same range.

**Employing the model to understand ‘diauxic lags’ between the aerobic and anaerobic growth-phases**

In a series of experiments with denitrifying bacteria (Pseudomonas denitrificans, Pseudomonas fluorescens, Alcaligenes eutrophus and Paracoccus pantotrophus) [24–26], oxic cultures were sparged with N2 to remove O2 and were monitored by measuring optical density (OD550). All the strains except Ps. fluorescens went through a conspicuous ‘diauxic lag: a period of little or no growth’ [26]; the OD remained practically constant during the lag period, lasting 4–30 hours, which was eventually followed by anaerobic growth.

To understand the diauxic lag, Liu et al. [24] used the common assumption that all cells would eventually switch to denitrification. They constructed a simulation model based on the assumption that all the cells contained a minimum of denitrification proteome (even after many generations under oxic conditions). This minimum would allow them to produce more denitrification enzymes when deprived of O2, albeit very slowly due to energy limitation. The time taken to effectively produce adequate amounts of denitrification enzymes (= the diauxic lag) was taken to be a function of the initial amounts of these enzymes per cell. Although their model may possibly explain short time-lags, it appears unrealistic for lag phases as long as 10–30 hours [25] because to produce such long lags, conceivably, the initial enzyme concentration would be less than one enzyme molecule per cell, which is mathematically possible but biologically meaningless.

**Table 1.** The simulated experiment of Bergaust et al [4,8].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Batch No.</th>
<th>O2HS (t0) (vol. %)*</th>
<th>NO2− (t0) (mM)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>~0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>~0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>~0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Targeted values for initial O2 in the headspace (where the headspace vol. = 70 mL). The actual initial O2 measured in the 0, 1, and 7% treatments was 0.012–0.19, 1.2–1.66, 6.6–6.8 vol%, respectively. The O2 present in the ~0% treatments was due to traces of O2 left behind despite various cycles of evacuation of the headspace air and subsequent flushing of the vials with helium (He-washing). doi:10.1371/journal.pcbi.1003933.t001
The model presented in this paper provides an alternative explanation for the apparent diauxic lags: a sudden shift from fully oxic to near anoxic conditions (by sparging with N₂) would leave the medium with only traces of O₂, which would be quickly depleted due to aerobic respiration. As a consequence, the available time for initiating the synthesis of denitrification proteome would be marginal, allowing only a tiny fraction \( F_{\text{den}} \) of the cells to switch to denitrification. This marginal fraction would grow exponentially from the very onset of anoxic conditions, but it would remain practically undetectable as measured (OD) for a long time, creating the apparent 4–30 h lag. The length of the lag depends on the fraction of the cells switching to denitrification. To demonstrate this alternative explanation, we adjusted our model to the reported conditions and simulated the experiment of Liu et al. [24]. The model produced qualitatively similar ‘diauxic lags’ in the simulated cell density (OD), although the time length of the lag could be anything (depending on assumptions regarding the residual O₂ after sparging, which was not measured).

**Materials and Methods**

An overview of the modelled experiment: Batch incubations in gas-tight vials

Bergaust et al. [4,8] studied aerobic and anaerobic respiration rates in *Paracoccus denitrificans* (DSM413). The cells were incubated (at 20°C) as stirred batches in 120 mL gastight vials, containing 50 mL Sistrom’s medium [27] (Fig. 3). The medium was supplemented with various concentrations of KNO₃ or KNO₂. Prior to inoculation, air in the headspace was replaced with He to remove O₂ and N₂ (He-washing), followed by the injection of no, 1, or 7 headspace-vol.% O₂. Finally, each vial was inoculated with \( \sim 3 \times 10^8 \) aerobically grown cells.

![Figure 3. An overview of the modelled system: batch incubation in a gas-tight vial.](image)

The experiment: The stirred Sistrom’s medium [27] was inoculated with aerobically grown *Pa. denitrificans* cells, which were provided with different concentrations of O₂ and NO₂⁻ (g or aq with a chemical species-name represents gaseous or aqueous, respectively). O₂ is consumed by respiration, driving its transport from the headspace to the liquid. Once the aerobic respiration becomes limited, the cells may switch to denitrification (recruitment), reducing NO₂⁻ to N₂ via the intermediates NO and N₂O (not shown). For monitoring O₂, CO₂, N₂, NO and N₂O, a robotised incubation system [28] was used, which automatically takes samples from the headspace by piercing the rubber septum. Each sampling removes a fraction (3.4%) of all gases in the headspace, but it also involves a marginal leakage of O₂ and N₂ into the vial (as indicated by the two-way arrows at the top of the figure). The model: The model operates with two sub-populations: one without and the other with denitrification enzymes \( (N_{D^-} \text{ and } N_{D^+}, \text{respectively}) \). Both consume O₂ if present, but \( N_{D^-} \) cannot reduce NOₓ. The \( N_{D^-} \) cells may be recruited to the \( N_{D^+} \) pool as \([O_2]_{aq} \) falls below a critical threshold. The rate of recruitment \( (R_{rec}) \) is modelled as a probabilistic function: \( R_{rec} = N_{D^-} \times r_{den}(O_2) \) (cells h⁻¹), where \( r_{den}(O_2) \) represents an O₂ dependent specific-probability (h⁻¹) for any \( N_{D^-} \) cell to initiate *nrS* transcription (leading to the synthesis of a full-fledged denitrification proteome).

doi:10.1371/journal.pcbi.1003933.g003
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**Figure 3. An overview of the modelled system: batch incubation in a gas-tight vial.** The experiment: The stirred Sistrom’s medium [27] was inoculated with aerobically grown *Pa. denitrificans* cells, which were provided with different concentrations of O₂ and NO₂⁻ (g or aq with a chemical species-name represents gaseous or aqueous, respectively). O₂ is consumed by respiration, driving its transport from the headspace to the liquid. Once the aerobic respiration becomes limited, the cells may switch to denitrification (recruitment), reducing NO₂⁻ to N₂ via the intermediates NO and N₂O (not shown). For monitoring O₂, CO₂, N₂, NO and N₂O, a robotised incubation system [28] was used, which automatically takes samples from the headspace by piercing the rubber septum. Each sampling removes a fraction (3.4%) of all gases in the headspace, but it also involves a marginal leakage of O₂ and N₂ into the vial (as indicated by the two-way arrows at the top of the figure). The model: The model operates with two sub-populations: one without and the other with denitrification enzymes \( (N_{D^-} \text{ and } N_{D^+}, \text{respectively}) \). Both consume O₂ if present, but \( N_{D^-} \) cannot reduce NOₓ. The \( N_{D^-} \) cells may be recruited to the \( N_{D^+} \) pool as \([O_2]_{aq} \) falls below a critical threshold. The rate of recruitment \( (R_{rec}) \) is modelled as a probabilistic function: \( R_{rec} = N_{D^-} \times r_{den}(O_2) \) (cells h⁻¹), where \( r_{den}(O_2) \) represents an O₂ dependent specific-probability (h⁻¹) for any \( N_{D^-} \) cell to initiate *nrS* transcription (leading to the synthesis of a full-fledged denitrification proteome).

doi:10.1371/journal.pcbi.1003933.g003
Treatments selected for simulation. Only $\text{NO}_2^-$-supplemented treatments (Table 1) were selected for this modelling exercise for two reasons. First, $\text{NO}_2^-$ was not monitored; hence, results of the $\text{NO}_3^-$-supplemented treatments could not provide exact estimates of anaerobic respiration rates (due to an unknown transient accumulation of $\text{NO}_2^-$). Second, by excluding the treatments requiring Nar, we could single out and focus on the regulation of the other key enzyme NirS.

Aerobic respiration followed by denitrification. $\text{O}_2$ diffused from the headspace to the liquid (Fig. 3), where the cells consumed it before switching to denitrification: the stepwise reduction of $\text{NO}_2^-$ to $\text{N}_2$ via the intermediates NO and $\text{N}_2\text{O}$ (not shown). Headspace concentrations of gases were monitored by frequent sampling (every 3 hours). A typical result is shown in Fig. 1A, illustrating the increasing rate of $\text{O}_2$ consumption until depletion, followed by transition to denitrification. The denitrification rate increased exponentially till all the $\text{NO}_2^-$ present in the medium was recovered as $\text{N}_2$. The medium contained ample amounts of carbon substrate (34 mM succinate) to support the consumption of all available electron acceptors.

Sampling procedure. To monitor $\text{O}_2$, $\text{CO}_2$, $\text{NO}$, $\text{N}_2\text{O}$, and $\text{N}_2$ in the headspace for respiring cultures, Bergaust et al. [4,8] used a robotised incubation system, which automatically takes samples from the headspace by piercing the rubber septum (Fig. 3). The auto-sampler is connected to a gas chromatograph (GC) and an NO analyser (For details, see [28]). The system uses peristaltic pumping, which removes a fraction (3–3.4%) of all the gases in the headspace and then reverses the pumping to inject an equal amount of He into the headspace, thus maintaining ~1 atmosphere pressure inside the vial. Sampling also involves a marginal leakage of $\text{O}_2$ and $\text{N}_2$ into the headspace (~22 and ~60 nmol per sampling, respectively) through tubing and membranes of the injection system.

Calculation of gases in the liquid. Concentrations of gases in the liquid were calculated using solubility of each gas at the given temperature (20°C), assuming equilibrium between the headspace and the liquid. However, the $\text{O}_2$ consumption rate was so high that to calculate $[\text{O}_2]$ in the liquid, its transport rate (from the headspace to the liquid) had to be taken into account.

An overview of the model

The model effectively represents the physical phenomena mentioned above, so as to ensure that the simulation results match the measured data for the right reasons. Net effect of sampling (dilution and leakage) is included in the simulation of $\text{O}_2$ kinetics at the reported sampling times. Transport of $\text{O}_2$ between the headspace and the liquid is modelled using an empirically determined transport coefficient and the solubility of $\text{O}_2$ in water at 20°C. To simulate the metabolic activity (O2 consumption and $\text{N}_2$ production) and growth, the model divides the cells into two sub-populations: one without and the other with denitrification enzymes ($\text{N}_2\text{D}_-$ and $\text{N}_2\text{D}_+$ pools, respectively, see Fig. 3). Both equally consume $\text{O}_2$ if present, but $\text{N}_2\text{D}_-$ cannot reduce $\text{NO}_2^-$ to $\text{N}_2$. Those $\text{N}_2\text{D}_-$ cells that, in response to $\text{O}_2$ depletion, are able to initiate nirS transcription (see Fig. 2) are recruited to the $\text{N}_2\text{D}_+$ pool, where $\text{N}_2\text{D}_+ = 0$ prior to the recruitment. The recruitment rate ($\text{Rec}$) is modelled according to a probabilistic function described below (Eqs. 7–8).

The model ignores sampling effect on $\text{N}_2$ (leakage and loss), thus calculating the cumulative $\text{N}_2$ production as if no sampling took place. That is because the experimentally determined $\text{N}_2$ accumulation (which is to be compared with the model predictions) was already corrected for the net sampling effect.

The model is developed in Vensim DSS 6.2 Double Precision (Ventana Systems, Inc. http://vensim.com/) using techniques from the field of system dynamics [29]. The model is divided into three sectors: I. $\text{O}_2$ kinetics, II. Population dynamics of $\text{N}_2\text{D}_-$ and $\text{N}_2\text{D}_+$, and III. Denitrification kinetics (Fig. 4).

Sector I: $\text{O}_2$ kinetics

Structural-basis for the $\text{O}_2$ kinetics is mapped in Fig. 4A: the squares represent the state variables, the circles the rate of change in the state variables, the shaded ovals the auxiliary variables, the arrows mutual dependencies between the variables, and the edges represent flows into or out of the state variables. Briefly, Fig. 4A (left to right) shows that $\text{O}_2$ in the vial’s headspace ($[\text{O}_2\text{HS}]$) is transported ($\text{Tr}_{\text{O}_2}$) to the liquid-phase ($[\text{O}_2\text{LP}]$), where it is consumed ($\text{O}_2\text{D}$) by both the $\text{N}_2\text{D}_-$ and $\text{N}_2\text{D}_+$ populations (lacking and carrying denitrification enzymes, respectively) in proportion to an identical cell-specific velocity of $\text{O}_2$ consumption ($v_{\text{O}_2}$). $\Delta[\text{O}_2\text{HS}]$ represents net marginal changes in $[\text{O}_2\text{HS}]$ due to sampling. Below we present equations and a detailed explanation of the structural components shown for this sector.

$\text{O}_2$ in the headspace. ($[\text{O}_2\text{HS}, \text{mol vial}^{-1}]$) is initialised by measured initial concentrations (Table 1) and modelled as a function of transport ($\text{Tr}_{\text{O}_2}$) between the headspace and the liquid [28]:

$$\text{Tr}_{\text{O}_2} = k_0 \times \left( k_{\text{H}(\text{O}_2)} \times P_{\text{O}_2} - [\text{O}_2\text{LP}] \right)$$

(1)

Units: mol vial$^{-1}$ h$^{-1}$

where $k_0$ (L vial$^{-1}$ h$^{-1}$) is the empirically determined coefficient for the transport of $\text{O}_2$ between the headspace and the liquid (See Table 2 for parametric values and their sources), $k_{\text{H}(\text{O}_2)}$ (mol L$^{-1}$ atm$^{-1}$) is the solubility of $\text{O}_2$ in water at 20°C, $P_{\text{O}_2}$ (atm) is the partial pressure of $\text{O}_2$ in the headspace, and $[\text{O}_2\text{LP}]$ (mol L$^{-1}$) is the $\text{O}_2$ concentration in the liquid-phase ($[\text{O}_2\text{LP}] = \frac{\text{O}_2\text{LP}}{V_{\text{vol}}}$).

In addition, changes in $[\text{O}_2\text{HS}]$ due to sampling are included at the reported sampling times. The robotised incubation system [28] used in the experiment monitors gas concentrations by sampling the headspace, where each sampling alters the concentrations in a predictable manner: a fraction of $\text{O}_2\text{HS}$ is removed and replaced by He (dilution), but the sampling also results in a marginal leakage of $\text{O}_2$ through the tubing and membranes of the injection system. Eq. 2 shows how the model calculates the net change in $\text{O}_2\text{HS}$ ($\Delta[\text{O}_2\text{HS}]$) as a result of each sampling:

$$\Delta[\text{O}_2\text{HS}] = \left( [\text{O}_2\text{HS}] - [\text{O}_2\text{HS}] \times D \right) / t_s$$

(2)

mol vial$^{-1}$ h$^{-1}$

where $[\text{O}_2\text{HS}]$ (mol vial$^{-1}$) is the $\text{O}_2$ leakage into the headspace, $D$ (dilution) is the fraction of $\text{O}_2\text{HS}$ replaced by He, and $t_s$ (h) is the time taken to complete each sampling. $\Delta[\text{O}_2\text{HS}]$ is negative if $\text{O}_2\text{HS}$ is greater than 0.38 μmol vial$^{-1}$ and marginally positive if it is less than that.

$\text{O}_2$ in the liquid-phase. ($[\text{O}_2\text{LP}, \text{mol vial}^{-1}$, see Fig. 4A) is initialised by assuming equilibrium with $\text{O}_2\text{HS}$ at the time of inoculation ($[\text{O}_2\text{LP}(0)] = P_{\text{O}_2} \times k_{\text{H}(\text{O}_2)} \times V_{\text{vol}}$). $\text{O}_2\text{LP}$ is modelled as a function of its transport into the liquid ($\text{Tr}_{\text{O}_2}$, Eq. 1) and consumption rate ($\text{O}_2\text{D}$, mol vial$^{-1}$ h$^{-1}$), where the latter is
modelling as a function of total cell numbers and the cell-specific velocity of O₂ consumption:

\[
\frac{d\left[O_2\right]_{LP}}{dt} = TrO_2 - CrO_2 = TrO_2 - (N_{D^{-}} + N_{D^{+}}) \times vO_2 \quad (3)
\]

where \(N_{D^{-}}\) and \(N_{D^{+}}\) (cells vial\(^{-1}\), see Sector II for details) are the cells without and with denitrification enzymes, respectively, and \(vO_2\) (mol cell\(^{-1}\) h\(^{-1}\)) is the cell-specific velocity of O₂ consumption. Thus, we assume that the \(N_{D^{+}}\) and \(N_{D^{-}}\) cells have the same potential to consume O₂.

\(vO_2\) is modelled as a Michaelis-Menten function of O₂ concentration:

\[
vO_2 = \frac{v_{\text{max}}(O_2) \times [O_2]_{LP}}{K_m(O_2) + [O_2]_{LP}} \quad (4)
\]

where \(v_{\text{max}}(O_2)\) (mol cell\(^{-1}\) h\(^{-1}\)) is the maximum cell-specific velocity of O₂ consumption (determined under the actual experimental conditions), \([O_2]_{LP}\) (mol \(L^{-1}\)) is the O₂ concentration in the liquid-phase, and \(K_m(O_2)\) (mol \(L^{-1}\)) is the half saturation constant for O₂.

**Sector II: Population dynamics of the cells without (\(N_{D^{-}}\)) and with (\(N_{D^{+}}\)) denitrification proteome**

Fig. 4B represents the structure governing the population dynamics of \(N_{D^{-}}\) and \(N_{D^{+}}\) cells. Briefly, the figure shows that both the populations are able to grow by aerobic respiration (\(Gr_{D^{-}}\) and \(Gr_{D^{+}}\), respectively). The growth rate of \(N_{D^{+}}\), however, is primarily based on denitrification (\(Gr_{DE}^{\text{AE}}\)). Initially, \(N_{D^{+}} = 0\) and is populated through recruitment (\(R_{rec}\)) of the cells from \(N_{D^{-}}\), where the recruitment is a function of \(N_{D^{-}}\) and an \([O_2]\) dependent specific-probability of the recruitment (\(r_{rec}(O_2)\)).

The growth rate of \(N_{D^{+}}\) is primarily based on denitrification (\(Gr_{DE}^{\text{AE}}\)), but the \(N_{D^{+}}\) cells that are recruited before \(O_2\) is completely exhausted also grow by consuming the remaining traces of \(O_2\). Below we present equations and a detailed explanation of the structural components shown for this sector.
Table 2. Model parameters.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector I: O₂ Kinetics</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Dilution: the fraction of O₂ replaced by He during sampling</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>Unitless</td>
<td>[28]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kₜ₂</td>
<td>Solubility of O₂ in water (20 °C)</td>
<td>0.00139</td>
<td>mol L⁻¹ atm⁻¹</td>
<td>[37]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kₜ</td>
<td>The O₂ transport coefficient between headspace and liquid</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>L vial⁻¹ h⁻¹</td>
<td>[28]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O₂ leak</td>
<td>O₂ leakage into the vial during each sampling</td>
<td>2.04×10⁻⁸</td>
<td>mol vial⁻¹</td>
<td>[28]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tₛ</td>
<td>The time taken to complete each sampling</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>[28]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kₑₚₜ</td>
<td>The half saturation constant for O₂ consumption</td>
<td>2.5×10⁻⁷</td>
<td>mol L⁻¹</td>
<td>Model-based estimation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vₑₚₜ</td>
<td>The maximum cell-specific velocity of O₂ consumption</td>
<td>1.33×10⁻⁵</td>
<td>mol cell⁻¹ h⁻¹</td>
<td>[4,8]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector II: Population dynamics of the cells without (Nₐₐₐ) and with (Nₐₐₐ) denitrification proteome</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[O₂]ₚₚₜ</td>
<td>[O₂] in the liquid below which the recruitment to Nₐₐₐ halts</td>
<td>1×10⁻⁸</td>
<td>mol L⁻¹</td>
<td>Assumption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[O₂]ₚₚₜ</td>
<td>[O₂] below which the recruitment to Nₐₐₐ triggers</td>
<td>9.75×10⁻⁶</td>
<td>mol L⁻¹</td>
<td>[22]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rₚₜₜ</td>
<td>The specific-probability of recruitment of a cell to Nₐₐₐ</td>
<td>0.0052</td>
<td>h⁻¹</td>
<td>[22]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yₚₚₜ</td>
<td>The growth yield per molN NO₂⁻</td>
<td>5.79×10¹³</td>
<td>cells molN⁻¹</td>
<td>[4,8]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yₚₚₜ</td>
<td>The growth yield per mol O₂</td>
<td>15×10¹³</td>
<td>cells mol⁻¹</td>
<td>[4,8]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector III: Denitrification Kinetics</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kₚₚₜₜ</td>
<td>The half saturation constant for NO₂⁻ reduction</td>
<td>4×10⁻⁶</td>
<td>molN L⁻¹</td>
<td>[33,34]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vₑₚₜₜ</td>
<td>The maximum cell-specific velocity of NO₂⁻ reduction</td>
<td>1.83×10⁻¹⁵</td>
<td>molN cell⁻¹ h⁻¹</td>
<td>[4,8]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>Universal gas constant</td>
<td>0.083</td>
<td>L atm K⁻¹ mol⁻¹</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>Temperature</td>
<td>293.1</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>[4,8]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volₜₜ</td>
<td>Headspace volume</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>L vial⁻¹</td>
<td>[4,8]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volₜₜ</td>
<td>Liquid-phase volume</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>L vial⁻¹</td>
<td>[4,8]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

doi:10.1371/journal.pcbi.1003933.1002

The pool of the cells lacking denitrification proteome. The pool of the cells lacking denitrification proteome (Nₐₐₐ) is initialised with 3×10⁶ cells vial⁻¹. The population dynamics of Nₐₐₐ are modelled as:

\[
\frac{d(N_{\text{N}_{\text{D}}})}{dt} = Gr_{\text{D}} - R_{\text{rec}} \tag{5}
\]

where \(Gr_{\text{D}}\) (cells vial⁻¹ h⁻¹) is the (aerobic) growth rate, and \(R_{\text{rec}}\) (cells vial⁻¹ h⁻¹, Eq. 7) is the rate of recruitment of Nₐₐₐ to the Nₐₐₐ pool.

\[
Gr_{\text{D}} = N_{\text{N}_{\text{D}}_1} \times v_{O_2} \times Y_{O_2} \tag{6}
\]

where \(v_{O_2}\) (mol cell⁻¹ h⁻¹, Eq. 4) is the cell-specific velocity of O₂ consumption, and \(Y_{O_2}\) (cells mol⁻¹) is the cell yield per mole of O₂ (determined under the actual experimental conditions).

The rate of recruitment. The rate of recruitment (\(R_{\text{rec}}\), see Fig. 4B) of the cells from Nₐₐₐ to Nₐₐₐ is modelled as:

\[
R_{\text{rec}} = N_{\text{N}_{\text{D}}_1} \times r_{\text{den}}(O_2) \tag{7}
\]

where \(r_{\text{den}}(O_2)\) (h⁻¹) represents the conditional specific-probability for any Nₐₐₐ cell to be recruited to denitrification, modelled as a function of O₂ concentration in the liquid-phase \([O_2]_{\text{LP}}\), see Fig. 5):

\[
r_{\text{den}}(O_2) = \begin{cases} 
0 & \text{for } [O_2]_{\text{LP}} > [O_2]_{\text{trigger}} \\
\frac{r_{\text{den}}}{[O_2]_{\text{min}} < [O_2]_{\text{LP}} < [O_2]_{\text{trigger}}} & \text{for } [O_2]_{\text{LP}} < [O_2]_{\text{min}} \
\end{cases} \tag{8}
\]

where \(r_{\text{den}}\) (h⁻¹) is a constant representing the specific-probability of the recruitment, \([O_2]_{\text{trigger}}\) is the O₂ concentration above which the transcription of nirS is effectively suppressed by O₂, and \([O_2]_{\text{min}}\) is the O₂ concentration assumed to provide minimum energy for the initial transcription to result in functional NirS. Once the first molecules of NirS are produced while \([O_2]_{\text{LP}} < [O_2]_{\text{trigger}}\), the transcription of nirS will be greatly enhanced through positive feedback by NO, paving the way for the full-scale production of denitrification proteome [10] (See Introduction and Fig. 2 for details).

\([O_2]_{\text{trigger}}\) (= 9.75×10⁻⁶ mol L⁻¹) is the empirically determined \([O_2]_{\text{LP}}\) at the outset of NO accumulation: Bergaust et al. [8] estimated \([O_2]_{\text{trigger}}\) between 0.1–12 µM, but recent Pa. denitrificans batch incubation data have provided a more precise estimate between 8.8–10.7 µM (average = 9.75 µM) [22].
As for $O_2^{1/2}/C_{138}$, we lack empirical basis for determining the parameter value, but sensitivity of the model to this parameter was tested (See Results/Discussion). Our simulations were run with $O_2^{1/2}/C_{138}^{min} = 1.610^{-2} \text{ mol L}^{-1}$, which would sustain an aerobic respiration rate equivalent to 0.4% of the empirically determined $v_{max}(O_2)$ (assuming our estimated $K_m(O_2) = 2.5 \times 10^{-7} \text{ mol L}^{-1}$, Table 2).

As modelled, the time-window for the recruitment to denitrification depends on the time taken to deplete $O_2^{LP}$ from $O_2^{trigger}$ to $O_2^{min}$ (Fig. 5); for obvious reasons, the length of this time-window depends on the cell density.

The lag observed between the emergence of denitrification gene transcripts and the subsequent gas products is as short as 20 minutes [8,22], which is insignificant in the sense that the estimations of $r_{den}$ and $F_{den}$ will not be affected by including it in the model. Therefore, the recruitment (Eq. 7) is modelled as an instantaneous event.

**Calculation of $F_{den}$: The fraction of the cells recruited to denitrification.** $F_{den}$ is calculated based on the integral of the recruitment (Eq. 7):

$$F_{den} = 1 - e^{-r_{den} \times (t_m-t_t)}$$  \hspace{1cm} (9)

Dimensionless

where $r_{den}$, see Eqs. 7–8 and Fig. 5) is the specific-probability for the recruitment of a cell to denitrification, $t_t$ is the time when $[O_2]$ in the liquid falls below $[O_2]_{trigger}$ (the concentration below which $r_{den}$ triggers), and $t_m$ is the time when $[O_2]$ in the liquid falls below $[O_2]^{min}$ (the concentration below which $r_{den}$ is assumed to be zero). Hence, effectively, $F_{den}$ expresses the probability for any cell to switch to denitrification within the time-frame $t_m - t_t$.

**The pool of the cells carrying denitrification proteome.** The pool of the cells carrying denitrification proteome ($N_{D^+}$, see Fig. 4B) is initialised with zero cells, and its population dynamics are modelled as:

$$\frac{d(N_{D^+})}{dt} = R_{rec} + Gr_{DE} + Gr_{AE}$$ \hspace{1cm} (10)

where $R_{rec}$ (cells vial$^{-1}$ h$^{-1}$, Eq. 7) is the recruitment rate, $Gr_{DE}$ (cells vial$^{-1}$ h$^{-1}$) the denitrification-based growth and $Gr_{AE}$ (cells vial$^{-1}$ h$^{-1}$) the aerobic growth rate.
\( G_{\text{DE}} \) is modelled as:

\[
G_{\text{DE}} = N_{\text{D}+} \times v_{\text{NO}_2^-} \times Y_{\text{NO}_2^-} \tag{11}
\]

where \( v_{\text{NO}_2^-} \) (molN cell\(^{-1}\) h\(^{-1}\)), see Eq. 15) is the cell-specific velocity of \( \text{NO}_2^- \) reduction, and \( Y_{\text{NO}_2^-} \) (cells molN\(^{-1}\)) is the growth yield per molN of \( \text{NO}_2^- \) as the \( e^- \)-acceptor (determined under the actual experimental conditions).

The \( N_{\text{D}+} \) cells are assumed to have the same ability as \( N_{\text{D}} \) to grow by aerobic respiration; their aerobic growth rate is formulated as:

\[
G_{\text{AE}} = N_{\text{D}+} \times v_{\text{O}_2} \times Y_{\text{O}_2} \tag{12}
\]

where \( v_{\text{O}_2} \) (mol cell\(^{-1}\) h\(^{-1}\)), see Eq. 4) is the cell-specific velocity of \( \text{O}_2 \) consumption, and \( Y_{\text{O}_2} \) (cells mol\(^{-1}\)) is the growth yield per mole of \( \text{O}_2 \) as the \( e^- \)-acceptor.

**Sector III: Denitrification kinetics**

The structure controlling the denitrification kinetics is mapped in Fig. 4C. Briefly, the figure shows that the cells with denitrification proteome \( (N_{\text{D}+}) \) control the consumption rate of \( \text{NO}_2^- \) (\( C_{\text{NO}_2^-} \)), recovered as \( N_{\text{D}} \), in proportion to a cell-specific concentration only \([4,8]\).

\( \text{NO}_2^- \) and \( \text{N}_2 \). The \( \text{NO}_2^- \) pool (molN vial\(^{-1}\)) is initialised by measured initial concentrations (Table 1), and the \( \text{N}_2 \) pool is initialised with zero molN vial\(^{-1}\). \( \text{NO}_2^- \) and \( \text{N}_2 \) kinetics are modelled as:

\[
d(\text{NO}_2^-)/dt = -C_{\text{NO}_2^-} \tag{13}
\]

molN vial\(^{-1}\) h\(^{-1}\)

where \( C_{\text{NO}_2^-} \) is the consumption rate of \( \text{NO}_2^- \) :

\[
C_{\text{NO}_2^-} = N_{\text{D}+} \times v_{\text{NO}_2^-} \tag{14}
\]

molN vial\(^{-1}\) h\(^{-1}\)

where \( N_{\text{D}+} \) (cells vial\(^{-1}\)) represents the denitrifying cells, and \( v_{\text{NO}_2^-} \) (molN cell\(^{-1}\) h\(^{-1}\)) is the cell-specific velocity of \( \text{NO}_2^- \) reduction, which is modelled as a function of \( \text{NO}_2^- \) using the Michaelis-Menten equation:

\[
v_{\text{NO}_2^-} = v_{\text{max}}(\text{NO}_2^-) \times [\text{NO}_2^-] \left( K_m(\text{NO}_2^-) + [\text{NO}_2^-] \right) \tag{15}
\]

where \( v_{\text{max}}(\text{NO}_2^-) \) (molN cell\(^{-1}\) h\(^{-1}\)) is the maximum cell-specific velocity of \( \text{NO}_2^- \) consumption (determined under the actual experimental conditions), \( [\text{NO}_2^-] \) (molN L\(^{-1}\)) is the \( \text{NO}_2^- \) concentration in the liquid-phase, and \( K_m(\text{NO}_2^-) \) (molN L\(^{-1}\)) is the half saturation constant for \( \text{NO}_2^- \) reduction.

See Table 2 for a summary of the parametric values and their sources and Table 3 for the initial values assigned to the state variables.

**Parameterisation**

Most of the parameter values used in the model are well established in the literature (See Table 2). However, somewhat uncertain parameters include \( K_m(\text{O}_2) \), \( K_m(\text{NO}_2^-) \)[4,8] \( \text{O}_2 \) trigger, and the assumed parameter \( \text{O}_2 \) min:

\( K_m(\text{O}_2) \). *P. denitrificans* has three alternative terminal oxidases [30] with \( K_m(\text{O}_2) \) ranging from nM to \( \mu \text{M} \) [31,32], so we decided to estimate \( K_m(\text{O}_2) \) by fitting our model to the data. Unfortunately, Bergaust et al.’s [4,8] ~0% \( \text{O}_2 \) treatments data, for which \( K_m(\text{O}_2) \) is relevant, has technical problems (needle clogging and/or high \( \text{O}_2 \) leakage during sampling). Therefore, we estimated \( K_m(\text{O}_2) \) (~2.5 \( \times 10^{-7} \) mol L\(^{-1}\)) by aply simulating our model against another ~0% \( \text{O}_2 \) data set produced by batch cultivations of *P. denitrificans* under similar experimental conditions [22].

\( K_m(\text{NO}_2^-) \) is given in the literature as 4–5 \( \mu \text{M} \) [33,34]. The model, however, does not show any considerable sensitivity to this parameter even within a range as wide as 0.1–10 \( \mu \text{M} \) because the simulated experiments were operating with much higher \( [\text{NO}_2^-] \).

\( [\text{O}_2]_\text{trigger} \) (~9.75 \( \times 10^{-6} \) mol L\(^{-1}\)) is empirically determined as the \( [\text{O}_2]_\text{LP} \) at the outset of NO accumulation: Bergaust et al. [8]

---

**Table 3. Initial values for the state variables.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector 1: ( \text{O}_2 ) Kinetics</th>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial ( \text{O}_2 ) in the headspace</td>
<td>( O_{\text{HS}}(t_0) )</td>
<td>See Table 5</td>
<td>mol vial(^{-1})</td>
<td>[4,8]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial ( \text{O}_2 ) in the liquid-phase</td>
<td>( O_{\text{LS}}(t_0) )</td>
<td>Equilibrium with ( O_{\text{HS}}(t_0) )</td>
<td>mol vial(^{-1})</td>
<td>Assumption</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sector II: Population dynamics of the cells without \( (N_{\text{D}+}) \) and with \( (N_{\text{D}}) \) denitrification proteome**

| Initial number of cells | \( N_{\text{D}}(t_0) \) | \( 3 \times 10^8 \) | cells vial\(^{-1}\) | [4,8] |
| Initial number of denitrifying cells | \( N_{\text{D}+}(t_0) \) | 0 | cells vial\(^{-1}\) | Assumption |

**Sector III: Denitrification Kinetics**

| Initial \( \text{NO}_2^- \) in the liquid-phase | \( \text{NO}_2^- (t_0) \) | See Table 5 | molN vial\(^{-1}\) | [4,8] |
| Initial \( \text{N}_2 \) in the headspace | \( \text{N}_2(t_0) \) | 0 | molN vial\(^{-1}\) | [4,8] |

doi:10.1371/journal.pcbi.1003933.t003
estimated \([O_2]_{\text{trigger}}\) between 0.1–12 \(\mu\text{M}\), but recent batch incubation data from *Pa. denitrificans* have provided a more precise estimate in the range 8.8–10.7 \(\mu\text{M}\) (average = 9.75 \(\mu\text{M}\)) [22]. The model, however, is not sensitive to \([O_2]_{\text{trigger}}\) within the latter range because of a high velocity of \(O_2\) depletion.

\([O_2]_{\text{min}}\) (\(= 1 \times 10^{-3} \text{ mol L}^{-1}\)) is assigned an arbitrary low value, since we lack any empirical estimation/data to support it. To compensate for the uncertainty, we conducted a sensitivity analysis exploring the consequences of increasing or decreasing \([O_2]_{\text{min}}\) by one order of magnitude (See Results/Discussion).

**Results/Discussion**

The specific-probability (\(r_{\text{den}}, h^{-1}\)) of recruitment of a cell to denitrification

To test the assumption of a single homogeneous population, we forced our model to achieve 100% recruitment to denitrification by setting \(r_{\text{den}} = 1 \text{ h}^{-1}\). In consequence, the simulated \(N_2\) accumulation (molN vial\(^{-1}\)) showed gross overestimation as compared to the measured for all the treatments (as illustrated for some randomly selected ones in Fig. 6).

To find a more adequate value, \(r_{\text{den}}\) was calibrated to produce the best possible match between the simulated and measured \(N_2\) through optimisation. (The optimisation was carried out in Vensim DSS 6.2 Double Precision, http://vensim.com/). Table 4 presents the optimal \(r_{\text{den}}\) for each treatment; no consistent effect of initial \([O_2]\) and \([NO_2]\) was found on the optimal results. The average for all the treatments = 0.0052, which appears to give reasonable fit between the simulated and measured \(N_2\) (See Figs. 7, 8, and 9). This indicates that the simulations with \(r_{\text{den}} = 0.0052\) should provide a reasonable approximation of \(F_{\text{den}}\) (the fraction recruited to denitrification) during the actual experiment.

**Sensitivity analysis.** \([O_2]_{\text{min}}\) (the \(O_2\) concentration below which the recruitment is arrested) was arbitrarily chosen to be \(1 \times 10^{-9} \text{ mol L}^{-1}\). In order to evaluate the sensitivity of the model to this parameter, we tested the model performance by increasing and decreasing \([O_2]_{\text{min}}\) by one order of magnitude. For each parameter value, we estimated \(r_{\text{den}}\) for the individual vials by optimisation (as outlined in the foregoing paragraph). A good fit was obtained for both the \([O_2]_{\text{min}}\) values, but the optimisation resulted in slightly different \(r_{\text{den}}\) values. Increasing \([O_2]_{\text{min}}\) by a

![Figure 6. Comparison of the measured (4,8) and simulated data assuming \(r_{\text{den}} = 1 \text{ h}^{-1}\). Assuming a single homogeneous population, as we forced our model to achieve 100% recruitment to denitrification by setting the specific-probability of recruitment (\(r_{\text{den}}\)) to 1 \text{ h}^{-1}, the simulated \(N_2\) accumulation (molN vial\(^{-1}\)) showed considerable overestimation as compared to that measured. To illustrate this, the simulated and measured data are compared here for some randomly chosen treatments. Initial vol.% \(O_2\) in the headspace and initial \(NO_2\) is shown above each panel. doi:10.1371/journal.pcbi.1003933.g006](http://www.ploscompbiol.org/article/10.1371/journal.pcbi.1003933.g006)
factor of 10 (to $1 \times 10^{-8}$ mol L$^{-1}$) resulted in 18–38% higher $r_{den}$ estimates (average = 28% ± stdev 10). Decreasing $[O_2]_{min}$ by a factor of 0.1 (to $1 \times 10^{-2}$ mol L$^{-1}$) resulted in 5–17% lower $r_{den}$ estimates (average = 11% ± stdev 6).

The fraction recruited to denitrification ($F_{den}$)

**A refined estimation with the presented model.** Bergaust et al. [8,16] and Nadeem et al. [9] used data from batch cultivations of *Pa. denitrificans*, as illustrated in Fig. 1, to assess $F_{den}$. Their estimation was effectively $F_{den} = \frac{N_{Dz}(t_e)}{N(t_e)}$, where $t_e$ is the time when $O_2$ is exhausted, $N_{Dz}$ (cells vial$^{-1}$) is the number of actively denitrifying cells estimated by the measured rate of denitrification (mol N h$^{-1}$) divided by the cell-specific denitrification (molN cell$^{-1}$ h$^{-1}$), and $N$ is the total number of cells estimated on the basis of $O_2$ consumption. Although this equation indisputably estimates the fraction of the cells that was actively denitrifying at the time $t_e$, it is a biased estimate of the ‘true’ $F_{den}$ because the number of cells does not remain constant through the recruitment phase: $N_{Dz}$ (the cells without denitrification enzymes) and $N_{Dz}$ will both grow until $O_2$ is depleted, but $N_{Dz}$ will grow faster because their growth is supported by both $O_2$ and $NO_x$. As a result, the estimation of $F_{den}$ by this equation might be too high.

**Table 4.** Specific-probability of recruitment of a cell to denitrification ($r_{den}$) estimated for each batch culture by optimisation (best match between the simulated and measured $N_2$ kinetics).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Batch No.</th>
<th>Treatment*: $O_2$HS ($t_0$ (vol.%))</th>
<th>$NO_2^-$ ($t_0$ (mM))</th>
<th>Optimal $r_{den}$ (h$^{-1}$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>~0, 0.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>~0, 0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>~0, 0.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1, 0.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1, 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1, 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7, 0.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>7, 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>7, 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Avg. $\approx$ 0.0052</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Treatment refers to the initial concentration of $O_2$ in the headspace (measured as headspace vol%) and the initial concentration of $NO_2^-$ in the medium (mM). doi:10.1371/journal.pcbi.1003933.t004*

**Figure 7. Simulations of the treatments with ~0 vol.% $O_2$HS using $r_{den} = 0.0052$ h$^{-1}$.** The figure compares the measured and simulated $O_2$ depletion (mol vial$^{-1}$) and $N_2$ accumulation (molN vial$^{-1}$) for the ~0 vol.% $O_2$ treatments of Bergaust et al. [4,8], i.e., the vials with near-zero $O_2$ in the headspace ($O_2$HS) at the time of inoculation. Separate plots are shown for each initial concentration of $NO_2^-$ (0.2, 1, and 2 mM). The measured initial $O_2$ was somewhat erratic due to episodes of needle clogging and/or high $O_2$ leakage during sampling, so the initial $O_2$HS used in the simulations is chosen somewhat ad lib so that the simulated $O_2$ depletion coincides with that measured. The discrepancy compared to the measured $O_2$ seems to be significant for 2 mM $NO_2^-$ treatment. That is most likely due to the inhibitory effect of nitrite on aerobic respiration, which is not taken into account; all simulations are run with an identical $K_m(O_2)$. Near exhaustion, the simulated $O_2$ increases slightly at each sampling time; that is due to the leakage of $O_2$ via the injection system exceeding dilution of the headspace (with He) during each sampling. doi:10.1371/journal.pcbi.1003933.g007
Besides, the experimental estimation is prone to error because of infrequent sampling, since the sampling time does not necessarily coincide with $t_{\text{ex}}$. In contrast, our model directly and more precisely calculates $F_{\text{den}}$ (Eq. 9) by 

a) explicitly simulating the actual kinetics of the recruitment of the cells to denitrification (in contrast to estimating total and denitrifying cell numbers from gas kinetics) and 

b) avoiding aerobic and anaerobic growth of the cells. Table 5 shows the model’s estimations of $F_{\text{den}}$ and the time-span of the recruitment ($t_m - t_i$) along with the $F_{\text{den}}$ estimations of Bergaust et al. [8,16].

In the ~0% $O_2$ treatments, $F_{\text{den}}$ is supported by the sampling leaks of $O_2$. Due to low cell density in the ~0% $O_2$ treatments (initial $O_2 = 1.5–2$ µmol), the $O_2$ leakage into the vial during sampling (every 3 hours) caused oxygen concentrations to exceed $[O_2]_{\text{min}}$ for 0.1–2.4 hours. This resulted in various spikes of recruitment after the initial $O_2$ was depleted. The recruitment through these spikes amounted to, on average, ~19% of $F_{\text{den}}$ in the ~0% $O_2$ treatments. $F_{\text{den}} < < 100\%$. The model’s estimations of $F_{\text{den}}$ (Table 5) corroborate the suggestion of Bergaust et al. [8,16] and Nadeem et al. [9] that in batch cultures of Pa. denitrificans $F_{\text{den}}$ remains far below 100%. According to Bergaust et al. [8,16], $F_{\text{den}}$ was 2–21% (average = 10%), whereas the model estimated it between 3.8–16.1% (average = 8.2%).

$F_{\text{den}}$ is inversely related to cell density. Bergaust et al. [16] argued that as the velocity of $O_2$ depletion is proportional to cell density, the time-frame available for the cells to produce (necessary initial) denitrification proteome would be inversely related to the cell density at the time of $O_2$ depletion. Simulation results (Table 5) support this: high initial $O_2$ concentrations resulted in high cell densities at the time of $O_2$ depletion, shortening the time-span for the recruitment to denitrification, hence resulting in the low $F_{\text{den}}$.

Underlying cause of the low $F_{\text{den}}$. $F_{\text{den}}$ remains low because of 

a) the limited time-window available to the cells for the recruitment and 

b) the low $r_{\text{den}}$ (specific-probability of the recruitment), presumably due to a low probability of initiating nirS transcription (subsequently reinforced through positive feedback by NO).

Simulation of the ‘diauxic lag’

To investigate whether the recruitment of a small fraction of the cells to denitrification could explain the ‘diauxic lag’ observed by Liu et al. [24], we used our model to simulate the conditions they reported for their experiment. In short, Liu et al. [24] incubated Ps. denitrificans (ATCC 13867) in oxic batch cultures, which were sparged with $N_2$ as the cultures had reached different cell densities ($OD_{550} = 0.05–0.17$). The sparging resulted in apparent diauxic lags, i.e., periods with little or no detectable growth. The length of...
Figure 9. Simulations of the treatments with 7 vol.% O\textsubscript{2}HS using $r_{\text{den}} = 0.0052$ h\textsuperscript{-1}. The figure compares the measured and simulated O\textsubscript{2} depletion (mol vial\textsuperscript{-1}) and N\textsubscript{2} production (molN vial\textsuperscript{-1}) for the treatments with 7 vol.% O\textsubscript{2} in the headspace (O\textsubscript{2}HS) at the time of inoculation; separate plots are shown for each initial concentration of nitrite (0.2, 1, and 2 mM). At each sampling time, the simulated O\textsubscript{2} is visibly reduced because of sampling, which results in 3.4% dilution of the headspace (with He).

doi:10.1371/journal.pcbi.1003933.g009

Table 5. The model’s and Bergaust et al.’s [16] estimations of the fraction recruited to denitrification ($F_{\text{den}}$).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Batch No.</th>
<th>O\textsubscript{2}HS ($t_0$) (vol%) NO\textsubscript{2} ($t_0$) (mM)</th>
<th>O\textsubscript{2}HS ($t_0$) ($\mu$mol)*</th>
<th>Model-based Estimations</th>
<th>Estimations of [16]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$t_{m} - t_{t}^{**}$</td>
<td>$F_{\text{den}}$</td>
<td>$F_{\text{den}}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0, 0.2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>0.141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0, 1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>0.161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0, 2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>0.156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1, 0.2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>0.161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1, 1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>0.156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1, 2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>0.156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7, 0.2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>0.156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>7, 1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>0.156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>7, 2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>0.156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\sum_{i=1}^{9} t_{m} - t_{t}^{**}$</td>
<td>$\sum_{i=1}^{9} F_{\text{den}}$</td>
<td>$\sum_{i=1}^{9} F_{\text{den}}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Avg. = 0.082</td>
<td>Avg. = 0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Refers to the initial values of O\textsubscript{2} in the headspace (O\textsubscript{2}HS) used in the simulations. The values show some inconsistency for the treatments corresponding to the same vol.% because of traces of O\textsubscript{2} left behind after He-washing.

**$t_t$ is the time when [O\textsubscript{2}] in the liquid falls below $O_{2,\text{trigger}} = 9.75$ mM [22], the concentration below which recruitment of the cells to denitrification is assumed to trigger), and $t_m$ is the time when [O\textsubscript{2}] in the liquid falls below $O_{2,\text{leak}}$ (= 1 nM, a practically zero concentration below which the recruitment is assumed to terminate). Due to low cell density in the 0% O\textsubscript{2} treatments, the O\textsubscript{2} leakage into the vial during sampling (every 3 hours) caused oxygen concentration to exceed $O_{2,\text{leak}}$ for 0.1–2.4 hours. This resulted in various recruitment spikes after the initial O\textsubscript{2} was depleted. If such recruitment is omitted, $F_{\text{den}} = 0.126$, 0.142, and 0.133 for the treatments 1, 2, and 3, respectively.

doi:10.1371/journal.pcbi.1003933.t005
such lags increased with the cell density present at the time of sparging.

**Structural amendments and parameterisation of the model.** To tentatively simulate their experiment, two changes were made in the $O_2$ kinetics sector (Fig. 4A). Firstly, the net sampling loss of $O_2HS$ ($\Delta O_2{HS}$) was omitted, since it was specifically set up for the robotised incubation system [28] used by Bergaust et al. [4,8]. Secondly, a sparging event was introduced, which immediately takes $O_2HS$ down to very low levels ($\leq 1 \times 10^{-5}$ mol vial$^{-1}$). Since we lack information about the exact concentration of $O_2$ immediately after the sparging, the present exercise is only qualitative.

Liu et al. [24] inoculated the culture to have an initial OD$_{500}$ = 0.07, which would correspond to $\sim 6.5 \times 10^6$ cells vial$^{-1}$ [4,8]. We used this number to initialise the OD$_{z-pool}$ (shown in Fig. 4B). They used NO$_3^-$ ($= 157 \mu$molN vial$^{-1}$) instead of NO$_2^-$, so we replaced the NO$_2^-$ pool (Fig. 4C) by the NO$_3^-$ pool, initialising it accordingly, and adjusted Eqs. 11 and 15: In Eq. 11, $Y_{NO_3}$ was replaced with the cell yield per molN of NO$_3^-$ as the $e^-$-acceptor ($Y_{NO_3} = 9.63 \times 10^{13}$ cells molN$^{-1}$ [4,8]). In Eq. 15, $v_{max(NO_2)}$ was replaced with the maximum cell-specific velocity of NO$_2^-$ consumption ($v_{max(NO_2)} = 2 \times 10^{-15}$ molN cell$^{-1}$ h$^{-1}$), calculated using the maximum specific NO$_2$-based growth rate ($\approx 0.322$ h$^{-1}$) reported for their experiment. Finally, in Eq. 4, $v_{max(O_2)}$ was calibrated ($= 2.28 \times 10^{-15}$ mol cell$^{-1}$ h$^{-1}$) with the reported maximum specific aerobic growth rate ($\approx 0.342$ h$^{-1}$).

The ‘diauxic lag’ is plausibly the initial growth phase of a minute $F_{den}$ (fraction recruited to denitriﬁcation). As the experiment of Liu et al. [24] was simulated with the model’s estimated $t_{den} = 0.0052$ h$^{-1}$ (specific-probability of recruitment), $F_{den}$ turned out to be 1.1% for the treatment sparged at $h = 1.1$ and 0.2% for the one sparged at $h = 2.55$. Simulations of the total cell density (NDP + NDP$_+$) for these cases (Fig. 10A) showed long apparent lags comparable to 10–30 h lag phases observed in their later experiments [25]. However, lags in the range that Liu et al. [24] observed ($\approx 3$ and 6 h for sparging at $h = 1.1$ and 2.55, respectively) could be achieved by our model by assuming higher residual $O_2$ concentrations after sparging (resulting in a higher $F_{den}$). Fig. 10B isolates the OD of NDP$_+$ for the simulated treatments and shows them on a logarithmic scale so that their exponential growth, right from the onset of anoxic conditions, becomes apparent. The figure initially shows a quick recruitment of the cells from the NDP$-$ to the NDP$_+$ pool, followed by the exponential growth-phase of NDP$_+$.

This exercise serves to illustrate that the ‘diauxic lags’ observed [24–26] may simply be a result of low recruitment to denitriﬁcation in response to sudden removal of $O_2$. This is possibly a more plausible explanation than suggested by the authors and further elaborated by Hamilton et al. [35], claiming that there is a true lag caused by extremely slow production of denitriﬁcation enzymes due to energy limitation. Our explanation of the apparent diauxic lag is corroborated by a chemostat culturing experiment conducted by Bauman et al. [36]: A steady state carbon (acetate) limited continuous culture with Pa. denitriﬁcans was made anaerobic and monitored for denitriﬁcation gene transcription, N-gas production, and acetate concentrations. A transient (3–10 h) peak of acetate accumulation after $O_2$ depletion suggested an apparent diauxic lag in the metabolic activity, but denitriﬁcation started immediately and increased gradually throughout the entire ‘lag’ period. They further observed that the number of denitriﬁcation gene transcripts peaked sharply during the first 1–2 hours. These observations are in good agreement with our model.

The aforementioned observation of Liu et al. [24] that the length of the apparent lags increased with the aeration period (or the cell density at the time of sparging) is also in agreement with our model demonstrating that the time available for the cells to switch to denitriﬁcation is inversely related to the cell density at the time of $O_2$ depletion.

**Model-based hypothesis: Initial $O_2$ determines the timespan to denitriﬁfy all NO$_3^-$ to N$_2$ in a batch.**

Two sensitivity analyses were run to investigate the system’s response to initial $O_2$ in the headspace, $O_2HS$(t$_0$): one corresponding
to a range of initial [O\textsubscript{2}] in the liquid-phase ([O\textsubscript{2}]\textsubscript{LP}(t\textsubscript{0})) below [O\textsubscript{2}]\textsubscript{trigger} (see Eqs. 7–8) and the other for a range much higher than [O\textsubscript{2}]\textsubscript{trigger}. All other model parameters and initial values remained as listed in Tables 2 and 3, respectively. The exercise helps illustrate the relative importance of aerobic growth versus the recruitment (F\textsubscript{den}) in determining the time taken to deplete the NO\textsubscript{2} pool.

**Sensitivity analysis (1).** Sensitivity analysis (1) was run with three [O\textsubscript{2}]\textsubscript{LP}(t\textsubscript{0}) within a very low range, starting from a concentration marginally below [O\textsubscript{2}]\textsubscript{trigger}:

1. \(O_{2LS}(t_0) = 2.02 \times 10^{-5} \text{ mol vial}^{-1} \) \([O\textsubscript{2}]_{\text{LP}} = 9.75 \mu\text{M}\),
2. \(O_{2HS}(t_0) = 1.01 \times 10^{-5} \text{ mol vial}^{-1} \) \([O\textsubscript{2}]_{\text{LP}} = 4.88 \mu\text{M}\),
3. \(O_{2HS}(t_0) = 5.04 \times 10^{-6} \text{ mol vial}^{-1} \) \([O\textsubscript{2}]_{\text{LP}} = 2.44 \mu\text{M}\).

This is rather a simple case demonstrating that increasing \([O\textsubscript{2}]_{\text{LP}}(t\textsubscript{0})\) within this low range (Fig. 11A) will result in increasing rates of denitrification (Fig. 11D) by increasing the number of aerobically grown cells \((N_{D_{a}}, \text{Fig. 11B})\) and, thus, the rate of recruitment \((R_{rec}, \text{Fig. 11C})\).

**Sensitivity analysis (2).** Sensitivity analysis (2) was run with three initial \([O\textsubscript{2}]\) concentrations much higher than \([O\textsubscript{2}]\textsubscript{trigger}:

1. \(O_{2HS}(t_0) = 2 \times 10^{-4} \text{ mol vial}^{-1} \) \([O\textsubscript{2}]_{\text{LP}} = 93 \mu\text{M}\),
2. \(O_{2HS}(t_0) = 1.19 \times 10^{-4} \text{ mol vial}^{-1} \) \([O\textsubscript{2}]_{\text{LP}} = 55 \mu\text{M}\),
3. \(O_{2HS}(t_0) = 3.84 \times 10^{-5} \text{ mol vial}^{-1} \) \([O\textsubscript{2}]_{\text{LP}} = 18 \mu\text{M}\).

In this case, the cumulated N\textsubscript{2} reached stable plateaus at nearly the same time for all the runs (Fig. 12E), despite that the time taken to deplete O\textsubscript{2} below [O\textsubscript{2}]\textsubscript{trigger} decreased with increasing...

---

*Figure 11. Sensitivity analysis (1): Varying initial O\textsubscript{2} in the headspace ([O\textsubscript{2}]\textsubscript{HS}(t\textsubscript{0})) within a low range. The figure shows the impact of varying \([O\textsubscript{2}]_{\text{HS}}(t\textsubscript{0})\) within a low range on: A. O\textsubscript{2} concentration in the liquid-phase ([O\textsubscript{2}]\textsubscript{LP}). B. The number of aerobically growing cells \((N_{D_{a}})\), which do not possess denitrification enzymes. C. The rate of recruitment of \(N_{D_{a}}\) to denitrification \((R_{rec})\), and D. N\textsubscript{2} accumulation. Marked in Panel A, \([O\textsubscript{2}]_{\text{LP}}\) is the \([O\textsubscript{2}]_{\text{LP}}\) below which \(R_{rec}\) triggers, and \([O\textsubscript{2}]_{\text{min}}\) is the \([O\textsubscript{2}]_{\text{LP}}\) below which \(R_{rec}\) terminates. In Panel C, the spikes of recruitment (following the initial recruitment) are due to spikes of \(O_{2}\) by sampling, causing \([O\textsubscript{2}]_{\text{LP}}\) to transiently exceed \([O\textsubscript{2}]_{\text{min}}\). The model predicts that reducing \([O\textsubscript{2}]_{\text{LP}}(t\textsubscript{0})\) within a low range (Panel A) will lower the number of aerobically grown cells (Panel B) and, thereby, the recruitment rate (Panel C), thus increasing the time taken to deplete NO\textsubscript{2} (slower N\textsubscript{2} accumulation, Panel D).*

doi:10.1371/journal.pcbi.1003933.g011
Figure 12. Sensitivity analysis (2): Varying initial $O_2$ in the headspace ($O_{2\,HS}(t_0)$) within a high range. The figure shows the impact of varying $O_{2\,HS}(t_0)$ within a range much higher than $O_2^\text{trigger}$ (the $O_2$ below which recruitment of the cells to denitrification is assumed to trigger) on:

A. $O_2$ concentration in the liquid-phase ($[O_2]^\text{LP}$), B. The number of aerobically growing cells ($N_{D^-}$), which do not possess denitrification enzymes, C. The rate of recruitment of $N_{D^-}$ to denitrification ($R_{rec}$), D. The number of cells as a result of the recruitment alone ($N_{D^-rec}(t)$), i.e., the denitrifying cells ($N_{D^-}$) but without aerobic and NO$_x$-based growth, and E. Cumulated $N_2$. The cumulated $N_2$ reached stable plateaus at nearly the same time for all the runs (Panel E), despite the fact that the time taken to deplete $O_2$ below $O_2^\text{trigger}$ decreased with increasing $[O_2]^\text{LP}(t_0)$ (Panel A). Thus, once denitrification was initiated, the rates increased with increasing initial $[O_2]^\text{LP}$ due to an increasing population of oxygen-raised cells (Panels B–D). The fraction of the cells recruited to denitrification ($F_{\text{rec}}$) declined with increasing initial $O_2$ concentration (not shown), but this was not sufficient to compensate for the increasing number of oxygen-raised cells.

doi:10.1371/journal.pcbi.1003933.g012
[O$_2$] LP(t) (Fig. 12A), reducing the time available to the cells for switching to denitrification (See Fig. 5). Thus, once denitrification was initiated, the rates increased with increasing [O$_2$] LP(t) due to an increasing population of oxygen-grown cells (Fig. 12B–D). F$_{den}$ (Eq. 9) declined with increasing [O$_2$] LP(t) (F$_{den}$ = 0.058, 0.041 and 0.028 for runs 3, 2 and 1, respectively), but this was not sufficient to compensate for the increasing number of oxygen-raised cells.

If the model is run without any initial O$_2$, there would be no recruitment and, hence, no denitrification. Verification of this in batch cultures is difficult because traces of O$_2$ remain after He- washout of the reactors. However, we (Bergaust et al., unpublished data) have been able to demonstrate that the aerobically grown _Pa. denitrificans_ cells are indeed entrapped in anaoxia if transferred to anaerobic conditions as instantaneously as in the experiments conducted by Højberg et al. [15].

**Conclusion**

The prevailing wisdom in denitrification research is that, under impending anoxic conditions, all cells in a batch culture of denitrifying bacteria will switch to denitrification. However, recent experiments with batch cultures of _Pa. denitrificans_ have provided evidence that, in response to O$_2$ depletion, only a small fraction (F$_{den}$) of the entire population is able to switch to denitrification [4,8,9]. The evidence is based on indirect analyses of c-flow rates to O$_2$ and NO$_x$ during the transition of the cells from aerobic to anaerobic respiration. To provide a direct and refined estimation of F$_{den}$, we constructed a dynamic model and directly simulated kinetics of recruitment of the cells to denitrification. We first formulated a hypothesis as to the underlying regulatory mechanism of cell differentiation under approaching anoxia. Briefly, it is that the low F$_{den}$ is due to a low probability of initiating transcription of the nirS genes, but once initiated, the transcription is greatly enhanced through autocatalytic positive feedback by NO, resulting in the recruitment of the transcribing cell to denitrification. Then, as we implemented this hypothesis in the model, the simulation results showed that the specific-probability (F$_{den}$) of 0.0052 (h$^{-1}$) for a cell to switch to denitrification is sufficient to robustly simulate the measured denitrification gas kinetics. The model estimated the resultant F$_{den}$ between 3.8–16.1% only (average = 0.2%). The phenomenon may be considered as a ‘bet-hedging’ regulation strategy [12]: the fraction switching to denitrification benefits if the anoxic spell is long and NO$_x$ remains available, whereas the non-switching fraction benefits, by saving energy required for the protein synthesis, if the anoxic spell is short. The strategy has important implications for the interpretation of numerous experiments on _Pa. denitrificans_ and other denitrifying organisms, as this study has illustrated by presenting a more plausible explanation of the apparent diauxic lag [24] on the basis of the low F$_{den}$.
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Abstract

Homeostatic control of NO at nanomolar concentrations appears common among denitrifying bacteria, often ascribed to synchronised expression of nitrite- and nitric oxide reductase (Nir and Nor). But we questioned whether this is a sufficient explanation: using the reported substrate affinities for cNor, our dynamic model of the enzyme activities in batch cultures of *Paracoccus denitrificans* predicted 1–3 orders of magnitude too high NO concentrations. We rejected a hypothesis that the homeostatic control is due to a negative feedback by NO on the activity of NirS because the inclusion of such feedback resulted in too slow anaerobic growth and N₂ production.

We proceeded by determining the kinetic parameters for cNor in vivo by a carefully designed experiment, allowing the estimation of NO concentration at the cell surface while anoxic cultures in a NO₃⁻/NO₂⁻-free medium depleted low headspace-doses of NO. With the new parameters for cNor (v_maxNO = 3.56 fmol NO cell⁻¹ h⁻¹, K₁NO < 1 nM, K₂NO = 34 nM), the model predicted NO concentrations close to that measured. Such determinations of enzyme kinetic parameters in vivo appears essential to understand denitrification phenotypes and for adequate modelling of the NO kinetics in soils and aquatic environments.
Introduction

Nitric oxide (NO) is a toxic intermediate product of denitrification and is also produced by organisms reducing nitrite ($\text{NO}_2^-$) to ammonium (Mania et al., 2014) and by nitric oxide synthase (NOS) in both eukaryotic and prokaryotic organisms (Bowman et al., 2011). In eukaryotic organisms, NO plays vital roles as a signalling molecule and a pathogen-killing agent; many prokaryotes appear to protect themselves against NO by enzymes which either oxidise it to $\text{NO}_2^-$ or reduce it to $\text{N}_2\text{O}$ (Poole and Hughes, 2000). In soils, NO is produced and consumed by a plethora of microorganisms, and soils emit significant amounts of NO (Medinets et al., 2014), which contribute to the formation of tropospheric ozone (Ludwig et al., 2001; Schlesinger and Bernhardt, 2013). Denitrifying bacteria and archaea are thought to protect themselves from their own NO production by delicately balancing the activity of the two enzymes Nir and Nor, responsible for the production and reduction of NO, respectively (van Spanning et al., 2007). However, their capacity to achieve this varies grossly between strains: *Agrobacterium tumefaciens* is shown to accumulate detrimentally high ($\mu\text{M}$) concentrations of NO during rapid transition from oxic to anoxic conditions (Bergaust et al., 2008). Similar phenomena have been observed in a number of strains within the genus *Bradyrhizobium* (K. W. Jillo et al., unpublished). In contrast, *Paracoccus denitrificans* – a model organism used for decades in research on the biochemistry of denitrification – demonstrates a robust homeostatic control of NO at 10–30 $n\text{M}$ ($[\text{NO}]_{ss}$) under a variety of experimental conditions (Bergaust et al., 2010). Similar $[\text{NO}]_{ss}$ were observed for eight strains within the genus *Thauera* (Liu et al., 2013). Thus, some denitrifiers have evolved the ability to robustly restrict NO to extremely low concentrations, while others are clearly at risk of killing themselves by NO when grown in pure cultures.

Homeostatic control of NO would require a coordinated expression of genes encoding nitrite- and nitric oxide reductase, *nir* and *nor*, respectively (van Spanning et al., 2007). Current understanding of the regulatory network of denitrification in *Pa. denitrificans* is summarised in Fig. 1, showing that there is indeed a coordination of *nirS* and *nor* transcription via a common regulator, NNR. But we were not convinced that such transcriptional coordination alone could explain the observed homeostasis of NO at $n\text{M}$ levels. That is primarily because the reported apparent half-saturation constants ($K_m$) for $c\text{Nor}$ are in the $\mu\text{M}$ range, which we found intuitively incompatible with the
low \([\text{NO}]_{ss}\) observed (a typical result for \textit{Pa. denitrificans} is shown in Fig. 2C). This led us to consider a hypothesis that the homeostasis could be due to a negative feedback of NO on the activity of NirS (Kuňák et al., 2004), as indicated by the dashed red arrow in Fig. 1. To explore this option and enhance our overall understanding of the homeostatic control, we constructed a model and simulated the NO kinetics observed in batch cultures of \textit{Pa. denitrificans}:

\[ 
\text{Figure 1. Regulatory network for the stepwise reduction of NO}^\text{2} \text{ to N}_2 \text{ in } \textit{Pa. denitrificans}. \] 

The reduction is driven by three enzymes: NirS (cytochrome \textit{cd} \_1 nitrite reductase), \textit{c}Nor (cytochrome \textit{c} dependent nitric oxide reductase), and NosZ (typical \textit{Z}-type nitrous oxide reductase), encoded by \textit{nirS}, \textit{norBC}, and \textit{nosZ}, respectively.

Transcription of \textit{nirS} and \textit{nor} is orchestrated by an FNR-type NO-sensor, NNR, which is apparently inhibited by O\textsubscript{2} (Spiro, 2007, 2012). Under micro-oxic or anoxic conditions, NO binds to and activates NNR, triggering the product-induced transcription of \textit{nirS}. Thus, once a cell starts producing traces of NO, \textit{nirS} transcription becomes autocatalytic via NNR (van Spanning et al., 2007; Bouchal et al., 2010). As for \textit{c}Nor and NosZ, \textit{nor} transcription is substrate (NO) induced via NNR, while \textit{nosZ} is equally and independently induced by both NNR and the self-regulatory FnrP protein (Bergaust et al., 2012). The dashed red arrow (low left) closes the loop of our hypothetical negative feedback by NO on the activity of NirS.
The model here is an elaboration of our previous model (Hassan et al., 2014), used to simulate O\textsubscript{2} consumption and N\textsubscript{2} production in NO\textsuperscript{2-}-supplemented batch culture experiments with \textit{Pa. denitrificans}. The model explicitly simulated aerobic and anaerobic growth, the kinetics of O\textsubscript{2} consumption and denitrification (using the Michaelis-Menten kinetics), and the transport of gases between the headspace and the liquid. The activities of \(c\)Nor and NosZ, however, were not explicitly simulated, thus lumping the reduction of NO\textsuperscript{2-} directly to N\textsubscript{2} without taking into account [NO] and [N\textsubscript{2}O]. We could afford this simplification because the main purpose was to assess denitrification kinetics (N\textsubscript{2} production) as a function of stochastic transition to denitrification, where N\textsubscript{2} production is essentially orchestrated by NirS activity (the rate limiting-step in the pathway). The simulations corroborated the hypothesis that the measured rates of N\textsubscript{2} production could be explained by a low probabilistic initiation of \textit{nirS} transcription \((= 0.005 \text{ h}^{-1})\), which then becomes autocatalytic via NO-NNR (Fig. 1). This implies that in such batch cultivations, only a small fraction of the cells (with activated \textit{nirS} transcription) sustains respiratory metabolism and growth once O\textsubscript{2} is depleted.

The present model explicitly simulates NO production and consumption, using enzyme kinetic parameters taken from the literature, with and without a negative feedback by NO on NirS activity. Unless assuming unrealistically high \(v_{\text{max}}\) values for \(c\)Nor or much lower \(K_{m\text{NO}}\) than reported in the literature, the model predicted [NO\textsubscript{ss}] (the steady state [NO] in the liquid) much higher than that measured. Negative feedback by NO on NirS activity could effectively bring the predicted NO concentrations down, but this resulted in a much too slow denitrification rate (N\textsubscript{2} production). We suspected that the reason for the failure of the model could be that the true substrate affinity of \(c\)Nor is much higher than commonly reported in the literature, where parameters are generally based on \textit{in vitro} measurements, employing detergent solubilised enzyme. We investigated this in detail by activity measurements \textit{in vivo}, using chemiluminescence-based detection of NO in the headspace of anoxic batch cultures. The measurements were conducted with very low cell density to minimise headspace–liquid diffusion limitations, and the molecular diffusion from the bulk liquid to the cell surface was taken into account when calculating the NO concentration at the cell surface. With the new kinetic parameters for \(c\)Nor, the model is able to simulate [NO\textsubscript{ss}] in reasonable agreement with the measurements. Thus, the observed NO homeostasis can be understood as a result of simple enzyme kinetics, without any feedback inhibition.
Results and Discussion

*In vitro* affinity constants estimated for cNor fail to explain the measured homeostatic control of NO.

We first simulated the model without feedback inhibition of NirS by NO. For the NO kinetics, critical parameters are the maximum velocities of NO reduction ($v_{maxNO}$ and $v_{maxN0}$) and the two dissociation constants for cNor ($K_{1NO}$ and $K_{2NO}$), determining the effective affinity for NO. Since cNor requires two molecules of NO to make one molecule of N$_2$O, the default kinetics is not a regular Michaelis-Menten equation, but a ‘dual substrate kinetics’ model with two dissociation constants $K_{1NO}$ and $K_{2NO}$ (see Eq. 3). $v_{maxNO}$ was estimated to be 1.83 fmol cell$^{-1}$ h$^{-1}$, deduced from empirically obtained parameters [growth rate = 0.106 h$^{-1}$ and yield = 5.79×10$^{13}$ cells mol$^{-1}$ N$_2$O$^-$ (Bergaust et al., 2010)]. For $v_{maxNO}$, however, no estimates were available. Regarding the literature values for the affinity of cNor in *Pa. denitrificans*, Girsch and de Vries (1997) reported $K_{1NO}$ and $K_{2NO}$ = 6 and 0.55 $\mu$M, respectively. The other available papers with *in vitro* determinations of the affinity have fitted a simple Michaelis-Menten function to their data, reporting $K_{mNO}$ values from 0.25–27 $\mu$M: $K_{mNO} < 17 \mu$M (Hoglen and Hollocher, 1989), < 10 (Carr and Ferguson, 1990), < 1 (Dermastia et al., 1991), = 0.25 (Fujiwara and Fukumori, 1996), and = 27 $\mu$M (Thorndycroft et al., 2007). To evaluate the model performance using the reported cNor-affinities, we tested the model’s predicted steady state NO concentrations ([NO]$_{ss}$) for a range of $v_{maxNO}$ values (as multiples of $v_{maxNO}^-$).

When we adopted Girsh and de Vries (1997) parameters ($K_{1NO}$ = 6 and $K_{2NO}$ 0.55 $\mu$M), the model predicted [NO]$_{ss}$ = 2 $\mu$M for $v_{maxNO} = 2 \times v_{maxNO}^- (= 3.7$ fmol NO cell$^{-1}$ h$^{-1}$). This is two orders of magnitude higher than the target value (measured [NO]$_{ss}$ = 10–30 nM). We had to increase $v_{maxNO}$ to 60 $\times$ $v_{maxNO}^-$ for [NO]$_{ss}$ to reach 25 nM. Such high $v_{maxNO}$ values seem unrealistic: $v_{maxNO} = 60 \times 1.83$ fmol cell$^{-1}$ h$^{-1}$ is equivalent to 18.5×10$^{6}$ NO molecules cell$^{-1}$ s$^{-1}$, i.e., 9.3×10$^{6}$ N$_2$O molecules cell$^{-1}$ s$^{-1}$. If we consider that each cell has 3200–4800 cNor molecules (see Supporting Information), this implies a turnover number ($k_{cat}$) = 1940–2900 s$^{-1}$ (i.e., mol N$_2$O mol$^{-1}$ cNor s$^{-1}$). Such high $k_{cat}$ values are very unusual (Bar-Even et al., 2011); the values are 48–
73 times higher than the $k_{cat} \approx 40 \text{ s}^{-1}$ estimated for Pa. denitrificans cNor, produced in E. coli (Thorndycroft et al., 2007) and 24–35 times higher than the $k_{cat} \approx 82 \text{ s}^{-1}$ determined by Al-Attar and de Vries (2015).

To test the other affinity estimates, we set $K_{1NO} = 0$, which turns Eq. 3 into a simple Michaelis-Menten function with $K_{mNO} = K_{2NO}$. For $K_{mNO} = 1 \mu M$ (i.e., $K_{1NO} = 0$ and $K_{2NO} = 1$), the model predicted $[\text{NO}]_{ss} \approx 1 \mu M$ for $v_{\max\text{NO}} = 2 \times v_{\max\text{NO}_2}$, as illustrated in Fig. 2. We had to increase $v_{\max\text{NO}}$ to $40 \times v_{\max\text{NO}_2}$ for $[\text{NO}]_{ss}$ to reach 25 nM. If we adopt the lowest $K_{mNO}$ value reported, i.e., 0.25 $\mu M$ (Fujiwara and Fukumori, 1996), $[\text{NO}]_{ss}$ reaches 250 nM for $v_{\max\text{NO}} = 2 \times v_{\max\text{NO}_2}$; for $[\text{NO}]_{ss}$ to reach 25 nM, we had to increase $v_{\max\text{NO}}$ to $11 \times v_{\max\text{NO}_2}$.

![Figure 2. Comparison of measured and simulated data.](image)

**Figure 2. Comparison of measured and simulated data.** Treatment with initially 7% O$_2$ in headspace and 2 mM NO$_2$ (Bergaust et al., 2010) is shown as a representative for all. **A.** A good-fit between the measured and simulated O$_2$ depletion in the headspace ([O$_2$]$_g$) and cumulated N$_2$-N vial$^{-1}$. **B.** Measured data vs. simulation of transient NO accumulation in the aqueous phase ([NO]$_{aq}$) is shown. Assuming $K_{mNO} = 1 \mu M$ and $v_{\max\text{NO}} = 2 \times v_{\max\text{NO}_2}$, the simulated [NO]$_{aq}$ at steady state ([NO]$_{ss}$) $\approx$ 60 times higher than that measured. [At each sampling time, the simulated O$_2$$_g$ and [NO]$_{aq}$ is visibly reduced because of sampling loss.] **C** (inserted panel). Measured [NO]$_{aq}$ appropriately scaled to illustrate the measured [NO]$_{ss}$.
Assuming a simple Michaelis-Menten function \( (K_{\text{1NO}} = 0 \text{ and } K_{\text{2NO}} = K_{\text{mNO}}) \), \([\text{NO}]_{\text{ss}}\) can also be calculated as 
\[ [\text{NO}]_{\text{ss}} = \frac{v_{\text{maxNO}} \times K_{\text{mNO}}}{v_{\text{maxNO}} - v_{\text{maxNO2}}} \]
Thus, dynamic modelling is not necessary to calculate 
\([\text{NO}]_{\text{ss}}\) as a function of the kinetics of NO reduction, but consideration of other variables requires a dynamic model (see below).

**Negative feedback of NO on NirS activity?**

By introducing a non-competitive inhibition of NirS by NO (Eq. 5), we easily forced the model to predict \([\text{NO}]_{\text{ss}}\) to the measured range (15–30 nM) with any of the reported affinities for cNor, using dissociation constants \((K_{\text{INO}})\) within the range 15–50 nM. If a time-lag is assumed in such inhibition, it is also possible to reproduce the NO oscillations (frequency = 3–10 h\(^{-1}\)) observed by Kuňák et al. (2004) in anoxic cultures of *Pa. denitrificans* (results not reported). However, the inclusion of inhibition appears spurious because its effect is equivalent to curtailing \(v_{\text{maxNO2}}\), resulting in too slow growth rates and N\(_2\) production compared to measurements. This poor overall fit of the model could be patched by increasing \(v_{\text{maxNO2}}\) to compensate for the inhibition, but that would bring us back to square one regarding \([\text{NO}]_{\text{ss}}\).

**Experimental determination of enzyme kinetics *in vivo.***

The model exercises so far suggested that we needed experimental data on NO reduction kinetics \((v_{\text{maxNO}}, K_{\text{1NO}} \text{ and } K_{\text{2NO}})\) *in vivo.* To obtain that, we monitored the depletion of NO injected into the headspace of vials with low cell density in a medium without nitrogen oxyanions. The low cell density was necessary to secure reasonably accurate estimation of NO in the bulk liquid ([NO]_aq). Further, the measured rates of NO reduction per cell \((v_{\text{NO}})\) were used to estimate the NO concentration at the cell surface.

The approach was first to raise cultures of *Pa. denitrificans* by anaerobic growth in Sistrom’s (1960) medium, with 2 mM NO\(_2^-\) in three consecutive batches (the first used to inoculate the second and so on). The consecutive batches were necessary to secure a culture with 100% denitrifying cells. The last batch was monitored for growth (OD\(_{660}\)) and gas kinetics, and the results were used
to estimate $\nu_{NO_2}$ (cell-specific rates of NO\textsubscript{2} reduction) throughout the incubation. [NO\textsubscript{aq}] in these cultures reached stable levels after 1–2 h, average $\approx 33 \text{ nM}$, until all NO\textsubscript{2} was recovered as N\textsubscript{2} after 10 h. The calculated realised $\nu_{maxNO_2}$ fluctuated between 1.5 and 2 fmol cell\textsuperscript{-1} h\textsuperscript{-1} until NO\textsubscript{2} depletion, average $= 1.78$ fmol cell\textsuperscript{-1} h\textsuperscript{-1} (Supporting Information, Fig. S1). The value corroborates the realised $\nu_{maxNO_2} = 1.83$ fmol cell\textsuperscript{-1} h\textsuperscript{-1} (Bergaust et al., 2010) used for simulations.

These cultures were then used to inoculate new vials with He-atmosphere and N-oxyanion free medium (initial cell density was $1.8\times10^6$ cell mL\textsuperscript{-1}). The cultures were first allowed to deplete residual O\textsubscript{2} (124–272 ppmv in the headspace = 0.37–0.8 μmol O\textsubscript{2} vial\textsuperscript{-1}) during a 7 h preincubation, resulting in some aerobic growth and final cell densities reaching 2.8–4×10\textsuperscript{6} cells mL\textsuperscript{-1}. NO was then injected into the headspace to monitor its depletion. The results for a single vial are presented in Fig. 3, showing the depletion of consecutive headspace doses (ppmv NO\textsubscript{g}, right axis) and the aqueous concentration ([NO\textsubscript{aq}, left axis, estimated by Eq. 10). The ‘equilibrium concentration’ shown, [NO\textsubscript{aq}]\textsubscript{eq} = P_{NO} \times k_{H(NO)}$ (left axis), is what [NO\textsubscript{aq}] would have been if in equilibrium with the measured concentration in the headspace. The ratio $\frac{[NO\textsubscript{aq}]}{[NO\textsubscript{aq}]_{eq}}$ was 0.27–0.85 throughout the entire incubation, average $= 0.45 \pm 0.16$ (stdev). The experiment was done in three replicate vials, where the other two replicates were very similar with respect to $\frac{[NO\textsubscript{aq}]}{[NO\textsubscript{aq}]_{eq}}$ (average = 0.34 and 0.45, respectively). This is important because it implies that the estimated [NO\textsubscript{aq}] is sufficiently accurate to use for further analyses, despite a somewhat uncertain transport coefficient for NO transport between the headspace and liquid (see Experimental Procedures).

The concentrations of N\textsubscript{2}O remained low (0–12 ppmv) throughout the entire incubation, with transient peaks after each injection, amounting to 2–4% of the injected NO-N, and the cumulative N\textsubscript{2} production closely matched the cumulative NO reduction (Fig. S2).

Preliminary experiments were run with much higher final doses than shown in Fig. 3. These experiments showed that micromolar [NO\textsubscript{aq}] resulted in permanent damage to the cells (Supporting Information, Fig. S3). In the final experiment (Fig. 3), the final density was measured ($OD_{660;} = 1.25\times10^9 OD^{-1} mL^{-1}$) to check the growth in relation to the cumulated NO- and O\textsubscript{2}-
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Reduction (each sampling caused an input of 6 nmol O₂). Based on the cumulated NO (3 µmol) and O₂ (0.48 µmol) reduction, the OD should increase from the initial 0.0022 to 0.0052, according to the previously measured yield (3.75×10¹³ cells mol⁻¹ e to O₂ and 1.9×10¹³ cells mol⁻¹ e to NOₓ) (Bergaust et al., 2010). In comparison, the measured final OD was 0.006, which is only 15% higher than that predicted. For the two other vials, the measured final OD was 36 and 7% higher than that predicted by cumulated O₂- and NO-reduction. This shows that the calculation of the cell density based on the cumulative NO and O₂-reduction is fairly accurate.

![Figure 3. Estimation of aqueous NO concentration ([NO]ₐq) based on measurements in the gas-phase (NO₉).](image)

**Figure 3. Estimation of aqueous NO concentration ([NO]ₐq) based on measurements in the gas-phase (NO₉).** [NO]ₐq is the estimated NO concentration for each time increment between two samplings, and [NO]ₐqₑq = P_NO × k_H(NO) is the [NO]ₐq if in equilibrium with the average partial pressure (P_NO, atm) for the time increment. (k_H(NO) is the solubility of NO, mol L⁻¹ atm⁻¹). The result is for a single vial (n = 3), which received six doses of NO.

The cell density throughout the incubation of each vial was estimated by the cumulative reduction of NO to N₂. These numbers were used to calculate the cell specific rate of NO reduction, ν_NO (fmol NO cell⁻¹ h⁻¹), for each time increment. The estimates were variable, which is hardly surprising, since they are based on short time intervals between two samplings (10 min).
Nevertheless, $v_{\text{NO}}$ showed a strong relationship with the NO concentration and a satisfactory agreement between individual vials (Supporting Information, Fig. S3).

Based on the estimated $[\text{NO}]_{\text{aq}}$ and $v_{\text{NO}}$, we estimated the NO concentration at the cell surface ($[\text{NO}]_{\text{cell}}$), using the function of molecular diffusion towards a sphere with radius $0.4 \mu m$ (see Eq. 17). The ratio between estimated cell surface- and bulk concentration $\frac{[\text{NO}]_{\text{cell}}}{[\text{NO}]_{\text{aq}}}$ for single time increments varied grossly due to experimental noise, especially for the low concentration range. But for $[\text{NO}]_{\text{aq}} > 20 \text{ nM}$, there was a general agreement between the empirical data and the theoretical model (Supporting Information, Fig. S4): $\frac{[\text{NO}]_{\text{cell}}}{[\text{NO}]_{\text{aq}}} \approx 0.5$ for $[\text{NO}]_{\text{aq}} = 100 \text{ nM}$ and increases towards 1 with increasing $[\text{NO}]_{\text{aq}}$. The theoretical $\frac{[\text{NO}]_{\text{cell}}}{[\text{NO}]_{\text{aq}}} \approx 0.25$ for $[\text{NO}]_{\text{aq}} < 20 \text{ nM}$.

Although we used lower NO concentrations in the final experiment than in the preliminary ones, the highest final dose ($\approx 881 \text{ ppmv}$) apparently resulted in some inhibition (Supporting Information, Fig. S3B), and the estimated rates for $[\text{NO}]_{\text{aq}} > 300 \text{ nM}$ were more variable than at lower concentrations (Supporting Information, Fig. S5). We, therefore, decided to use only the data for $[\text{NO}]_{\text{aq}} < 300 \text{ nM}$ to estimate the kinetic parameters.

The data for $v_{\text{NO}}$, which was taken as an estimate of the flux of NO towards the cell ($J, \text{ mol s}^{-1}$), and $[\text{NO}]_{\text{cell}}$ were used to estimate the parameters $v_{\text{maxNO}}, K_{1\text{NO}}, K_{2\text{NO}},$ and $K_{\text{INO}}$ (Eq. 18) by nonlinear least-squares regression. The estimated $K_{\text{INO}}$ reached extremely high values ($1 \text{ M}$), probably reflecting that the dataset does not include concentrations at which inhibition was significant. Further, $K_{1\text{NO}}$ approached zero, $K_{2\text{NO}} = 49 \text{ nM}$, and $v_{\text{maxNO}} = 3.9 \text{ fmol cell}^{-1} \text{ h}^{-1}$. The model performed equally well by forcing $K_{1\text{NO}}$ to $1 \text{ nM}$, indicating that $K_{\text{INO}} \ll K_{2\text{NO}}$ and, thus, a simple Michaelis-Menten model would adequately describe the data.

Due to the uncertainties in the estimates of $[\text{NO}]_{\text{cell}}$, we suspected a bias in the parameter estimates with this approach (for 23% of the time increment, the estimated $[\text{NO}]_{\text{cell}}$ was negative, Fig. 4A). Thus, we tried an alternative approach, using a simple Michaelis-Menten function (Eq. 19) combined with the function for molecular diffusion towards the cell surface (Eq. 16) to find flux.
(J, $mol \ NO \ s^{-1}$) as an explicit function of the aqueous concentration ($[NO]_{aq}$, Eq. 20). By fitting this function to the empirical data ($v_{NO}$ and $[NO]_{aq}$), we estimated $v_{maxNO} = 3.56 \pm 0.2 \ fmol \ cell^{-1} h^{-1}$ and $K_{mNO} = 34 \pm 4 \ nM$ using Levenberg Marquardt algorithm (Fig. 4B and 4C).

**Figure 4. Rates of NO reduction depending on concentrations, data vs. model with $v_{maxNO} = 3.56 \ fmol \ cell^{-1} h^{-1}$ and $K_{mNO} = 34 \ nM$.**

A. The empirically determined cell-specific rate of NO reduction ($v_{NO}, fmol \ cell^{-1} h^{-1}$) plotted against the measured NO concentration at the cell surface ($[NO]_{cell}$) for single time increments, together with model predictions. B. The empirical $v_{NO}$ plotted against the measured bulk aqueous concentration ($[NO]_{aq}$), together with model predictions using Eq. 20. C (inserted panel). $v_{NO}$ versus $[NO]_{aq}$ for the low concentration range (0–30 nM). Due to the uncertainties in the estimates of $[NO]_{cell}$, we suspected a bias in the $v_{maxNO}$ and $K_{mNO}$ estimates with the approach shown in A: for 23% of the time increment, the estimated $[NO]_{cell}$ is negative. Thus, an alternative approach was adopted (B and C), using a simple Michaelis-Menten function combined with the function for NO diffusion towards the cell surface to find flux (J, $mol \ NO \ s^{-1}$) as an explicit function of the aqueous concentration ($[NO]_{aq}$, Eq. 20). By fitting this function to the empirical data ($v_{NO}$ and $[NO]_{aq}$), $v_{maxNO} = 3.56 \pm 0.2 \ fmol \ cell^{-1} h^{-1}$ and $K_{mNO} = 34 \pm 4 \ nM$ was estimated using Levenberg Marquardt algorithm.

The $v_{maxNO}$ estimated is probably not reflecting the upper limit of cNor, since the cultures receiving $[NO]_{aq} > 1 \ \mu M$ did indeed show higher $v_{NO}$ (> 5 fmol cell$^{-1}$ h$^{-1}$). But the $v_{NO}$ in response to high $[NO]_{aq}$ was highly variable; growth was inhibited, and the cells exposed to micromolar...
[NO]_{aq} were apparently permanently offended, as judged by their poor cNor-performance (compared to the unoffended cells) once [NO]_{aq} reached below 300 nM (Supporting Information, Fig. S3). It appears that the upper limit for $v_{NO}$ is rather determined by the delivery of electrons than by the enzyme (cNor) itself: a reduction rate of 3.56 fmol NO cell$^{-1}$ h$^{-1}$ is equivalent to 7.1 fmol electrons cell$^{-1}$ h$^{-1}$ (2 electrons per NO reduced to N$_2$). In comparison, the electron flow to denitrification during unrestricted growth with NO$^-_2$ is 5.34 fmol electrons cell$^{-1}$ h$^{-1}$ (= 1.78 fmol NO$^-_2$ cell$^{-1}$ h$^{-1}$, 3 e$^-$ per NO$^-_2$), and for unrestricted aerobic growth it is 5.33 fmol electrons cell$^{-1}$ h$^{-1}$ (Bergaust et al., 2010).

A $v_{maxNO} = 3.56$ fmol cell$^{-1}$ h$^{-1}$ is equivalent to 0.6x10$^6$ NO-molecules cell$^{-1}$ s$^{-1}$ or 0.3x10$^6$ N$_2$O molecules cell$^{-1}$ s$^{-1}$. If we assume that each cell contains 3200–4800 cNor molecules (see Supporting Information), we arrive at $k_{cat}$ values ranging from 62 to 94 N$_2$O s$^{-1}$, which are higher than that determined for cNor expressed in E. coli $\approx$ 40 N$_2$O s$^{-1}$ (Thorndycroft et al., 2007), but encompass the recently measured turnover rates for purified cNor reconstituted in liposomes $\approx$ 82 N$_2$O s$^{-1}$ (Al-Attar and de Vries, 2015). Given that $K_{1NO} << K_{2NO}$ under steady state conditions, the reduced cNor contains a permanently bound molecule of NO. Only when the second NO molecule comes in ($K_{2NO} = 34$ nM), the enzyme turns over to produce N$_2$O.

Simulations of Bergaust et al’s. (2010) data with $v_{maxNO} = 3.56$ fmol cell$^{-1}$ h$^{-1}$ and $K_{mNO} = 34$ nM

With these parameters and $v_{maxNO^-_2} = 1.8$ fmol cell$^{-1}$ h$^{-1}$, the predicted steady state NO aqueous-concentration ([NO]$_{ss}$) for an actively denitrifying population is 35 nM, which closely matches the range measured in the batches used for the experimental determination of $v_{NO^-_2}$ ([NO]$_{ss}$ = 30–35 nM, see Supporting Information, Fig. S1). Since these cultures were raised by many generations of anaerobic growth, they were all actively denitrifying. In contrast, the major fraction of the cells in the batch cultures of Bergaust et al. (2010) was without NirS (Z$^-$, see Experimental Procedures). Our dynamic model assumes that these cells neither have cNor, but this is not known. It might be that a fraction of the Z$^-$ cells actually has some cNor activity. If so, this could explain the low [NO]$_{ss}$ in batch cultures switching from aerobic to anaerobic respiration, compared to that in
cultures with 100% denitrifying cells. Model simulations of the batch cultures by Bergaust et al. (2010) are shown in Fig. 5.

\begin{figure}
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\caption{Comparison of measured and simulated \( \text{O}_2 \) in headspace (\( \text{O}_2 \)), \( \text{N}_2 \)-N vial\(^{-1} \) (liquid + headspace), and NO concentration in aqua ([NO]\(_{\text{aq}}\)). The NO kinetics are simulated assuming...}
\end{figure}
no feedback inhibition of NirS by NO and with the empirically estimated parameters for cNOR: $v_{\text{maxNO}} = 3.56 \text{ fmol NO cell}^{-1} \text{ h}^{-1}$ (SD = 0.2) and $K_{m\text{NO}} = 34 \text{ nM}$ (SD = 4). The bold line is the result with the estimated values ($3.56 \text{ fmol NO cell}^{-1} \text{ h}^{-1}$ and 34 nM) and the two thin lines are the results for the two extreme combinations of parameter estimates ± SD (worst-case: $v_{\text{maxNO}} - \text{SD}$, $K_{m\text{NO}} + \text{SD}$; best-case: $v_{\text{maxNO}} + \text{SD}$, $K_{m\text{NO}} - \text{SD}$). Out of nine treatments simulated, three are shown here as representative for all.

There are speculations in the literature for *in vivo* $K_{m\text{NO}}$ to be around 10 nM (de Vries et al., 2007; Pan et al., 2013), but the present exercise shows that this is not needed to explain the performance of *Pa. denitrificans*.

**Experimental Procedures**

**A synopsis of the simulated experiment**

Bergaust et al. (2010) incubated *Paracoccus denitrificans* (DSM413) as stirred batches (20 °C) in 120 mL gastight vials with 50 mL Sistrom’s medium (Lueking et al., 1978). The medium was supplemented with 0.2, 1, or 2 mM KNO$_2$ and 34 mM succinate as the main carbon source. Prior to inoculation, the headspace atmosphere was replaced by He + O$_2$ (initial concentrations ≈ 0.1, 1 and 7 vol.% O$_2$). The vials were inoculated with 3×10$^8$ cells of *Pa. denitrificans* (raised by aerobic growth) and monitored for O$_2$, NO, N$_2$O and N$_2$ concentration in the headspace while the cultures depleted O$_2$ and switched to anoxic respiration, thus reducing the available NO$_2^-$ to N$_2$. Monitoring of the headspace was done with a robotised incubator, described by Molstad et al. (2007), which takes frequent gas samples by peristaltic pumping, returning equal amounts of He after each sampling so as to sustain 1 atm pressure. NO is analysed by chemiluminescence, while the other gases (O$_2$, N$_2$O and N$_2$) are analysed by gas chromatography. By taking sampling loss and marginal leakage of N$_2$ into account, the system allows an accurate determination of N$_2$ production. The monitoring of NO aqueous concentrations ([NO]$_{aq}$) in these cultures demonstrated, irrespective of
the treatments, that the steady state concentration $[\text{NO}]_{ss}$ is 10–30 $nM$ in the liquid during active denitrification.

**Model**

The model is an elaborated version of our previous model (Hassan et al., 2014), designed to analyse a depression in the $e^-$-flow during the transition from aerobic to anaerobic respiration in batch cultures of *Pa. denitrificans* (Bergaust et al., 2010). The depression was hypothesised to be due to a large fraction of the population not being able to produce denitrification enzymes. The model was designed to enable a direct comparison with measurements of headspace gas concentration as measured with a robotised incubation system (Bergaust et al., 2010), thus simulating not only the enzymatic reactions and growth but also the gas loss by sampling and the gas transport between the headspace and the liquid. The model successfully simulated the $O_2$ and $NO_2^-$ reduction ($N_2$ accumulation); the latter assuming a stochastic initiation of *nirS* transcription in each cell (Fig. 1), with a very low probability ($0.005 \ h^{-1}$). Thus, the model corroborated our hypothesis, predicting that only a small fraction of the population ($F_{den}$) was able to express *nirS* prior to $O_2$ depletion and that the major fraction ($1 - F_{den}$) was entrapped in anoxia, without enough energy to produce NirS (the medium contained only $NO_2^-$; hence, the energy from nitrate reduction was no option). The model did not explicitly simulate the intermediates NO and $N_2O$ kinetics, since *Pa. denitrificans* accumulated only miniscule amounts thereof under the experimental conditions used.

The present model is identical to the original regarding the simulation of gas transport between the liquid and headspace, gas losses by sampling, and the probabilistic initiation of *nirS* transcription. The new element is the explicit simulation of NO and $N_2O$ transformations (production and consumption). In response to anoxia, *nosZ* is assumed to be expressed in all cells, whereas the initiation of *nirS*- and *nor*-transcription is stochastic (and synchronised), as in the previous model. The explicit simulation of $N_2O$ kinetics allowed us to include a new feature: after $O_2$ depletion, the cells without NirS could still sustain a minimum of respiration by reducing the miniscule amounts of $N_2O$ produced by the cells with NirS (and $cNor$); hence, they may have indeed had the energy required to produce denitrification enzymes (NirS and $cNor$) despite the complete exhaustion of $O_2$. The model is visualised in Fig 6.
Figure 6. Model overview. The model assumes two sub-populations $Z^-$ (white box) and $Z^{Ni}$ (black box), differentiated according to their enzymes. $Z^-$ contains the inoculum that grows by aerobic respiration. As $O_2$ is depleted below a critical concentration, $Z^-$ initiates recruitment to $Z^{Ni}$, according to a low probabilistic function. The function represents the stochastic initiation of $nirS$ transcription, leading to the autocatalytic NirS production and coordinated expression of nor (Fig. 1). $Z^{Ni}$ can reduce $O_2$ and $Z^-$ can respire traces of $N_2O$ produced by $Z^{Ni}$. The latter because, in response to $O_2$ depletion, $nosZ$ is expressed in all cells via FnrP (Bergaust et al., 2012). The kinetics of $e^-$-flow by $Z^-$ and $Z^{Ni}$ are controlled by the $e^-$-acceptors in the liquid ($X_{aq}$), and the amounts of gases in the liquid are controlled by the rate of consumption/production and the
concentration-dependent transport between the aqueous phase and the headspace. The headspace amounts \((X_h)\) are disturbed at each sampling (dilution and leakage). All these phenomena are included in the model, and the numbers in the figure refer to equation numbers in the text.

**Respiration and cell diversification**

The cell-specific respiration rate drives the concentration dependent rates of e⁻-flow to the available electron acceptors:

\[
ve_{O_2}^- = \frac{ve_{\text{max}O_2} \times [O_2]_{aq}}{K_{mO_2} + [O_2]_{aq}} \quad (\text{mol } e^- \text{ cell}^{-1} \text{ h}^{-1})
\]  

\[
ve_{NO_2^-}^- = \frac{ve_{\text{max}NO_2^-} \times [NO_2^-]}{K_{mNO_2^-} + [NO_2^-]} \quad (\text{mol } e^- \text{ cell}^{-1} \text{ h}^{-1})
\]  

\[
ve_{NO}^- = \frac{ve_{\text{max}NO}^-}{1 + K_{2NO} \left( \frac{1}{[NO]_{aq}} + \frac{K_{1NO}}{[NO]_{aq}} \right)} \quad (\text{mol } e^- \text{ cell}^{-1} \text{ h}^{-1})
\]  

\[
ve_{N_2O}^- = \frac{ve_{\text{max}N_2O} \times [N_2O]_{aq}}{K_{mN_2O}^- + [N_2O]_{aq}} \quad (\text{mol } e^- \text{ cell}^{-1} \text{ h}^{-1})
\]

where \(ve_{\text{max}X} \) (\(\text{mol } e^- \text{ cell}^{-1} \text{ h}^{-1}\)) is the maximum e⁻-flow to the acceptor X (see Table 1 for parametric values and sources thereof), \(K_{mX} \) (\(\text{mol } O_2 \text{ L}^{-1} \text{ or } \text{mol } N \text{ L}^{-1}\)) is the half saturation concentration, \([X]\) (\(\text{mol } O_2 \text{ L}^{-1} \text{ or } \text{mol } N \text{ L}^{-1}\)) is the concentration in the aqueous-phase, specified as \([X]_{aq}\) for the gases, and \(K_{1NO} \text{ & } K_{2NO} \) (\(\text{mol } N \text{ L}^{-1}\)) are the dissociation constants for NO binding to cNor (Girsch and de Vries, 1997).

In the version of the model with a negative feedback by NO on NirS activity, Eq. 2 was modified according to the Michaelis-Menten kinetics for non-competitive inhibition:

\[
ve_{NO_2^-}^- = \frac{ve_{\text{max}NO_2^-} \times [NO_2^-]}{(K_{mNO_2^-} + [NO_2^-]) \times \left( 1 + \frac{[NO]_{aq}}{K_{NO_2^-}} \right)} \quad (\text{mol } e^- \text{ cell}^{-1} \text{ h}^{-1})
\]
where $K_{\text{NO}_2} (\text{mol N L}^{-1})$ is the dissociation constant.

The model has two populations, defined according to their reductases:

1. $Z^-$ (cells): cells without NirS and cNor
2. $Z^{\text{Ni}}$ (cells): cells with NirS and cNor

### Table 1. Model parameters.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$[O_2]_{\text{aq}}$ below which recruitment from $Z^-$ to $Z^{\text{Ni}}$ triggers</td>
<td>$9.75 \times 10^{-6}$</td>
<td>mol L$^{-1}$</td>
<td>(Qu, 2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$D_g$ Dilution: the fraction of gas replaced by He during sampling</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>Unitless</td>
<td>Measured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$k_{\text{H(O}_2\text{)}}$ Solubility of O$_2$ in water at 20 °C</td>
<td>0.00139</td>
<td>mol L$^{-1}$ atm$^{-1}$</td>
<td>(Wilhelm et al., 1977)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$k_{\text{H(NO)}}$ Solubility of NO at 20 °C</td>
<td>0.0021</td>
<td>mol N L$^{-1}$ atm$^{-1}$</td>
<td>(Molstad et al., 2007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$k_{\text{H(N}_2\text{O)}}$ Solubility of N$_2$O at 20 °C</td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td>mol N L$^{-1}$ atm$^{-1}$</td>
<td>(Wilhelm et al., 1977)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$k_{\text{H(N}_2\text{)}}$ Solubility of N$_2$ at 20 °C</td>
<td>0.0014</td>
<td>mol N L$^{-1}$ atm$^{-1}$</td>
<td>(Wilhelm et al., 1977)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$K_{\text{mO}_2}$ The half saturation constant for O$_2$ reduction</td>
<td>$2.5 \times 10^{-7}$</td>
<td>mol L$^{-1}$</td>
<td>Model-based estimation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$K_{\text{mNO}_2}$ The half saturation constant for NO$_2$ reduction</td>
<td>$4.13 \times 10^{-6}$</td>
<td>mol N L$^{-1}$</td>
<td>(Gates et al., 2011; Pan et al., 2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$K_{\text{INO}_2}$ The dissociation constant for Nir/NO$_2$ complex</td>
<td>$4 \times 10^{-8}$</td>
<td>mol N L$^{-1}$</td>
<td>Assumption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$K_{\text{INO}}$ The steady state dissociation constant for cNor/NO complex</td>
<td>$8.07 \times 10^{-14}$</td>
<td>mol N L$^{-1}$</td>
<td>Estimated based on experiments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$K_{\text{2NO}}$ The steady state dissociation constant for cNor(NO)$_2$ complex</td>
<td>$34 \times 10^{-9}$</td>
<td>mol N L$^{-1}$</td>
<td>Estimated based on experiments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$K_{\text{mN}_2\text{O}}$ The half saturation constant for N$_2$O reduction</td>
<td>$8.82 \times 10^{-7}$</td>
<td>mol N L$^{-1}$</td>
<td>Model-based estimation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$k_t$ The O$_2$ transport coefficient between the headspace and liquid</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>L s$^{-1}$</td>
<td>Measured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$L_{\text{O}_2}$ O$_2$ leakage into the vial during each sampling</td>
<td>$2.04 \times 10^{-8}$</td>
<td>mol</td>
<td>(Bergaust et al., 2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$r_{\text{Ni}}$ The specific-probability of recruitment from Z$^-$ to Z$^{\text{Ni}}$</td>
<td>0.0072</td>
<td>h$^{-1}$</td>
<td>Model-based estimation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$t_s$ The time taken to complete a sampling procedure</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>(Molstad et al., 2007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$T$ Temperature</td>
<td>293.15</td>
<td>°K</td>
<td>(Bergaust et al., 2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$v_{e_{\text{maxO}_2}}$ The maximum cell-specific velocity of e$^{-}$-flow to O$_2$</td>
<td>$5.32 \times 10^{-15}$</td>
<td>mol e$^{-}$ cell$^{-1}$ h$^{-1}$</td>
<td>(Bergaust et al., 2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$v_{e_{\text{maxNO}_2}}$ The maximum cell-specific velocity of e$^{-}$-flow to NO$_2$</td>
<td>$1.83 \times 10^{-15}$</td>
<td>mol e$^{-}$ cell$^{-1}$ h$^{-1}$</td>
<td>(Bergaust et al., 2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$v_{e_{\text{maxNO}}}$ The maximum cell-specific velocity of e$^{-}$-flow to NO</td>
<td>$3.56 \times 10^{-15}$</td>
<td>mol e$^{-}$ cell$^{-1}$ h$^{-1}$</td>
<td>Measured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$v_{e_{\text{maxN}_2\text{O}}}$ The maximum cell-specific velocity of e$^{-}$-flow to N$_2$O</td>
<td>$5.50 \times 10^{-15}$</td>
<td>mol e$^{-}$ cell$^{-1}$ h$^{-1}$</td>
<td>(Bergaust et al., 2012)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The minimum e-flow required for protein synthesis (ATP) is $5.30 \times 10^{-18}$ mol e-cell\(^{-1} h^{-1}\).

The growth yield for e-flow to O\(_2\) is $3.75 \times 10^{13} \text{ cells mol}^{-1} e^{-1}$ (Bergaust et al., 2010).

The growth yield for e-flow to NO\(_x\) is $1.93 \times 10^{13} \text{ cells mol}^{-1} e^{-1}$ (Bergaust et al., 2010).

The model is initiated with all cells in $Z^{-}$, which then express NirS + cNor, thus recruiting to $Z^{Ni}$ in response to O\(_2\) depletion. The NirS and cNor expression is assumed to be coordinated because they are both enhanced by NO (via the NO-sensor NNR, Fig. 1), and the initiation of nirS transcription is stochastic because it happens in the absence of NO (or at too low concentrations to be sensed by NNR, see Hassan et al., 2014). All cells ($Z^{-} + Z^{Ni}$) are assumed to be able to respire O\(_2\) and express NosZ in response to impending anoxia (see Bergaust et al. 2012).

The kinetics of NirS + cNor expression (i.e., recruitment to $Z^{Ni}$) are modelled as instantaneous recruitment events (i.e., ignoring the time from the initiation of the gene expression till the cell is fully equipped with the reductases in question). The simplification is based on the observations that the lag between the emergence of denitrification gene transcripts and the subsequent gas products is practically insignificant ($\approx 20$ minutes, Bergaust et al., 2010; Qu, 2014). The rate of recruitment from $Z^{-}$ to $Z^{Ni}$ is given by:

$$R_{Ni} = \begin{cases} Z^{-} \times r_{Ni} & \text{IF} \ [O_2]_{aq} < [O_2]_{Ni} \ \text{AND} \ [ve_{O_2}^- + (0.5 \times ve_{N_2O}^-)] > ve_{min}^- \ (\text{cells h}^{-1}) \\ 0 & \text{OTHERWISE} \end{cases}$$

where $Z^{-}$ (cells) is the population without NirS and cNor, $r_{Ni} \ (h^{-1})$ is the probability for a $Z^{-}$ cell to initiate nirS transcription once the aqueous oxygen concentration ([O\(_2\)]\(_{aq}\)) reaches below a critical limit $[O_2]_{ni}$, empirically determined as the [O\(_2\)]\(_{aq}\) at the outset of NO accumulation (Qu, 2014). The second condition for the cell to express NirS is a minimum of e-flow to other e-acceptors, expressed as $ve_{min}^-$ (mol e-cell\(^{-1} h^{-1}\)). The idea is that a minimum of energy required for protein synthesis must be available by the reduction of an accessible e-acceptor(s). The e-flow to N\(_2\)O ($ve_{N_2O}^-$) is assumed to count only 50% of the e-flow to O\(_2\) because of the lower ATP production per e- to NO\(_x\) (van Spanning et al., 2007).
Growth

The number of cells within each population (Z^- and Z^N_i) change as a function of growth and recruitment. The growth is a direct function of the rates of e^-flow to the various e^-acceptors:

\[
\frac{d(Z^-)}{dt} = Z^- \times \left( v_{eO_2} \times YeO_2 + ve_{N_2O} \times Ye_{NO_x} \right) - R_{Ni} \quad \text{(cells h}^{-1}) \quad (7)
\]

where Z^- (cells) is the population size, ve_{O_2} (mol e^- cell}^{-1} h}^{-1}, Eq. 1) is the cell-specific rate of e^-flow to O_2, Ye_{O_2} (cells mol^{-1} e^- to O_2) is the growth yield for aerobic respiration, ve_{N_2O} is the cell-specific rate of e^-flow to N_2O, Ye_{NO_x} is the growth yield for the e^-flow to NO_x (identical for all N species), and R_{Ni} (cells h}^{-1}) is the recruitment from Z^- to Z^N_i in response to O_2 depletion (Eq. 6).

Likewise:

\[
\frac{d(Z^N_i)}{dt} = Z^N_i \times \left[ v_{eO_2} \times YeO_2 + (ve_{NO_2} + ve_{NO} + ve_{N_2O}) \times Ye_{NO_x} \right] + R_{Ni} \quad \text{(cells h}^{-1}) \quad (8)
\]

Kinetics of O_2 and NO_x

The O_2 and NO_x kinetics in the aqueous-phase are simulated as a net result of consumption and production as well as the transport between the liquid and the headspace (for gases).

The nitrite depletion rate is a simple function (no gaseous phase required):

\[
\frac{d(NO_2^-)}{dt} = -Z^N_i \times v_{NO_2^-} \quad \text{(mol N h}^{-1}) \quad (9)
\]

where v_{NO_2^-} (mol N cell}^{-1} h}^{-1}) is the cell-specific velocity of NO_2^- consumption, obtained by the velocity of e^-flow to NO_2^- (see Eq. 2, 1 \frac{molN}{mol e^-}).
The gas consumption and production takes place in the aqueous phase, but the gases are transported between the aqueous phase and the headspace depending on their concentrations in the two phases. The transport is modelled according to Molstad et al. (2007):

\[ T_{rX} = k_t \times (P_X \times k_{H(X)} - [X]_{aq}) \]  \hspace{1cm} (mol O_2 h^{-1} \text{ or } mol \text{ N-NO}_x h^{-1}) \tag{10} \]

where \( T_{rX} \) is the transport of gas \( X \), \( k_t \) (\( L h^{-1} \)) is the transport coefficient, \( P_X \) (atm) is the partial pressure of the gas in the headspace, \( k_{H(X)} \) (\( mol O_2 L^{-1} \text{ atm}^{-1} \text{ or } mol \text{ N-NO}_x L^{-1} \text{ atm}^{-1} \)) is the solubility of the gas, and \( [X]_{aq} \) (\( mol L^{-1} \)) is the aqueous gas concentration. \( T_{rX} \) is positive for the net transport from the headspace to the aqueous phase (i.e., \( [X]_{aq} < P_X \times k_{H(X)} \)).

The production and consumption of the various gases in the liquid are proportional to the e⁻-flow rates; thus, the amounts of each gas in the aqueous-phase are modelled as:

\[ \frac{d(O_{2aq})}{dt} = T_{rO_2} - (Z^- + Z^{Ni}) \times v_{O_2} \]  \hspace{1cm} (mol \text{ O}_2 h^{-1}) \tag{11} \]

\[ \frac{d(NO_{aq})}{dt} = T_{rNO} + Z^{Ni} \times (v_{NO_2}^- - v_{NO}) \]  \hspace{1cm} (mol \text{ N h}^{-1}) \tag{12} \]

\[ \frac{d(N_2O_{aq})}{dt} = T_{rN_2O} + Z^{Ni} \times v_{NO} - (Z^- + Z^{Ni}) \times v_{N_2O} \]  \hspace{1cm} (mol \text{ N h}^{-1}) \tag{13} \]

\[ \frac{d(N_2a_{aq})}{dt} = T_{rN_2} + (Z^- + Z^{Ni}) \times v_{N_2O} \]  \hspace{1cm} (mol \text{ N h}^{-1}) \tag{14} \]

where \( T_{rX} \) (Eq. 10) is the transport rate of the relevant gas from the headspace to the liquid, and \( v_X \) is the cell-specific velocity of the \( X \)'s consumption, obtained by the velocity of e⁻-flow to \( X \) (Eqs. 1–4; \( v_{O_2} = \frac{1}{4} \times ve_{O_2}^- \) and \( v_{NO_x} = ve_{NO_x}^- \)).
**Gases in the headspace affected by gas sampling**

Gases in the headspace \((X_g, \text{mol O}_2 \text{ or mol N NO}_3)\) is a function of transport (Eq. 10) and the net sampling loss. The gas sampling removes a fraction of the headspace (replaced by He), but it also involves a leakage of \(\text{O}_2\) and \(\text{N}_2\) via tubing and valves in the injection system (Molstad et al., 2007). To simulate the experiments conducted, the sampling disturbance is simulated as discrete events, at time points given as input to the model (equivalent to the sampling times in the simulated experiment):

\[
\Delta X_g = \frac{L_X - X_g \times D_g}{t_s} \quad (\text{mol O}_2 \text{ h}^{-1} \text{ or mol N-NO}_3 \text{ h}^{-1})
\]

(15)

where \(\Delta X_g\) is the net change in the amount of gas \(X\) in the headspace, \(L_X\) (\(\text{mol O}_2\) or \(\text{mol N-NO}_3\)) is the leakage of \(X\) into the system via the sampling operation, \(X_g\) (\(\text{mol O}_2\) or \(\text{mol N-NO}_3\)) is the amount of gas, and \(D_g\) is the fraction of the headspace volume replaced by He. The sampling disturbance is simulated as a continuous process over a short time period \((t_s)\), equivalent to the time taken to complete each sampling.

For all other gases than \(\text{O}_2\), \(L_X\) is negligible and is not included in the model. \(\Delta \text{O}_{2g}\) is negative (outflow) at high \(\text{O}_2\) concentrations and turns positive (inflow) only at very low \(\text{O}_{2a}\), depending on the value of \(L_{\text{O}_2}\) and \(D\). For the simulated experiment, \(L_{\text{O}_2} = 4 \times 10^{-9} \text{ mol O}_2\), and \(D = 0.013\); hence, \(\Delta \text{O}_{2g}\) turns positive when \(\text{O}_{2a} < 0.3 \mu\text{mol}\), equivalent to 100 ppmv in the headspace or 0.13 \(\mu\text{M}\) in the liquid if in equilibrium.

For \(\text{N}_2\), the model ignores the sampling disturbance because the experimental data on \(\text{N}_2\) production to be compared with the model output are already corrected for the sampling disturbance (Molstad et al., 2007).
Determination of NirS and cNor kinetics \textit{in vivo}

All experiments were done in gas-tight 120 mL serum vials containing 50 mL Sistrom’s (1960) medium with 34 mM succinate, stirred at 650 rpm (3.5 cm long magnetic stirrers) at 20 °C. The vials were placed in a robotic incubation system for monitoring the gas concentrations in the headspace (Molstad et al., 2007). Sistrom’s medium contains K$_2$HPO$_4$: 3.48, NH$_4$Cl: 0.195, succinic acid: 4.00, L-glutamic acid: 0.10, L-aspartic acid: 0.04, NaCl: 0.50, nitrilotriacetic acid: 0.20, MgSO$_4$$\times$7H$_2$O: 0.30, CaCl$_2$$\times$7H$_2$O: 0.015, and FeSO$_4$$\times$7H$_2$O: 0.007 g L$^{-1}$. In addition, trace elements and vitamins were added as EDTA (triplex 3): 0.001765, ZnSO$_4$$\times$7H$_2$O: 0.01095, FeSO$_4$$\times$7H$_2$O: 0.005, MnSO$_4$$\times$H$_2$O: 0.00154, CuSO$_4$$\times$5H$_2$O: 0.00039, CoCl$_2$$\times$6H$_2$O: 0.0002 g, H$_3$BO$_3$: 0.000114, nicotinic acid: 0.0010, thiamine HCl: 0.0005, biotin: 0.00001 (g L$^{-1}$). pH was brought to 7.0 with 1 M KOH, and the medium was autoclaved for sterility.

Inoculum preparation

To determine the enzyme kinetic parameters for NirS and cNor \textit{in vivo}, we needed an inoculum with all cells actively denitrifying. This was obtained by three sequential batch cultivations under anoxic conditions: 120 mL vials, with He atmosphere containing 50 mL Sistrom’s medium with 2 mM NO$_2^-$, were inoculated to an initial cell density of $\approx 10^6$ cells mL$^{-1}$ and incubated at 20 °C (stirred) in the incubation robot. When NO$_2^-$ had been depleted (recovered as N$_2$), 1 mL of the culture ($\approx 1 \times 10^8$ cells) was used to inoculate a second equivalent batch culture, which was then used to inoculate a third batch. The culture was allowed to deplete NO$_2^-$ (final cell density = 1.8$\times 10^8$ cells mL$^{-1}$) before 0.5 mL therefrom was used to inoculate vials for the two enzyme kinetic assays:

Nitrite reductase (NirS) assay

For determination of the cell-specific rate of nitrite reductase ($v_{NO_2^-}$), we inoculated vials (n=3) with 50 mL Sistroms containing 1 mM NO$_2^-$ and He atmosphere. Once NO$_2^-$ had been depleted (recovered as N$_2$), a second dose of NO$_2^-$ was added (2 mM), and the gas production (NO, N$_2$O and N$_2$) was monitored by frequent sampling (every 25 min) until all the NO$_2^-$ was recovered as N$_2$ (10
In order to estimate $v_{\text{NO}_2}$ throughout this incubation, we needed an estimate of cell density for each time increment. The cell density was measured only at the beginning and at the end of the incubation, but we could use the cumulative e$^-$-flow to NO$_x$ (based on measured NO, N$_2$O and N$_2$) to estimate the cell density throughout, assuming a growth yield of $1.79 \times 10^{13}$ cells mol$^\text{e}^{-}$ during anaerobic growth on NO$_2^-$ (Bergaust et al., 2010, Supplementary Material). The validity of this growth yield was confirmed in the present experiment: the net increase in cell density by reducing 2 mM NO$_2^-$ to N$_2$ ($= 100$ μmol NO$_2^-$ vial$^{-1}$; 300 μmol e$^-$ vial$^{-1}$) was $5.1 \times 10^9$ cells vial$^{-1}$ (stdev $= 0.1 \times 10^9$, n=3), giving yield $= 1.7 \times 10^{13}$ cells mol$^\text{e}^{-}$ (which is only 5% lower than that obtained by Bergaust et al., 2010).

### Nitric oxide reductase (cNor) assay

For this assay, we needed a medium completely free of N-oxyanions, which is not the case for the standard Sistrom’s medium (Bergaust et al., 2008). The oxyanion concentration was reduced by using CoCl$_2$ instead of Co(NO$_3$)$_2$, but we still found traces of NO$_2^-$, possibly due to impurities of the medium components, water, or glassware. This appears to be a common problem for microbiological media (Xu et al., 2000). To remove the residual NO$_2^-$, *Paracoccus denitrificans* was grown anaerobically overnight in 50 mL stirred batches at 30°C (final cell density $< 2 \times 10^7$ cells $\text{mL}^{-1}$). The cells were then removed by filtering, and the medium was distributed back to the same vials and re-autoclaved (for details, see Bergaust et al., 2012).

We inoculated vials with 50 mL N-oxyanion stripped medium and He atmosphere and monitored the NO depletion kinetics after injections of NO into the headspace. The NO injected was produced in separate vials with He atmosphere, containing acetic acid and NaI (saturated) to which a small dose of KNO$_2^-$ was added while stirring (with magnetic bars). Once NO$_2^-$ was converted to NO (which is practically instantaneous), 1 M NaOH was injected to ensure pH $> 8$, so as to minimise the vapour pressure of acetic acid in the headspace. Small doses of the headspace were then transferred to the culture vials.

To estimate NO concentrations in the liquid ([NO]$_{\text{aq}}$), we used the transport function (see Eq. 10). For each time increment between two measurements, [NO]$_{\text{aq}}$ was estimated by solving Eq. 10 for...
\([\text{NO}]_{\text{aq}} = k_{H(\text{NO})} \times P_{\text{NO}} - \frac{\text{Tr}_{\text{NO}}}{k_t}\), where \(P_{\text{NO}}\) is the average partial pressure of NO in the headspace (\(NO_g\)) for the time increment, and \(\text{Tr}_{\text{NO}}\) is the estimated transport of NO from the headspace to the liquid, which is corrected for a significant loss by each sampling, as explained by Molstad et al. (2007).

The estimated \([\text{NO}]_{\text{aq}}\) depends on accurate determination of the transport coefficient \((k_t)\), and this becomes critical if \([\text{NO}]_{\text{aq}} \ll P_{\text{NO}} \times k_{H(\text{NO})}\) (Eq. 10), i.e., if the NO reduction rate is so high that \([\text{NO}]_{\text{aq}}\) is much lower than the ‘equilibrium concentration’ = \(P_{\text{NO}} \times k_{H(\text{NO})}\). For instance, if \(\frac{[\text{NO}]_{\text{aq}}}{k_{H(\text{NO})} \times P_{\text{NO}}} = 0.1\), a 10% error in \(k_t\) results in 90–100% error in the estimate of \([\text{NO}]_{\text{aq}}\). On the other hand, if \(\frac{[\text{NO}]_{\text{aq}}}{k_{H(\text{NO})} \times P_{\text{NO}}} > 0.5\), the \([\text{NO}]_{\text{aq}}\) estimate is less than 10% off-target by a 10% error in the determination of \(k_t\). Thus, our target was to achieve \(\frac{[\text{NO}]_{\text{aq}}}{k_{H(\text{NO})} \times P_{\text{NO}}} > 0.5\) throughout the NO reductase assay by low cell density and high transport coefficient \((k_t)\).

Initial experiments were done with relatively high initial cell densities (≈6\(\times\)10\(^7\) cells mL\(^{-1}\)) and the same magnetic stirrers (2.5 cm) as used by Molstad et al (2007). The results were found to be useless at low NO concentrations in the headspace (0–50 ppmv): the estimated \(\frac{[\text{NO}]_{\text{aq}}}{k_{H(\text{NO})} \times P_{\text{NO}}}\) ratio was close to zero, resulting in very inaccurate determinations of \([\text{NO}]_{\text{aq}}\). To improve the experiments, we switched to longer magnetic bars (3.5 cm), thus increasing \(k_t\). We determined \(k_t\) with the new 3.5 cm magnetic bars for seven individual vials with 50 mL distilled water. The measurements were done by first injecting NO into the headspace (≈ 0.1 vol.%), which was allowed to equilibrate with the liquid by stirring for 5 min. Then the stirring was stopped, and the headspace was purged by He-flow for 5 min (via needles through the septa). Finally, stirring was restarted (650 rpm), and the NO concentration was monitored by frequent sampling. The average \(k_t\) for the seven vials was 0.87 mL s\(^{-1}\) (stdev = 0.1 mL s\(^{-1}\)). The value is substantially higher than the \(k_t = 0.28\) mL s\(^{-1}\) with the 2.5 cm magnetic bars, determined by Molstad et al. (2007).
Further, we reduced the number of cells inoculated to an initial cell density of $1.8 \times 10^6$ cells mL$^{-1}$ in order to secure $\frac{[NO]_{aq}}{k_{H(NO)} \times P_{NO}} > 0.5$ throughout the entire experiment. Although the target of 0.5 was not sustained throughout (see Results and Discussion), the combination of high transport rates and low cell densities secured a reasonably high $\frac{[NO]_{aq}}{k_{H(NO)} \times P_{NO}}$ ratio.

### NO concentration at the cell surface ($[NO]_{cell}$)

During the NO reductase assay, there is a net flux of NO towards the cells ($J$, mol s$^{-1}$), driven by molecular diffusion. This implies that the NO concentration at the cell surface ($[NO]_{cell}$) is lower than the bulk concentration of NO in the liquid ($[NO]_{aq}$). To estimate $[NO]_{cell}$ for each time increment, we used the equation for molecular diffusion towards a sphere (Berg, 1983):

$$ J = 4 \pi D r ([NO]_{aq} - [NO]_{cell}) \quad (mol \ s^{-1}) \quad (16) $$

where $J$ is the area integrated flux of NO towards the cell, $D (= 1.93 \times 10^{-5} \ cm^2 \ s^{-1})$ is the diffusion coefficient for NO in water, $r (= 4 \times 10^{-5} \ cm)$ is the radius of the sphere, $[NO]_{aq}$ (mol cm$^{-3}$) is the bulk concentration of NO, and $[NO]_{cell}$ (mol cm$^{-3}$) is the NO concentration at the cell surface. Zacharia and Deen (2005) found identical diffusion coefficients for NO in water and phosphate buffer solution at 25 °C ($D = 2.21 \times 10^{-5} \ cm^2 \ s^{-1}$). Extrapolation to our temperature of 20 °C, using the Stokes-Einstein equation (Poling et al., 2000), gives $D = 1.93 \times 10^{-5} \ cm^2 \ s^{-1}$.

Solving Eq. 16 for $[NO]_{cell}$ gives:

$$ [NO]_{cell} = [NO]_{aq} - \frac{J}{4 \pi D r} \quad (mol \ cm^{-3}) \quad (17) $$

which was used to estimate $[NO]_{cell}$ for each time increment; $J$ (mol s$^{-1}$) is estimated by the measured rate of NO reduction (per cell) divided by cell numbers, and $[NO]_{aq}$ (mol cm$^{-3}$) is the bulk concentration estimated as described above.
Enzyme kinetics

Since cNor requires the participation of two molecules of NO to make one molecule of N$_2$O, the default kinetics is not a regular Michaelis-Menten equation, but rather a ‘dual substrate kinetics’ model. Further, analysis of in vitro kinetics of cNor has shown that the enzyme reaction is inhibited by high (micromolar) NO concentrations. To take these phenomena into account, we adopted the model by Girsch and de Vries (1997):

\[
\nu_{\text{NO}} = \frac{v_{\text{maxNO}} [\text{NO}]_{\text{cell}}}{1 + \frac{K_{\text{NO}}}{[\text{NO}]_{\text{cell}}} + \frac{K_{\text{NO}} \times K_{\text{NO}}}{[\text{NO}]_{\text{cell}}} + \frac{[\text{NO}]_{\text{cell}}}{K_{\text{NO}}}} \quad (\text{mol cell}^{-1} \text{h}^{-1})
\]  

(18)

where $v_{\text{maxNO}}$ (mol cell$^{-1}$ h$^{-1}$) is the maximum reduction rate, $K_{\text{NO}}$ and $K_{\text{NO}}$ (mol L$^{-1}$) are the apparent half-saturation constants for the two active sites, $K_{\text{NO}}$ (mol L$^{-1}$) is the inhibition dissociation constant, and $[\text{NO}]_{\text{cell}}$ (mol L$^{-1}$) is the NO concentration at the cell surface.

Using the data for $v_{\text{NO}}$ and $[\text{NO}]_{\text{cell}}$, we estimated the parameters $K_{\text{NO}}$, $K_{\text{NO}}$, $K_{\text{NO}}$, and $v_{\text{maxNO}}$ by least-squares regression, using the Levenberg-Marquardt algorithm and Metropolis Markov chain Monte Carlo (Tarantola, 2005; Müller et al., 2007). Both the methods predicted extremely high values for $K_{\text{NO}}$ (> 100 µM) and $K_{\text{NO}}$ approaching zero. This suggested that the dataset contains no information about these two parameters, apart from indicating that $K_{\text{NO}}$ is too low to affect the model predictions significantly within the measured range and that $K_{\text{NO}}$ is too high to affect the predictions within the concentration range used. The latter agrees well with the apparent $K_{\text{NO}} = 13$ µM determined in vitro (Girsch and de Vries, 1997).

On this basis, we decided to fit a regular Michaelis-Menten function to our data (Eq. 18 becomes a Michaelis-Menten function if we eliminate the inhibition term and assume $K_{\text{NO}} = 0$):

\[
\nu_{\text{NO}} = \frac{v_{\text{maxNO}} [\text{NO}]_{\text{cell}}}{(K_{\text{MNO}} + [\text{NO}]_{\text{cell}})} \quad (\text{mol cell}^{-1} \text{h}^{-1})
\]  

(19)

Combining Eq. 16 and 19 ($J = \nu_{\text{NO}}$), we can find $J$ (flux of NO towards the cell) as an explicit function of $[\text{NO}]_{\text{aq}}$ (Bailey et al., 1986):


\[ J = -\frac{b}{2} - \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\frac{b^2}{16} - 16 v_{\text{maxNO}} \pi D r [\text{NO}]_{aq}} \quad (\text{mol s}^{-1}) \]  

(20)

where \( b = -4 \pi D r (K_{mNO} + [\text{NO}]_{aq}) - v_{\text{maxNO}} \)

The parameters \( v_{\text{maxNO}} \) and \( K_{mNO} \) were then estimated by fitting Eq. 20 to the measured rate of NO reduction \( (J = v_{\text{NO}}) \) and estimated \([\text{NO}]_{aq}\) (Fig. 4B), using the least squares regression (Levenberg-Marquardt and Metropolis MCMC).

Once the enzyme kinetic parameters for cNor are known, the steady state NO concentrations \([\text{NO}]_{ss}\) in a culture can be explicitly calculated, since at steady state:  

\[ \frac{d([\text{NO}]_{aq})_{ss}}{dt} = v_{\text{NO}^2} - v_{\text{NO}} = 0, \]

and we can assume \( v_{\text{NO}^2} \) to be nearly constant (since \([\text{NO}^2] >> K_{mNO}^{-2}\)); hence, we get:

\[ \frac{d([\text{NO}]_{aq})_{ss}}{dt} = v_{\text{NO}^2} - \frac{v_{\text{maxNO}}}{1+K_{2NO} \left( \frac{1}{[\text{NO}]_{cell}} + \frac{K_{mNO}}{[\text{NO}]_{cell}^2} \right) + \frac{[\text{NO}]_{cell}}{K_{mNO}}} = 0 \quad (\text{mol N h}^{-1}) \]

(21)

which can be solved for \([\text{NO}]_{cell}\), equivalent to \([\text{NO}]_{aq}\) when in steady state.
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Calculation of the cNor molecules per cell in *Pa. denitrificans*

To estimate turnover rates of cNor, we need an estimate of the number of protein molecules per cell. Girsch and de Vries (1997) extracted and purified cNor from anaerobically grown *Paracoccus denitrificans* and obtained a nearly pure fraction (on protein-basis) after hydroxyapatite column separation. Based on the measured activity in this fraction and the fact that the activity of cNOR *in vitro* is approx. 50% of that in intact membranes, 18% of the cNor was recovered. Based on the protein content in the pure fraction (4.2 mg) and the protein content of the original membrane fraction (2000 mg), we find that the membrane protein fraction contains $\frac{4.2}{2000} = 0.0117$ g cNor g$^{-1}$ membrane proteins, or 167 nmol cNor g$^{-1}$ membrane proteins (assuming mol weight of cNor = 70,000).

Assuming that membrane proteins account for $\frac{1}{3}$ to $\frac{1}{2}$ of the total protein pools of bacterial cells, we find that the cNor content per g whole cell protein is 56–84 nmol cNor g$^{-1}$ cell-protein.

Bergaust et al. (2010, Supplementary Material) measured whole cell protein of *Pa. denitrificans* to be $96\times10^{-15}$ g cell$^{-1}$. With 56–84 nmol cNor g$^{-1}$ cell-protein, we find that the amount of cNor per cell is $5.34–8.02\times10^{-21}$ mol cell$^{-1} = 3212–4818$ molecules cell$^{-1}$.

References


Figure S1. Cell-specific rates of NO$_2^-$ reduction ($\nu_{\text{NO}_2}$). The measured N$_2$ production (A) was used to estimate cell density (B) based on previously determined growth yield = 1.79×10$^{13}$ cells mol$^{-1}$ electrons to NO$_x$ (Bergaust et al., 2010). Panel C shows the NO concentrations (nM in the liquid). For each time increment, the cell specific rates of NO$_2^-$ reduction were calculated (Panel D) based on the measured rates per vial and the estimated cell numbers. For all the panels, the individual result for the three replicate vials are shown (line = average). The final cell density, measured by OD$_{660}$ in the individual vials, was within ±7% of that predicted by cumulative electron flow and the growth yield = 1.79×10$^{13}$ cells mol$^{-1}$ electrons.
Figure S2. Recovery of NO-N as N$_2$ (A) and N$_2$O concentrations throughout the NO reduction assay (B). Panel A shows the cumulative NO reduction and N$_2$ production (µmol NO and N$_2$–N via$^{-1}$, i.e., in liquid + headspace), closely matching throughout the incubation. Panel B shows the amounts of NO and N$_2$O-N (nmol N via$^{-1}$) throughout the incubation (logarithmic scale). Both the results are for the same vial as shown in Fig. 4 in the manuscript.
Figure S3. Inhibition of NO reduction by high NO concentrations. Panel A shows the results for preliminary experiments similar to that shown in Fig. 4, but with higher final doses of NO. The log-log plot shows the cell-specific rates of NO reduction ($v_{NO}, \text{fmol cell}^{-1} \text{h}^{-1}$) against the NO concentrations in the liquid ([NO]$_{aq}$) for single time increments during depletion of four consecutive doses (7, 55, 292, and 3000 ppmv; 1 ppmv NO in headspace gives 2.12 nM in the liquid when in equilibrium). $v_{NO}$ during depletion of the first three doses shows reasonably
similar concentration dependency, while the cells that had been exposed to the final high dose of NO (3000 ppmv; [NO]_{aq} \approx 6 \mu M) had clearly lower rates by a factor of 2–3. In these experiments, OD was measured throughout the experiments, and the cell numbers were found to increase in proportion with the cumulated NO reduction throughout the depletion of the first three doses, but not after the fourth high dose. Thus, growth was evidently permanently impeded by exposure to such high NO concentrations. Panel B shows the result for one of the three replicate vials used in the final experiment for determining $K_{m_{NO}}$ and $v_{max_{NO}}$. In this case, the last high dose (881 ppmv; [NO]_{aq} \approx 1.87 \mu M if in equilibrium) apparently resulted in a more transient depression in NO reduction.

Figure S4. The relationship between the estimated NO concentration at the cell surface ([NO]_{cell}) and that in the bulk liquid ([NO]_{aq}). The panel shows the ratio $\frac{[NO]_{cell}}{[NO]_{aq}}$ plotted against [NO]_{aq} (log scale), together with the theoretical curve for spheres with radius 0.4 \mu m, $v_{max_{NO}} = 3.56 \text{ fmol cell}^{-1} \text{ h}^{-1}$, and $K_{m_{NO}} = 34 \text{ nM}$. There is good agreement for [NO]_{aq} > 20 \text{ nM}, but for lower concentrations, there is much experimental noise. A negative ratio means that the estimated [NO]_{cell} is negative.
Figure S5. Estimated cell-specific rates of NO-reduction ($v_{NO}, \text{fmol cell}^{-1} \text{h}^{-1}$) for individual time increments. The rates are plotted against the estimated concentration of NO in the aqua ([NO]$_{aq}$). Panel A shows the entire range, and Panel B shows the results for [NO]$_{LP} < 300$ nM. All data shown are for NO depletion through the first 2–3 injections of NO < 500 ppmv ($= [NO]_{aq} < 1 \mu M$). The estimated $v_{NO}$ for [NO]$_{aq} > 300$ nM is more variable than at lower concentrations.
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Abstract

Denitrifying bacteria accumulate $\text{NO}_2^-$, NO and $\text{N}_2\text{O}$, the amounts depending on the transcriptional regulation of core denitrification genes in response to $\text{O}_2$-limiting conditions. The genes include $\text{nar}$, $\text{nir}$, $\text{nor}$ and $\text{nosZ}$, encoding $\text{NO}_3^-$-, $\text{NO}_2^-$-, NO- and $\text{N}_2\text{O}$ reductase, respectively. We previously constructed a dynamic model to simulate growth and respiration in batch cultures of Paracoccus denitrificans. The observed denitrification kinetics were adequately simulated by assuming a stochastic initiation of $\text{nir}$-transcription in each cell with an extremely low probability (0.5% h⁻¹), leading to product- and substrate-induced transcription of $\text{nir}$ and $\text{nor}$, respectively, via NO. Thus, the model predicted cell diversification: after $\text{O}_2$ depletion, only a small fraction was able to grow by reducing $\text{NO}_2^-$. 

1
Here, we have developed the model further to simulate batch cultivation with NO$_3^-$, i.e., the NO$_3^-$, NO, N$_2$O and N$_2$ kinetics, measured in a novel experiment including frequent measurements of NO$_3^-$ \textit{Pa. denitrificans} reduced practically all NO$_3^-$ to NO$_2^-$ before initiating gas production. The NO$_2^-$ production is adequately simulated by assuming stochastic \textit{nar}-transcription, as that for \textit{nirS}, but with a higher probability (0.035 h$^{-1}$) and initiating at a higher O$_2$ concentration.

Our model assumes that all cells express \textit{nosZ}, thus predicting that a majority of cells have only N$_2$O-reductase. This sub-population (A) grows by respiring N$_2$O produced by the sub-population with NO$_2^-$ and NO-reductase (B). The ratio $\frac{B}{A}$ is low immediately after O$_2$ depletion, but increases throughout the anoxic phase because B grows faster than A. As a result, the model predicts initially low but gradually increasing N$_2$O concentration throughout the anoxic phase, as observed.

The modelled cell diversification neatly explains the observed denitrification kinetics and transient intermediate accumulations. The result has major implications for understanding the relationship between genotype and phenotype in denitrification research.

\textbf{Author Summary}

Denitrifiers generally respire O$_2$, but if O$_2$ becomes limiting, they may switch to anaerobic respiration (denitrification) by producing NO$_3^-$, NO$_2^-$, NO- and/or N$_2$O reductase, encoded by \textit{nar}, \textit{nir}, \textit{nor} and \textit{nosZ} genes, respectively. Denitrification causes transient accumulation of NO$_2^-$ and NO/N$_2$O emissions, depending on the activity of the four reductases. Denitrifiers lacking \textit{nosZ} produce $\sim$100% N$_2$O, whereas organisms with only \textit{nosZ} are net consumers of N$_2$O. Full-fledged denitrifiers are equipped with all four reductases, genetic regulation of which determines NO$_2^-$ accumulation and NO/N$_2$O emissions. \textit{Paracoccus denitrificans} is a full-fledged denitrifying bacterium, and here we present a modelling approach to understand its regulation. We found that the observed transient accumulation of NO$_2^-$ and N$_2$O can be neatly
explained by assuming cell diversification: all cells express nosZ, while a minority expresses nar and nir+nor. Thus, the model predicts that in a batch culture of this organism, only a minor sub-population is full-fledged denitrifier. The cell diversification is a plausible outcome of stochastic initiation of nar and nir transcription, which then becomes autocatalytic by NO\textsuperscript{−} and NO. The findings are important for understanding the regulation of denitrification in bacteria: product-induced transcription of denitrification genes is common, and we surmise that diversification in response to anoxia is widespread.

Introduction

The dissimilative reduction of nitrate (NO\textsuperscript{−}) to nitrite (NO\textsuperscript{−}\textsubscript{2}), nitric oxide (NO), nitrous oxide (N\textsubscript{2}O), and finally to N\textsubscript{2} (denitrification) is an indispensable process in the nitrogen cycle, returning N to the atmosphere as N\textsubscript{2}. However, denitrification significantly leaks the gaseous intermediates NO and N\textsubscript{2}O, both with serious consequences for the environment. N\textsubscript{2}O catalyses depletion of the stratospheric ozone (1) and causes global warming, contributing ~10% to the anthropogenic climate forcing (2). Data suggests that since the 1950s, the atmospheric N\textsubscript{2}O has been increasing, and before being photolysed in the stratosphere, the gas persists for an average ~120 years in the troposphere (3). ~70% of global N\textsubscript{2}O emissions are tentatively attributed to microbial nitrification and denitrification in soils (4), where denitrification, generally, is considered a more dominant source (5).

To mitigate N\textsubscript{2}O emissions, we need to understand the physiology of denitrifiers.

To devise robust strategies for mitigating global N\textsubscript{2}O emissions, a good understanding of its primary source is imperative, i.e., genetics, physiology, and regulatory biology of denitrifiers. Any knowledge of the environmental controllers of N\textsubscript{2}O is incomplete without understanding the causal relationships of such controllers at the physiological level (6).

The biogeochemical models developed for understanding the ecosystem controls of denitrification and N\textsubscript{2}O emissions treat the denitrifying community of soils and sediments as
a single homogenous unit with certain characteristic responses to O₂ and NO₃⁻ concentrations (6, 7). Natural denitrifying communities, however, are mixtures of organisms with widely different denitrification regulatory phenotypes (8). The regulatory response of such mixtures is not necessarily equal to the ‘sum of its components’ because there will be interactions, not the least, via the intermediates NO and NO₂⁻. Hence, it is probably a mission impossible to predict the regulatory responses of complex communities based on their phenotypic composition. Nevertheless, investigations of the regulation in model organisms like Pa. denitrificans provide us with essential concepts, enhancing our ability to understand the regulatory responses of mixed communities and to generate meaningful hypotheses. Thus, future biogeochemical models of N₂O and NO emissions are expected to have more explicit simulations of the regulatory networks involved, and a first attempt has recently been published (9).

**Simulating the cell diversification in response to impending anoxia to analyse its implications for NO₂⁻, N₂, and N₂O kinetics**

Dynamic modelling has been used to a limited extent to analyse various denitrification phenotypes; for example, to analyse NO₃⁻ and NO₂⁻ reduction and gas-kinetic data for individual strains (10) and mixtures of selected phenotypes (11); to model the consequence of competition for electrons between denitrification reductases (12, 13); to investigate the control of O₂ on denitrification enzymes and inhibition of cytochrome c oxidase by NO in *Agrobacterium tumefaciens* (14); and to examine the effect of copper availability on N₂O reduction in *Paracoccus denitrificans* (15). In our previous model (16), we simulated O₂ and N₂ kinetics from batch incubations of *Pa. denitrificans* (8, 17) to test if a postulated cell diversification, driven by stochastic initiation of nirS, could explain the N₂ production kinetics in NO₂⁻-supplemented media. The available data also contained NO₃⁻-supplemented treatments, but NO₃⁻ and NO₂⁻ were not monitored, and the experiment provided no information about the N₂O kinetics, except that the concentrations were extremely low (below the detection limit of the thermal conductivity detector used). Recently, a neat dataset was generated from batch incubations supplemented with NO₃⁻, with frequent
measurements of $\text{NO}_3^-$ and a more sensitive detection of $\text{N}_2\text{O}$ by an electron capture detector (18). That encouraged us to extend our previous model and simulate the cell diversification during transition from oxic to anoxic conditions, targeting the regulation of Nar and cNor/NosZ ($\text{N}_2\text{O}$ emissions) in *Pa. denitrificans*.

**Regulatory network of denitrification in *Paracoccus denitrificans***

*Pa. denitrificans* is a facultative anaerobe capable of reducing $\text{NO}_3^-$ all the way to $\text{N}_2$:

$$\text{NO}_3^- \xrightarrow{n\text{Nar}} \text{NO}_3^- \xrightarrow{\text{NirS}} \text{NO} \xrightarrow{\text{cNor}} \text{N}_2\text{O} \xrightarrow{\text{NosZ}} \text{N}_2$$

In response to impending anoxic conditions, the organism sustains respiratory metabolism by producing the membrane-bound cytoplasmic nitrate reductase (nNar), cytochrome $cd_1$ nitrite reductase (NirS), cytochrome $c$ dependent nitric oxide reductase (cNor), and nitrous oxide reductase (NosZ). Transcription of the genes encoding these reductases ($narG$, $nirS$, $norBC$, and $nosZ$, respectively) are regulated by the FNR-type proteins FnRP, NarR, and NNR. FnRP contains a 4Fe-4S cluster for sensing $\text{O}_2$, and NNR harbours a NO-sensing haem; NarR, however, is poorly characterised and is most likely a $\text{NO}_3^-$-sensor (19-21). All these sensors remain inactive during aerobic growth conditions (19).

**Transcription of denitrification genes in *Pa. denitrificans***. FnRP/NarR and NNR facilitate a product-induced transcription of the *nar* and *nirS* genes, respectively (Fig. 1, see P$_1$ and P$_2$): Low oxygen concentration ([O$_2$]) activates the self-regulating FnRP, which induces *nar* transcription in coaction with NarR. The self-regulating NarR is activated by $\text{NO}_3^-$ [and/or, probably, by $\text{NO}_3^-$ (21)]; thus once a cell starts producing traces of $\text{NO}_3^-$, *nar* expression becomes autocatalytic. Transcription of *nirS* is induced by NNR, which is apparently inactivated by $\text{O}_2$ (22, 23), but under anoxic/micro-anoxic conditions, NNR is activated by NO. Thus, once traces of NO are produced, the expression of *nirS* also becomes autocatalytic (19, 20). In contrast, *nor* transcription is substrate (NO) induced via NNR while *nosZ* is equally induced by NNR or FnRP (24). High concentrations of NO may constrain *nar* transcription by inactivating FnRP (20) and, like $\text{O}_2$, render NosZ dysfunctional by inactivating the Cu$_2$ subunit...
of the reductase (25), but these observations are ignored in our model because *Pa. denitrificans* restrict [NO] to very low levels.

**Entrapment of cells in anoxia: the underlying hypothesis and modelling**

Denitrification proteome, once produced in response to an anoxic spell, is likely to linger within the cells under subsequent oxic conditions, ready to be used if anoxia recurs. But the proteome will be diluted by aerobic growth because the transcription of denitrification genes is inactivated under oxic conditions (20). Hence, a population growing through many generations under fully oxic conditions is expected to undertake *de novo* synthesis of denitrification enzymes when confronted with anoxia. Batch cultivations of such aerobically raised *Pa. denitrificans* provided indirect evidence for a novel claim that, in response to anoxia, only a small fraction of the incubated population is able to produce denitrification proteome (8, 17, 26, 27). Our dynamic modelling of Bergaust et al.’s (17) NO$_2^-$-supplemented incubations corroborated this, suggesting that a probabilistic function (specific probability = 0.005 h$^{-1}$) resulting in the recruitment of 3.8–16.1% of all cells to denitrification is adequate to explain the measured N$_2$ kinetics (16).

![Fig. 1. Regulatory network of denitrification in *Pa. denitrificans*. The network is driven by four core enzyme-complexes: nNar (transmembrane nitrate reductase encoded by the *narG* gene), NarR (activator), nirS (activator), and NNR (activator).](image-url)
gene), NirS (cytochrome cd₂ nitrite reductase encoded by nirS), cNor (NO reductase encoded by norBC), and NosZ (N₂O reductase encoded by nosZ). When anoxia is imminent, the low [O₂] is sensed by FnRP, which in some interplay with NarR (a NO⁻ sensor) induces nar transcription. NarR is activated by NO²⁻; thus once a cell starts producing traces of NO⁻, nar expression becomes autocatalytic (see P₁). Transcription of nirS is induced by NNR (a NO sensor), activated under anoxic/micro-anoxic conditions by NO; thus once traces of NO are produced, the expression of nirS also becomes autocatalytic (see P₂) (20). The activated P₂ will also induce nor and nosZ transcription via NNR. The transcription of nosZ, however, can also be induced equally and independently by FnRP (24).

Our model was based on the hypothesis that the entrapment of a large fraction in anoxia is due to a low probability of initiating nirS transcription, which in response to O₂ depletion is possibly mediated through a minute pool of intact NNR, crosstalk with other factors (such as FnRP), unspecific reduction of NO₂⁻ to NO by Nar, and/or through non-biologically formed traces of NO found in a NO₂⁻-supplemented medium. Regardless of the exact mechanism(s), once nirS transcription is initiated, the positive feedback via NO/NNR (Fig. 1, see P₂) would allow the product of a single transcript of nirS to induce a subsequent burst of nirS transcription. The activated positive feedback will also help induce nor and nosZ transcription via NNR, rapidly transforming a cell into a full-fledged denitrifier. We further hypothesised that recruitment to denitrification will only be possible as long as a minimum of O₂ is available because, since Pa. denitrificans is non-fermentative, the synthesis of first molecules of NirS will depend on energy from aerobic respiration.

The above hypothesis was modelled by segregating the culture into two pools (subpopulations): one for the cells without (N₀₋) and the other with denitrification enzymes (N₀₊). Initially, all cells were N₀₋, growing by consuming O₂. As [O₂] fell below a certain threshold, N₀₋ recruited to N₀₊ with a constant probability (h⁻¹), assumed to be that of the nirS transcriptional activation, and the recruitment halted as O₂ was completely exhausted, assuming lack of energy (ATP) for enzyme synthesis.
Underlying assumptions and aims of the present modelling

Fig. 2. A stock and flow diagram illustrating the model's structure. A. Cell diversification and growth; B. O₂ kinetics; C. Denitrification kinetics. The squares represent the state variables, the circles the rate of change in the state variables, the shaded ovals the auxiliary variables, the arrows dependencies between the variables, and the edges (thicker arrows) represent flows into or out of the state variables. All feedback relationships among the three model sectors could not be shown; however, for illustration the feedback relationships of one sub-population (Z⁻) are shown (dashed arrows). Within each state variable, t₀ refers to its initial value.

The present model is an extension of that developed in Hassan et al. (16). Here we have divided the respiring culture into four pools (Fig. 2A):
1. $Z^{-}$: cells without Nar, NirS, and cNor
2. $Z^{Na}$: cells with Nar
3. $Z^{NaNi}$: cells with Nar, NirS, and cNor
4. $Z^{Ni}$: cells with NirS and cNor

All these subpopulations are assumed to scavenge $O_2$ (if present) and produce NosZ in response to impending anoxia. The latter because the nosZ genes are readily induced by the $O_2$-sensor FnrP (24).

The $Z^{-}$ pool (Fig. 2A) contains the inoculum that grows by aerobic respiration. As $[O_2]$ falls below a critical threshold (empirically determined, 18), the cells within $Z^{-}$ are assumed to start synthesising Nar with a certain probability and populate the $Z^{Na}$ pool. The aim is to investigate whether, like for nirS, the initiation of nar transcription (by some mutually dependent activity of FnrP and NarR) can also be explained as a probabilistic phenomenon, quickly differentiating a cell into a full-fledged NO$_2^-$ scavenger through product (NO$_2^-$) induced transcription via NarR (Fig. 1, see P$_1$). If so, we were interested to estimate what fraction of the cells is required to adequately simulate the measured data (NO$_2^-$ production), aiming at scrutinising the general assumption that all cells in such populations produce Nar in response to impending anoxia.

Next, when $[O_2]$ is further depleted to another critical threshold (18), the $Z^{-}$ and $Z^{Na}$ cells are assumed to initiate nirS transcription with a low per hour probability and, thereby, populate the $Z^{Ni}$ and $Z^{NaNi}$ pools, respectively. As explained above for our previous model, NirS + cNor production is assumed to be a) coordinated because the transcription of both nirS and nor is induced by NO via the NO-sensor NNR (Fig. 1), and b) stochastic because the initial transcription of nirS (paving the way for the autocatalytic expression of NirS and substrate-induced nor transcription) happens in the absence of NO or at too low [NO] to be sensed by NNR.

Synthesis of denitrification enzymes requires energy, which all the subpopulations can obtain by respiration only. Hence, the initiation of the autocatalytic expression of nar and nirS (i.e., recruitment to $Z^{Na}$ and $Z^{NaNi}/Z^{Ni}$, respectively, Fig. 2A) depends on the availability of the relevant terminal e$^-$-acceptor(s) above a critical concentration to sustain a minimum of
respiration. For $Z^-$, the only relevant e-acceptors are O$_2$ and the traces of N$_2$O produced by $Z^{Ni}$ and $Z^{NaNi}$. The same applies for $Z^{Na}$, but in addition, this subpopulation can also obtain energy by reducing NO$_3^-$, if present. In our previous model (16), we assumed that recruitment to denitrification was sustained by energy from O$_2$-respiration only, not NO$_3^-$ because we simulated NO$_2^-$-supplemented treatments and not by N$_2$O because we naively assumed that the pool of this e-acceptor was insignificant (N$_2$O concentrations were below the detection limit of the system used for those experiments). However, the present model assumes that the recruitment from $Z^-$ to $Z^{Na}$ and $Z^-$ to $Z^{Ni}$ is sustained by both O$_2$- and N$_2$O-reduction, and the recruitment from $Z^{Na}$ to $Z^{NaNi}$ is sustained by O$_2$-, N$_2$O- and NO$_3^-$-reduction, when above a critical minimum ($v_{e_{min}}^-$. The default value for $v_{e_{min}}^-$ was set to an arbitrary low value (≈ 0.44% of maximum e-flow rate to O$_2$), and we have investigated the consequences of increasing, decreasing, and setting $v_{e_{min}}^- = 0$.

The expressions of $nar$ and $nirS + nor$ (recruitments to $Z^{Na}$ and $Z^{NaNi}/Z^{Ni}$, respectively, Fig. 2A) are modelled as instantaneous discrete-events in each cell, thus ignoring the time-lag from the initiation of gene transcription till the cell is fully equipped with the reductase(s) in question. That is because the lag observed between the emergence of denitrification gene transcripts and the subsequent gas products suggests that the synthesis of denitrification enzymes takes less than half an hour (17, 18), which is negligible for the purposes of our modelling.

The main purpose of the present modelling is to investigate if a full-fledged model including all four functional denitrification reductases could adequately simulate the observed kinetics and stoichiometry of denitrification in a medium supplemented with NO$_3^-$. In particular, we were interested in the NO$_2^-$ kinetics as controlled by $nar$- and $nir$ transcription and to test if the peculiar N$_2$O kinetics (low, but increasing concentrations throughout the anoxic phase) could be explained by our modelled cell diversification.
Materials and Methods

An overview of the modelled experiment

Batch incubation. Qu et al. (18) incubated Pa. denitrificans (DSM-413) at 20 °C, using 50 mL Sistrom’s (28) medium in 120 mL gas-tight vials. Either succinate or butyrate (5 mM) was used as the main carbon source, enough to secure consumption of all available e’-acceptors. After distribution of the medium, each vial was loaded with a magnetic stirring bar, sterilised through autoclaving, supplemented with 2 mM KNO$_3$ and tightly sealed. To remove O$_2$ and N$_2$ from the headspace, the headspace air was evacuated and replaced by helium (He) through cycles of evacuation and He-filling (He-washing). Some vials were supplemented with oxygen to reach 7 vol.% O$_2$ in headspace (treatment designated 7% O$_2$). The remaining vials received no O$_2$ (designated 0% O$_2$, although there were traces of O$_2$ present, despite the He washing). For each treatment (i.e., C source and initial O$_2$), there were three replicates, and each vial was inoculated with $2.2 \times 10^8$ aerobically grown cells.

NO$_3^-$ and gas measurement. Gases (CO$_2$, O$_2$, NO, N$_2$O, and N$_2$) were monitored by frequent sampling of the headspace, using an improved version of the robotised incubation system described by Molstad et al. (29). In short, the system draws gas samples from the headspace (peristaltic pumping) via the septum (pierced by a needle), filling three loops that are used to inject samples to the two GC columns and the chemiluminescence analyser for the determination of NO. The sample drawn is replaced by He (reversing the peristaltic pump), thus securing ~1 atm pressure. The primary improvements of the new system are a more sensitive detection of N$_2$O (by an electron capture detector), lower sampling volumes (~1 mL), and lower leaks of O$_2$ and N$_2$ through the sampling system (4 nmol O$_2$ and 12 nmol N$_2$ per sampling, which is ~20% of that for the old system).

To extract samples for measuring NO$_3^-$ without tampering the original vials, identical (parallel) vials were prepared for each treatment. Using sterile syringes, samples of 0.1 mL were regularly drawn from the liquid-phase of the parallel vials and immediately analysed for NO$_3^-$.
The model

The model is constructed in Vensim DSS 6.2 Double Precision (Ventana Systems, inc. http://vensim.com/) using techniques from the field of system dynamics (30).

Cell diversification and growth. The respiring population is divided into four subpopulations, according to their reductases (Fig. 2A): 1) \( Z^- \): cells without Nar, NirS, and \( \text{cNor} \); 2) \( Z^{Na} \): cells with Nar; 3) \( Z^{NaNi} \): cells with Nar, NirS, and \( \text{cNor} \); and 4) \( Z^{Ni} \): cells with NirS and \( \text{cNor} \). All the subpopulations are assumed to equally respire \( \text{O}_2 \), if present, and express \( \text{nosZ} \) in response to oxygen depletion (24). \( Z^- \) contains the inoculum (= \( 2.2 \times 10^8 \) cells) that grows by aerobic respiration. As \( \text{O}_2 \) is depleted, the \( Z^- \) cells populate the other pools by producing Nar and/or NirS + \( \text{cNor} \).

The recruitment from \( Z^- \) to \( Z^{Na} \) (\( R_{Na} \), Fig. 2A) takes place first:

\[
R_{Na} = Z^- \times r_{Na}(O_2, N_2O) \tag{1}
\]

(cells h\(^{-1}\))

where \( r_{Na}(O_2, N_2O) \) is a conditional specific probability (h\(^{-1}\)) for any \( Z^- \) cell to initiate \( \text{nar} \) transcription (quickly transforming a cell into a \( \text{NO}_3^- \) scavenger through autocatalytic gene expression, see Fig. 1, P_1):

\[
r_{Na}(O_2, N_2O) =
\begin{align*}
\text{IF} & \quad [O_2]_{aq} < [O_2]_{na} \quad \text{AND} \quad \left( v_{O_2}^- + 0.5 \times v_{N_2O}^- \right) > v_{min}^- \\
\text{THEN} & \quad r_{Na} \\
\text{ELSE} & \quad 0
\end{align*} \tag{2}
\]

(h\(^{-1}\))

where \( r_{Na} \) (h\(^{-1}\)) is a constant specific probability for a cell to initiate \( \text{nar} \) transcription once \( \text{O}_2 \) concentration in the aqueous-phase ([\( O_2 \] \(_{aq}\), mol L\(^{-1}\)) falls below a critical concentration ([\( O_2 \] \(_{na}\)), empirically determined as the \( [O_2]_{aq} \) (= \( 4.75 \times 10^{-5} \) mol L\(^{-1}\)) at the outset of \( \text{NO}_3^- \) accumulation in the medium (18). The second condition for a cell to produce first molecules...
of Nar is a minimum of e–-flow to an e–-acceptor (\( v_{e_{\text{min}}} \), mol e– cell\(^{-1}\) h\(^{-1}\)), assumed to generate minimum ATP required for protein synthesis. \( v_{e_{\text{O}_2}} \) and \( v_{e_{\text{N}_2\text{O}}} \) (mol e– cell\(^{-1}\) h\(^{-1}\)) are the cell-specific velocities of e–-flow to \( \text{O}_2 \) and \( \text{N}_2\text{O} \), respectively. The latter is weighed down by 0.5 because mole ATP per mole e– transferred to \( \text{NO}_x^-/\text{NO}_x \) is lower for denitrification than for aerobic respiration (17, 20). For a \( \text{Z}^- \) cell, \( v_{e_{\text{NO}_2}}^- \) and \( v_{e_{\text{NO}}}^- \) are not considered here, since such a cell is assumed to have no NirS and cNor.

The fraction of the cells that successfully produces Nar (\( F_{\text{Na}} \)) is calculated based on the integral of the recruitment (Eq. 1):

\[
F_{\text{Na}} = 1 - e^{-r_{\text{Na}} \times t_{\text{Na}}} \tag{3}
\]

(dimensionless)

where \( t_{\text{Na}} \) is the time-window available for the recruitment. In theory, \( t_{\text{Na}} \) is the time-period when \([\text{O}_2]_{\text{aq}} < [\text{O}_2]_{\text{na}} \) \ AND \ (\( v_{e_{\text{O}_2}}^- + 0.5 \times v_{e_{\text{N}_2\text{O}}}^- > v_{e_{\text{min}}}^- \)) (Eq. 2), thus including the recruitment to \( Z^{\text{Na}} \) after the depletion of \( \text{NO}_x^- \) (the recruitment based on \( v_{e_{\text{N}_2\text{O}}}^- \) starts after \( \text{NO}_x^- \) is depleted). However, the recruitment after the \( \text{NO}_x^- \) depletion would be inconsequential for the simulated (and measured) \( \text{NO}_x^- \) kinetics. To calculate the functional \( F_{\text{Na}} \) actually responsible for producing \( \text{NO}_x^- \), we ignored the \( \text{N}_2\text{O} \)-sustained recruitment, thus considering \( t_{\text{Na}} \) as the time when \([\text{O}_2]_{\text{aq}} < [\text{O}_2]_{\text{na}} \) \ AND \ \( v_{e_{\text{O}_2}}^- > v_{e_{\text{min}}}^- \).

Next, the cells within \( Z^{\text{Na}} \) and \( Z^- \) are recruited to \( Z^{\text{NaNi}} \) and \( Z^\text{Ni} \) (\( R_{\text{NaNi}} \) and \( R_{\text{Ni}} \), respectively, Fig. 2A), as they are assumed to stochastically initiate nirS transcription, paving the way for NO/NNR mediated autocatalytic expression of \( \text{nirS} + \text{nor} \) (Fig. 1). In principle, the rates of both these recruitments are modelled as that of the recruitment from \( Z^- \) to \( Z^{\text{Na}} \) (Eqs. 1–2): a) Both trigger as \( \text{O}_2 \) falls below another critical concentration ([\( \text{O}_2 \)\(_{\text{ni}} \)]) , low enough to activate NNR to induce nirS transcription; \( [\text{O}_2]_{\text{ni}} = 1.16 \times 10^{-5} \text{ mol L}^{-1} \) is empirically determined as the \( \text{O}_2 \) concentration at the outset of NO accumulation (18). b) Both continue as long as a minimum
of e⁻-flow to the relevant terminal e⁻-acceptor is possible, sustaining the respiratory metabolism to generate ATP for protein synthesis:

$$R_{\text{NaNi}} = Z^Na \times r_{\text{Ni}}(O_2, NO_3^-, N_2O)$$

(cells h⁻¹)

$$r_{\text{Ni}}(O_2, NO_3^-, N_2O) =$$

$$\text{IF } [O_2]_{aq} < [O_2]_{ni} \text{ AND } \left( v_{O_2}^- + 0.5 \times v_{NO_3^-}^- + 0.5 \times v_{N_2O^-}^- \right) > v_{\text{min}}^-$$

THEN $$r_{\text{Ni}}$$

ELSE 0

(h⁻¹)

where $$v_{NO_3^-}^-$$ and $$v_{N_2O^-}^-$$ are multiplied with 0.5 as in Eq. 2, and $$r_{\text{Ni}}$$ is a constant specific probability (h⁻¹) for the initiation of nirS transcription.

The recruitment from $$Z^-$$ to $$Z^Ni$$ ($$R_{\text{Ni}}$$, Fig. 2A) is modelled as a product of $$Z^-$$ and a conditional specific probability, $$r_{\text{Ni}}(O_2, N_2O)$$, which is different from Eq. 5 only in that $$v_{NO_3^-}^-$$ is omitted, since $$Z^-$$ do not possess Nar:

$$R_{\text{Ni}} = Z^- x r_{\text{Ni}}(O_2, N_2O)$$

(cells h⁻¹)

$$r_{\text{Ni}}(O_2, N_2O) =$$

$$\text{IF } [O_2]_{aq} < [O_2]_{ni} \text{ AND } \left( v_{O_2}^- + 0.5 \times v_{N_2O^-}^- \right) > v_{\text{min}}^-$$

THEN $$r_{\text{Ni}}$$

ELSE 0

(h⁻¹)

The fraction that successfully produced NirS + cNor ($$F_{\text{Ni}}$$) is calculated based on the integral of $$R_{\text{NaNi}}$$ and $$R_{\text{Ni}}$$:
$$F_{Ni} = \left(1 - e^{-\frac{t_{NaNi}}{t_{Na}}} \right) \times F_{Na} + \left(1 - e^{-\frac{t_{Ni}}{t_{Ni}}} \right) \times (1 - F_{Na})$$  \hspace{1cm} (8)

where $t_{NaNi}$ is the duration of the recruitment from $Z_{Na}$ to $Z_{NaNi}$, i.e., when $[O_2]_{aq} < [O_2]_{ni \text{ AND}}(ve_{O_2}^- + 0.5\times ve_{NO_3}^- + 0.5\times ve_{N_2O}^-) > ve_{min}^-$ (Eqs. 4–5), $F_{Na}$ is the fraction recruited to the pool of Nar positive cells ($Z_{Na}$, Eq. 3), and $t_{Ni}$ is the duration of the recruitment from $Z^{-}$ to $Z_{Ni}$, i.e., when $[O_2]_{aq} < [O_2]_{ni \text{ AND}}(ve_{O_2}^- + 0.5\times ve_{N_2O}^-) > ve_{min}^-$ (Eqs. 6–7).

Each of the populations will grow depending on the rates of e- flow to the various e-acceptors they are able to use:

$$G_{Z^-} = Z^- \times \left( Ye_{O_2}^- \times ve_{O_2}^- + Ye_{NO_3}^- \times ve_{N_2O}^- \right)$$  \hspace{1cm} (9)

$$G_{Z^{Na}} = Z^{Na} \times \left[ Ye_{O_2}^- \times ve_{O_2}^- + Ye_{NO_3}^- \left( ve_{NO_3 res}^- + ve_{N_2O}^- \right) \right]$$  \hspace{1cm} (10)

$$G_{Z^{NaNi}} = Z^{NaNi} \times \left[ Ye_{O_2}^- \times ve_{O_2}^- + Ye_{NO_3}^- \left( ve_{NO_3 res}^- + ve_{NO res}^- + ve_{NO}^- + ve_{N_2O}^- \right) \right]$$  \hspace{1cm} (11)

$$G_{Z^{Ni}} = Z^{Ni} \times \left[ Ye_{O_2}^- \times ve_{O_2}^- + Ye_{NO_3}^- \left( ve_{NO_3 res}^- + ve_{NO res}^- + ve_{NO}^- + ve_{N_2O}^- \right) \right]$$  \hspace{1cm} (12)

(cells h$^{-1}$)

where $Ye^{-}_X$ (cells mol$^{-1}$ e- to X = O$_2$ or NO$_x$ / NO$_x$) is the growth yield determined under the actual experimental conditions, and $ve^{-}_X$ (mol e·cell$^{-1}$ h$^{-1}$) is the cell-specific velocity of e- flow to X (O$_2$ or NO$_x$ / NO$_x$), which depends on the concentration of the e- acceptor (see Eqs. 17, 20, and 28). For NO$_3^{-}$ and NO$_2^{-}$, a restricted velocity ($ve_{NO res}^-$) is used so that when electrons flow to O$_2$, NO$_3^{-}$, and NO$_2^{-}$ simultaneously, the total $ve^{-}$ per cell does not exceed the maximum electrons that the TCA cycle ($ve_{max TCA}^-$) can deliver per hour (see Eqs. 21–22).
**O₂ kinetics.** O₂ is initially present in the headspace (O₂,g, mol, initialised according to the experiment, see Table 1) but is transported to the liquid-phase (O₂,aq) due to its consumption therein (Fig. 2B). The transport rate (TrO₂) is modelled according to Molstad et al. (29):

\[
TrO₂ = k_t \left( k_{H(O₂)} \times P_{O₂} - [O₂]_{L,P} \right)
\]  

(mol h⁻¹)

where \( k_t \) (L h⁻¹) is the empirically determined coefficient for the transport of gas between the headspace and the liquid, \( k_{H(O₂)} \) (mol L⁻¹ atm⁻¹) is the solubility of O₂ in water at 20 °C, \( P_{O₂} \) (=O₂,g × R × T, atm) is the partial pressure of O₂ in the headspace, and \([O₂]_{aq}\) (mol L⁻¹) is the O₂ concentration in the liquid ([O₂]aq = \( \frac{O₂_{aq}}{V_{aq}} \)).

**Table 1. Simulated experiment (18).**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Batch</th>
<th>C-source</th>
<th>O₂,t (vol.%)*</th>
<th>NO₃,t (mM)</th>
<th>Replicates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Butyrate</td>
<td>~0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Butyrate</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Succinate</td>
<td>~0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Succinate</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Target values for initial O₂ concentrations in the headspace (vol.%). ~0 means that the intended concentration should be zero, but there were detectable traces of O₂, despite several cycles of evacuation and He-flushing of the headspace.

In addition, the model simulates the changes in O₂,g due to sampling. The robotised incubation system used monitors gas concentrations by sampling the headspace, where each sampling alters the concentrations in a predictable manner: a fraction of O₂,g is removed and replaced by He (dilution), but the sampling also results in a marginal leakage of O₂ through the tubing and membranes in the injection system. The net change in O₂,g (\( \Delta O₂(g) \)) as a result of each sampling is calculated as:

\[
\Delta O₂(g) = \frac{O_{\text{leak}} - O₂,g \times D_{t}}{t_s}
\]

(mol h⁻¹)
where $O_{\text{leak}}$ (mol vial$^{-1}$) is the $O_2$ leakage into the headspace, $D$ (dilution) is the fraction of each headspace gas replaced by He, and $t_s$ (h) is the time taken to complete each sampling. $\Delta O_{2(g)}$ is negative if $O_{2g}$ is high and marginally positive at very low oxygen concentrations.

$O_2$ in the liquid-phase ($O_{2\text{aq}}$, mol, Fig. 2B) is initialised by assuming equilibrium with $O_{2g}$ at the time of inoculation ($O_{2\text{aq}}(t_o) = P_{O_2} \times k_{H(O_2)} \times Vol_{\text{aq}}$). The dynamics of $O_{2\text{aq}}$ are modelled as a function of transport between the headspace and the liquid ($Tr_{O_2}$, Eq. 13) and its reduction rate ($Rr_{O_2}$, mol h$^{-1}$):

\[
\frac{d(O_{2\text{aq}})}{dt} = Tr_{O_2} - Rr_{O_2} \tag{15}
\]

\[
Rr_{O_2} = \left(Z^- + Z^{Na} + Z^{NaNi} + Z^{Ni}\right) \times V_{O_2} \tag{16}
\]

(mol h$^{-1}$)

where $Z^-$, $Z^{Na}$, $Z^{NaNi}$, and $Z^{Ni}$ (cells) are all the sub-populations present (described above); thus, we assume that all cells have the same potential to consume $O_2$. $V_{O_2}$ (mol cell$^{-1}$ h$^{-1}$) is the cell-specific velocity of $O_2$ consumption, obtained by the velocity of $e^-$-flow to $O_2$ ($\left(\frac{v^e_{O_2} \text{ mol e}^-}{1 \text{ mol O}_2}, \frac{1 \text{ mol O}_2}{4 \text{ mol e}^-}\right)$, where $v^e_{O_2}$ is modelled as a Michaelis-Menten function of oxygen concentration:

\[
v^e_{O_2} = \frac{v_{\text{max}O_2} \times [O_{2\text{aq}}]}{K_{mO_2} + [O_{2\text{aq}}]} \tag{17}
\]

(mol e$^-$ cell$^{-1}$ h$^{-1}$)

where $v_{\text{max}O_2}$ (mol e$^-$ cell$^{-1}$ h$^{-1}$) is the maximum velocity of $e^-$-flow to $O_2$ per cell (determined under the actual experimental conditions), $[O_{2\text{aq}}]$ (mol L$^{-1}$) is the $O_2$ concentration in the liquid-phase, and $K_{mO_2}$ (mol L$^{-1}$) is the half-saturation constant for $O_2$ reduction.
Denitrification kinetics. The pool of $\text{NO}_3^-$ (mol, Fig. 2C) is initialised according to the experiment (Table 1) and that of $\text{NO}_2^-$ = 0. The kinetics of these nitrogen oxyanions ($\text{NO}_x^-$) are modelled as:

\[
\frac{d(\text{NO}_3^-)}{dt} = -R_{\text{NO}_3} = -\left(Z^{\text{Na}} + Z^{\text{NaNi}}\right) \times v_{\text{NO}_3^-} \quad (18)
\]

\[
\frac{d(\text{NO}_2^-)}{dt} = R_{\text{NO}_2} - R_{\text{NO}_3} = R_{\text{NO}_2} - \left(Z^{\text{NaNi}} + Z^{\text{Ni}}\right) \times v_{\text{NO}_2^-} \quad (19)
\]

(mol h$^{-1}$)

where $R_{\text{NO}_x^-}$ (mol h$^{-1}$) is the reduction rate, $Z^{\text{Na}} + Z^{\text{NaNi}}$ (cells) is the total number of cells with Nar, $Z^{\text{NaNi}} + Z^{\text{Ni}}$ (cells) is the total NirS active population, and $v_{\text{NO}_x^-}$ (mol cell$^{-1}$ h$^{-1}$) is the cell-specific velocity of $\text{NO}_x^-$ consumption, obtained by the velocity of e$^-$-flow to $\text{NO}_x^-$.

\[
\left(\frac{1 \text{ mol NO}_3^-}{2 \text{ mol e}^-} \text{ & } \frac{1 \text{ mol NO}_2^-}{1 \text{ mol e}^-}\right)
\]

The latter is modelled as a Michaelis-Menten function of $\text{NO}_x^-$ concentration:

\[
v_{e^-_{\text{NO}_x^-}} = \frac{v_{e^-_{\max \text{NO}_x^-}} \times [\text{NO}_x^-]_{\text{aq}}}{K_{m\text{NO}_x^-} + [\text{NO}_x^-]_{\text{aq}}} \quad (20)
\]

(mol e$^-$ cell$^{-1}$ h$^{-1}$)

where $v_{e^-_{\max \text{NO}_x^-}}$ (mol e$^-$ cell$^{-1}$ h$^{-1}$) is the maximum velocity of e$^-$-flow to $\text{NO}_x^-$ per cell (determined under the actual experimental conditions), $[\text{NO}_x^-]_{\text{aq}}$ (mol L$^{-1}$) is the $\text{NO}_x^-$ concentration in the aqueous-phase, and $K_{m\text{NO}_x^-}$ (mol L$^{-1}$) is the half-saturation constant for $\text{NO}_x^-$ reduction.

The velocity of $\text{NO}_3^-$ and $\text{NO}_2^-$ consumption had to be restricted ($v_{e^-_{\text{NO}_3,\text{NO}_2^-}}$) to ensure that when electrons flow to $\text{O}_2$, $\text{NO}_3^-$, and $\text{NO}_2^-$ simultaneously, the total e$^-$ per cell does not exceed
an estimated maximum delivery of electrons from the TCA cycle \( (v_{e_{\text{maxTCA}}}^-) \). In competition for electrons, \( O_2 \) is prioritised \((20)\), followed by \( NO_3^- \) and \( NO_2^- \), respectively \((18)\):

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ve}^-_{\text{NO}_3\text{res}} &= \text{Min} \left( \text{ve}^-_{\text{NO}_3}, \left( \text{ve}_{\text{maxTCA}}^- - \text{ve}^-_{O_2} \right) \right) \\
\text{ve}^-_{\text{NO}_2\text{res}} &= \text{Min} \left( \text{ve}^-_{\text{NO}_2}, \left( \text{ve}_{\text{maxTCA}}^- - \text{ve}^-_{O_2} - \text{ve}^-_{\text{NO}_3\text{res}} \right) \right)
\end{align*}
\]

(mol e\textsuperscript{-} cell\textsuperscript{-1} h\textsuperscript{-1})

where \( ve^-_{\text{NO}_3\text{res}} \) is the realised e\textsuperscript{-} flow to \( NO_3^- \), limited either by available \( NO_3^- \) or the availability of electrons (due to competition with \( O_2 \)); \( ve^-_{\text{NO}_2\text{res}} \) is the realised e\textsuperscript{-} flow to \( NO_2^- \).

Such competition for electrons was not implemented for \( ve^-_{\text{NO}} \) and \( ve^-_{N_2O} \) because at the onset of NO- and N\textsubscript{2}O production (hence reduction), the total velocity of e\textsuperscript{-} flow to all available e\textsuperscript{-} acceptors (as predicted by the enzyme kinetics alone) never exceeded \( ve^-_{\text{maxTCA}} \).

Gas consumption and production takes place in the aqueous phase, but the gases are transported between the aqua and the headspace depending on their concentrations in the two phases. Each gas in the aqua, \( X_{aq} \) (molN, Fig. 2C), is modelled as a function of production, consumption (not applicable to \( N_2 \)), and the net transport, where \( N_2O_{aq} \) and \( N_2_{aq} \) are initialised with zero, and \( NO_{aq} \) is initialised with a negligible \( 1 \times 10^{-25} \) mol to avoid division by zero (in Eq. 28).

\[
\begin{align*}
\frac{d(NO_{aq})}{dt} &= R_{NO_{aq}}^- - R_{NO}^- + Tr_{NO}^-
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\frac{d(N_2O_{aq})}{dt} &= R_{N_2O}^- - R_{N_2O}^- + Tr_{N_2O}^-
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\frac{d(N_2_{aq})}{dt} &= R_{N_2O}^- + Tr_{N_2}^-
\end{align*}
\]

(molN h\textsuperscript{-1})
where $R_{NOx}$ (molN h^{-1}) is the relevant NO$_x$/NO$_x$ reduction rate, and $T_{Nx}$ represents the gas transport rate between the aqua and the headspace (Eq. 29; NB: $T_{Nx} < 0$ for the net transport from aqua to the headspace).

The reduction of NO to N$_2$O ($R_{NO}$) and N$_2$O to N$_2$ ($R_{N2O}$) is modelled likewise as a function of the number of relevant cells and the velocity of e$^-$-flow to NO and N$_2$O (mol e$^-$ cell$^{-1}$ h$^{-1}$), respectively:

$$R_{NO} = (Z^{NaNi} + Z^{Ni}) \times v_{NO}$$  \hspace{1cm} (26)

$$R_{N2O} = (Z^- + Z^{Na} + Z^{NaNi} + Z^{Ni}) \times v_{N2O}$$  \hspace{1cm} (27)

(molN h^{-1})

where $v_{NO}$ and $v_{N2O}$ are obtained by the velocity of e$^-$-flow to NO and N$_2$O, respectively

$$v_{nO} = \left(\frac{1}{molN \text{ mole}^{-1}}\right) \cdot v_{nO}^-$$ is modelled as a Michaelis-Menten function of [N$_2$O], similarly as that of O$_2$, NO$_3^-$, and NO$_2^-$ (Eqs. 17 and 20), but $v_{nO}^-$ is modelled assuming a cooperative binding of two NO molecules with cNor to form N$_2$O (31):

$$v_{nO}^- = \frac{v_{max\text{NO}}^-}{1 + K_{1\text{NO}} \left(\frac{1}{[NO]_{aq}} + \frac{K_{1\text{NO}}}{([NO]_{aq})^2}\right)}$$  \hspace{1cm} (28)

(mol cell$^{-1}$ h$^{-1}$)

where $v_{max\text{NO}}^-$ (mol e$^-$ cell$^{-1}$ h$^{-1}$) is the empirically determined maximum velocity of e$^-$-flow to NO per cell, $[NO]_{aq}$ (mol L$^{-1}$) is the NO concentration in the liquid-phase, and $K_{1\text{NO}}$ & $K_{2\text{NO}}$ (mol L$^{-1}$) are the equilibrium dissociation constants for the cNor/NO$^-$ and cNor/(NO)$^2$ complex, respectively.
The transport of NO\textsubscript{aq}, N\textsubscript{2}O\textsubscript{aq}, and N\textsubscript{2}\textsubscript{aq} between the liquid and the headspace (Eqs. 23–25) is modelled as:

\[ T_{RN} = k_t \times k_{h(N)} \times P_N - [N]_{aq} \]

\[ (\text{molN h}^{-1}) \]

where \( k_t \) is the empirically determined coefficient for the transport of each gas between the headspace and the liquid, \( k_{h(N)} \) (molN L\textsuperscript{-1} atm\textsuperscript{-1}) is the solubility of NO, N\textsubscript{2}O, or N\textsubscript{2} in water at 20 °C, \( P_N \) (molN L\textsuperscript{-1} atm) is the partial pressure of each gas in the headspace, and \([N]_{aq}\) (mol L\textsuperscript{-1}) represents the concentration of each gas in the liquid-phase.

The amount of NO and N\textsubscript{2}O in the headspace (NO\textsubscript{xg}, molN, Fig. 2C) is a function of transport (Eq. 29) and the disturbance by gas sampling, simulated as discrete events at time-points given as input to the model (equivalent to the sampling times in the experiment):

\[ \Delta \text{NO}_{x(S)} = \frac{\text{NO}_{xg} \times D}{t_s} \]

\[ (\text{molN h}^{-1}) \]

where \( \Delta \text{NO}_{x(S)} \) is the net change in the amount of NO\textsubscript{xg} (molN), \( D \) (dilution) is the fraction of each gas replaced by He, and \( t_s \) (h) is the time taken to complete each sampling. For N\textsubscript{2}, the model ignores the sampling loss because the experimental data on N\textsubscript{2} production to be compared with the model output are corrected for the sampling disturbance (29). Thus, the model estimates somewhat higher N\textsubscript{2} concentrations than that experienced by the organisms, which is acceptable, since the concentration of N\textsubscript{2} is unlikely to have consequences for the metabolism.

**Parameterisation**

Most of the parameter values used in the model are well established in the literature (see Table 2); however, uncertain parameters include \( K_{mO_2} \), \( K_{mN_2O} \), \( v_e^{\max O_2} \), and \( v_e^{\min} \).
### Table 2. Model parameters.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Butyrate treatments</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( v_e^-_{\text{maxTCA}} ) Max. cell-specific rate of e^-flow from the TCA cycle</td>
<td>( 1 \times 10^{14} )</td>
<td>mol e^- cell^-1 h^-1</td>
<td>(18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( v_e^-_{\text{maxO}_2} ) The maximum cell-specific velocity of e^-flow to O_2</td>
<td>( 4.22 \times 10^{-5} )</td>
<td>mol e^- cell^-1 h^-1</td>
<td>Optimisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( v_e^-_{\text{maxNO}_3^-} ) The maximum cell-specific velocity of e^-flow to NO_3^-</td>
<td>( 1 \times 10^{14} )</td>
<td>mol e^- cell^-1 h^-1</td>
<td>(18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( v_e^-_{\text{maxNO}_2^-} ) The maximum cell-specific velocity of e^-flow to NO_2^-</td>
<td>( 2.65 \times 10^{-5} )</td>
<td>mol e^- cell^-1 h^-1</td>
<td>(18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( v_e^-_{\text{min}} ) The min. velocity of e^-flow to O_2/NO_3^-/NO_2 required for protein synthesis (ATP)</td>
<td>( 1.87 \times 10^{-7} )</td>
<td>mol e^- cell^-1 h^-1</td>
<td>Assumption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( Y_{eO_2}^- ) The growth yield per mole of electrons transferred to O_2</td>
<td>( 2.74 \times 10^{13} )</td>
<td>cells (mol e^-)^1</td>
<td>(18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( Y_{eNO_x}^- ) The growth yield per mole e^- to NO_3^-, NO_2^-, NO, or N_2O</td>
<td>( 1.12 \times 10^{13} )</td>
<td>cells (mol e^-)^1</td>
<td>(18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Succinate treatments</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( v_e^-_{\text{maxTCA}} ) Max. cell-specific rate of e^-flow from the TCA cycle</td>
<td>( 9.34 \times 10^{-15} )</td>
<td>mol e^- cell^-1 h^-1</td>
<td>(18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( v_e^-_{\text{maxO}_2} ) The maximum cell-specific velocity of e^-flow to O_2</td>
<td>( 4.42 \times 10^{-5} )</td>
<td>mol e^- cell^-1 h^-1</td>
<td>(18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( v_e^-_{\text{maxNO}_3^-} ) The maximum cell-specific velocity of e^-flow to NO_3^-</td>
<td>( 9.34 \times 10^{-15} )</td>
<td>mol e^- cell^-1 h^-1</td>
<td>(18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( v_e^-_{\text{maxNO}_2^-} ) The maximum cell-specific velocity of e^-flow to NO_2^-</td>
<td>( 2.01 \times 10^{-15} )</td>
<td>mol e^- cell^-1 h^-1</td>
<td>(18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( v_e^-_{\text{min}} ) The minimum velocity of e^-flow to O_2/NO_3^-/NO_2 required for protein synthesis (ATP)</td>
<td>( 1.95 \times 10^{-7} )</td>
<td>mol e^- cell^-1 h^-1</td>
<td>Assumption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( Y_{eO_2}^- ) The growth yield per mole of electrons transferred to O_2</td>
<td>( 4.97 \times 10^{13} )</td>
<td>cells (mol e^-)^1</td>
<td>(18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( Y_{eNO_x}^- ) The growth yield per mole e^- to NO_3^-, NO_2^-, NO, or N_2O</td>
<td>( 1.52 \times 10^{13} )</td>
<td>cells (mol e^-)^1</td>
<td>(18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parameters common for both succinate and butyrate treatments</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>([O_2]_{Na} ) The [O_2] in aqua below which Nar production triggers</td>
<td>( 5.95 \times 10^{-5} )</td>
<td>mol L^-1</td>
<td>(18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>([O_2]_{Ni} ) The [O_2] in aqua below which NirS production triggers</td>
<td>( 9.75 \times 10^{-6} )</td>
<td>mol L^-1</td>
<td>(18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( r_{Na} ) The specific-probability of producing Nar</td>
<td>( 0.035 )</td>
<td>h^-1</td>
<td>Optimisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( r_{Ni} ) The specific-probability of producing NirS</td>
<td>( 0.004 )</td>
<td>h^-1</td>
<td>Optimisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( v_e^-_{\text{maxNO}} ) The maximum cell-specific velocity of e^-flow to NO</td>
<td>( 3.56 \times 10^{-15} )</td>
<td>mol e^- cell^-1 h^-1</td>
<td>(32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( v_e^-_{\text{maxN}_2O} ) The maximum cell-specific velocity of e^-flow to N_2O</td>
<td>( 5.5 \times 10^{-15} )</td>
<td>mol e^- cell^-1 h^-1</td>
<td>(24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( K_{mO_2} ) The half-saturation constant for O_2 reduction</td>
<td>( 2.25 \times 10^{-7} )</td>
<td>mol L^-1</td>
<td>Optimisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( K_{mNO}_3^- ) The half-saturation constant for NO_3^- reduction</td>
<td>( 5 \times 10^{-6} )</td>
<td>mol L^-1</td>
<td>(33, 34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( K_{mNO}_2^- ) The half-saturation constant for NO_2^- reduction</td>
<td>( 4.13 \times 10^{-6} )</td>
<td>mol L^-1</td>
<td>(35, 36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( K_{sNO} ) The equilibrium dissociation constant for cNir/NO complex</td>
<td>( 8 \times 10^{-14} )</td>
<td>mol L^-1</td>
<td>(32)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$K_{2NO}$</td>
<td>The equilibrium dissociation constant for cNor/(NO)$_2$ complex</td>
<td>$34 \times 10^{-9}$</td>
<td>mol L$^{-1}$</td>
<td>(32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$K_{mN_2O}$</td>
<td>The half-saturation constant for N$_2$O reduction</td>
<td>$5.93 \times 10^{-7}$</td>
<td>mol N$_2$O L$^{-1}$</td>
<td>Optimisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$D$</td>
<td>Dilution (due to sampling): fraction of O$_2$ replaced by He</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>(18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$k_{H(O_2)}$</td>
<td>Solubility of O$_2$ in water at 20 °C</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>mol L$^{-1}$ atm$^{-1}$</td>
<td>(37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$k_{H(NO)}$</td>
<td>Solubility of NO at 20 °C</td>
<td>0.0021</td>
<td>mol L$^{-1}$ atm$^{-1}$</td>
<td>(29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$k_{H(N_2O)}$</td>
<td>Solubility of N$_2$O at 20 °C</td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td>mol N$_2$O-N L$^{-1}$ atm$^{-1}$</td>
<td>(37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$k_{H(N_2)}$</td>
<td>Solubility of N$_2$ at 20 °C</td>
<td>0.0007</td>
<td>mol N$_2$ L$^{-1}$ atm$^{-1}$</td>
<td>(37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$k_t$</td>
<td>The coeff. for gas transport between headspace and liquid</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>L vial$^{-1}$ h$^{-1}$</td>
<td>Measured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$O_2^{leak}$</td>
<td>O$_2$ leakage into the vial during each sampling</td>
<td>$2.92 \times 10^{-9}$</td>
<td>mol</td>
<td>Measured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R$</td>
<td>Universal gas constant</td>
<td>0.083</td>
<td>L atm K$^{-1}$ mol$^{-2}$</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$T$</td>
<td>Temperature</td>
<td>293.15</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>(18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$t_s$</td>
<td>The time taken to complete each sampling</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>(29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Vol_y$</td>
<td>Headspace volume</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>(18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Vol_{aq}$</td>
<td>Aqueous-phase volume</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>(18)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**K$_{mO_2}$** (Eq. 17). *Pa. denitrificans* has three haem-copper terminal oxidoreductases (38) with $K_{mO_2}$ ranging from nM to µM (39, 40), so we decided to estimate the parameter value by optimising $K_{mO_2}$ for the low [O$_2$] treatments data. Vensim was used for the optimisation, where $K_{mO_2} = 2.25 \times 10^{-7}$ neatly simulated the O$_2$ depletion for both the succinate- and butyrate-supplemented treatments.

**K$_{mN_2O}$**. *In vitro* studies of NosZ from *Pa. denitrificans* estimate the values for $K_{mN_2O} = 5$ µM at 22 °C and pH 7.1 (41) and 6.7 µM at 25 °C and pH 7.1 (42). When our model was simulated with $K_{mN_2O}$ in this range, given our empirically estimated $v_{e_{maxH_2O}}$ (24), the simulated N$_2$O reached concentrations much higher than that measured (see Results/Discussion). A more adequate parameter value (= 0.6 µM) was found by optimising $K_{mN_2O}$ in Vensim. The value is within the range determined for soil bacterial communities (43).

$v_{e_{maxO_2}}$ (Eq. 17) could be estimated using the empirically determined cell yield per mole of electrons to O$_2$ ($Y_{eO_2}^{-}$, cells per mol e$^{-}$) and the maximum specific growth rate ($\mu$, h$^{-1}$):
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\[ \nu e_{\text{maxO}_2} = \frac{\mu}{\nu e_{\text{O}_2}}. \]

We are confident about the yields for the two C-substrates used, but the empirically determined \( \mu \) for the butyrate treatments is suspiciously low (= 0.067 h\(^{-1}\)), providing \( \nu e_{\text{maxO}_2}^- = 2.45\times10^{-15} \) mol e\(^-\) cell\(^{-1}\) h\(^{-1}\). Simulations with this value grossly underestimated the rate of O\(_2\) depletion as compared to that measured, which forced us to estimate the parameter value by optimisation, providing \( \nu e_{\text{maxO}_2}^- = 4.42\times10^{-15} \) and \( 4.22\times10^{-15} \) mol e\(^-\) cell\(^{-1}\) h\(^{-1}\) for the succinate- and butyrate treatments, respectively. These values give \( \mu = 0.22 \) and 0.12 h\(^{-1}\), respectively: for the succinate treatments, the value is in the same range as that empirically determined (= 0.2 h\(^{-1}\)); for the butyrate treatments, the value seems more realistic than 0.067 h\(^{-1}\).

\( \nu e_{\text{min}}^- \) (Eqs. 2, 5, and 7) is the per cell velocity of e\(^-\)-flow to O\(_2\) (\( \nu e_{\text{O}_2}^- \)) assumed to generate minimum ATP required for synthesising the initial molecules of denitrification enzymes. Since we lack any empirical or other estimations for this parameter, it is arbitrarily assumed to be the \( \nu e_{\text{O}_2}^- \) when \([\text{O}_2]_{\text{aq}}\) reaches 1 nM. At this concentration, \( \nu e_{\text{min}}^- \) is determined by the Michaelis-Menten equation

\[ \nu e_{\text{min}}^- = \frac{\nu e_{\text{maxO}_2}^- \times [\text{O}_2]_{\text{aq}}}{K_{\text{mO}_2} + [\text{O}_2]_{\text{aq}}}, \]

using \( \nu e_{\text{maxO}_2}^- \) and \( K_{\text{mO}_2} \) given above. The values obtained for the succinate- and butyrate-supplemented treatments = 1.96\times10^{-17} \) and 1.87\times10^{-17} mol e\(^-\) cell\(^{-1}\) h\(^{-1}\), respectively, which for both the cases is 0.44\% of \( \nu e_{\text{maxO}_2}^- \). To investigate the impact of \( \nu e_{\text{min}}^- \) on the model behaviour (\( r_{\text{Na}} \) and \( r_{\text{Ni}} \), Eqs. 1–2, 4–5, and 6–7), sensitivity analyses were performed by simulating the model with \( \nu e_{\text{min}}^- \) corresponding to \([\text{O}_2]_{\text{aq}} = 5\times10^{-9}, 5\times10^{-10}, \) and 0 mol L\(^{-1}\) (see Results/Discussion).

**Results/Discussion**

**Low probabilistic initiation of nar transcription, resulting in the fraction of the population with Nar < 100%**

To test the assumption of a single homogeneous population with all cells producing Nar in response to O\(_2\) depletion, we simulated the model with the specific probability for a \( Z^- \) cell
to initiate *nar* transcription ($r_{Na} = 4 \, h^{-1}$), resulting in 98% of the cells possessing Nar within an hour (see Eqs. 1–3). Evidence suggests that less than half an hour is required to synthesise denitrification enzymes (17, 18), but an hour’s time is assumed here to allow margin for error. The results show that, for all the treatments, the simulated NO$_3^-$ production (mol vial$^{-1}$) grossly overestimates that measured (Fig. 3).

To find a reasonable parameter value, we optimised $r_{Na}$ for the 0% O$_2$ treatments, so that the simulated NO$_3^-$ production matches that measured. The results (Table 3) suggest that a low probabilistic initiation of *nar* transcription (average $r_{Na} = 0.035 \, h^{-1}$) is adequate to simulate the measured NO$_3^-$ kinetics (Fig. 3). In the Butyrate, 7% O$_2$ treatment (Fig. 3B), the simulated NO$_3^-$ starts earlier, but the rate of accumulation is similar to that measured.

Once O$_2$ falls below a certain threshold, the production of Nar is assumed to trigger with $r_{Na} = 0.035 \, h^{-1}$ and last until a minimum of respiration is sustained by the $e^-$-flow to O$_2$ and N$_2$O (ve$_{O_2}^-$ and ve$_{N_2O}^-$), assumed to fulfil the ATP needs for Nar production (Eqs. 1–2). But the production of Nar sustained by ve$_{N_2O}^-$ was inconsequential for simulating the measured NO$_3^-$ production, since NO$_3^-$ was already exhausted when N$_2$O started accumulating (i.e., when ve$_{N_2O}^- > 0$). For this reason, the fraction that produced Nar ($F_{Na}$, Eq. 3 and Table 4) is calculated as functional (= 0.23–0.43) and theoretical (= 0.56–0.81), where the first is the fraction actually responsible for NO$_3^-$ production (sustained by ve$_{O_2}^-$), but the latter also incorporates the fraction that produced Nar after the exhaustion of NO$_3^-$ (sustained by ve$_{O_2}^-$ as well as ve$_{N_2O}^-$.)

The rationale behind calculating the theoretical $F_{Na}$ is the empirical data indicating that Nar transcription is not turned off in response to NO$_3^-$ depletion (18). Although our model cannot test the theoretical $F_{Na}$, but the functional $F_{Na}$ suggests that, contrary to the common assumption, the measured NO$_3^-$ kinetics can be neatly explained by only 23–43.3% of the population producing Nar in response to O$_2$ depletion.
Fig. 3. Comparison of measured and simulated \(\text{NO}_2^-\) accumulation assuming definitive versus stochastic initiation of \(\text{nar}\) transcription. To test the assumption of a single homogeneous population with almost all cells expressing \(\text{nar}\) in response to \(\text{O}_2\) depletion, we forced our model to achieve 98% Nar-positive cells (\(Z_{\text{Na}}\)) within an hour by setting the specific-probability of initiating \(\text{nar}\) transcription (\(r_{\text{Na}}\)) = 4 h\(^{-1}\). This resulted in grossly overestimated rates of \(\text{NO}_2^-\) accumulation for all treatments (grey curves). In contrast, we simulated the model with \(r_{\text{Na}} = 0.035\) h\(^{-1}\) obtained through optimisation, resulting in a reasonable agreement with measurements for all treatments, except for an apparent time frameshift for the Butyrate, 7% \(\text{O}_2\) treatment.
Table 3. Specific-probability of *nar* and *nirS* transcriptional initiation (\( r_{Na} \) and \( r_{Ni} \), respectively) estimated for each treatment by optimisation (best match between the simulated and measured data).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Batch</th>
<th>C-source</th>
<th>Treatment*: ( O_2 ) (vol.%), ( NO_3^- ) (mM)</th>
<th>Optimal ( r_{Na} ) (h(^{-1}))</th>
<th>Optimal ( r_{Ni} ) (h(^{-1}))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Butyrate</td>
<td>(-0, 2)</td>
<td>0.041</td>
<td>0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Butyrate</td>
<td>(7, 2)</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Succinate</td>
<td>(-0, 2)</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Succinate</td>
<td>(7, 2)</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Avg. = 0.035</td>
<td>Avg. = 0.004</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Treatment refers to the C-source, initial oxygen concentration in the headspace (measured as headspace-vol.%), and initial \( NO_3^- \) concentration in the medium (mM).

Table 4. The fraction of the population with Nar (\( F_{Na} \)) and NirS (\( F_{Ni} \)) estimated based on the optimal specific-probability of *nar* and *nirS* transcriptional initiation (\( r_{Na} \) and \( r_{Ni} \)), respectively.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Batch</th>
<th>C-source</th>
<th>( O_2 ) (vol.%), ( NO_3^- ) (mM)</th>
<th>Functional ( F_{Na} )* (unitless)</th>
<th>Theoretical ( F_{Na} )* (unitless)</th>
<th>( F_{Ni} ) (unitless)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Butyrate</td>
<td>(-0, 2)</td>
<td>0.433</td>
<td>0.813</td>
<td>0.221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Butyrate</td>
<td>(7, 2)</td>
<td>0.363</td>
<td>0.656</td>
<td>0.088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Succinate</td>
<td>(-0, 2)</td>
<td>0.357</td>
<td>0.803</td>
<td>0.206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Succinate</td>
<td>(7, 2)</td>
<td>0.230</td>
<td>0.564</td>
<td>0.077</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Functional \( F_{Na} \) is the fraction of cells expressing Nar while \( NO_3^- \) is still present, while Theoretical \( F_{Na} \) is the fraction expressing Nar when including the theoretical recruitment after \( NO_3^- \) depletion (supported by energy from \( N_2O \) reduction).

**Very low probabilistic initiation of *nirS* transcription**

When we optimised the specific probability of *nirS* transcriptional activation (\( r_{Ni} \), see Eqs. 4–5 and 6–7) to fit the measured data, the average \( r_{Ni} = 0.004 \) h\(^{-1}\) (Table 3) adequately simulated the measured \( NO_3^- \) depletion and \( N_2 \) accumulation (Fig. 4). The recruitment to denitrification lasted for 19.5–47.3 h, i.e., the time when \( [O_2] \) was below a critical concentration and the velocity of e\(-\)-flow to \( O_2 \) and the relevant \( NO_3^- /NO_x \) remained above a critical minimum (Eqs. 4–5 and 6–7). The resulting fraction recruited to denitrification (\( F_{Ni} \), see Eq. 8 and Table 4) was 0.08–0.18, the bulk of which depended on the e\(-\)-flow to \( NO_3^- \) and \( N_2O \) (instead of aerobic respiration).

To test whether the measured data could be explained without the recruitment sustained by \( NO_3^- \) and \( N_2O \) respiration, we also simulated the model with the recruitment as a function of \( O_2 \) alone and re-optimised \( r_{Ni} \), which on average increased to 0.012 h\(^{-1}\) (providing \( F_{Ni} = 0.083–\)
0.35). This was expected since O\textsubscript{2} is exhausted rather quickly, shrinking the time-window available for the recruitment. However, the simulations without the recruitment sustained by NO\textsubscript{3}\textsuperscript{-} and N\textsubscript{2}O respiration were less satisfactory: using the average $r_{Ni} = 0.012$ h\textsuperscript{-1} generally resulted in larger deviations than for the default simulations (S1 Fig.), and the optimal $r_{Ni}$ for individual treatments varied grossly (50% higher values for the ~0% O\textsubscript{2} treatments than for the 7% O\textsubscript{2} treatments). This contrasts the default simulations, where the optimal $r_{Ni}$ for individual treatment were quite similar.

**Fig. 4.** Comparison of measured and simulated data assuming stochastic initiation of nirS transcription. Each panel compares NO\textsubscript{3} depletion (sub-panel) and N\textsubscript{2} accumulation (main panel) from three/four replicates of an experimental treatment with simulations. The simulations are carried out with an optimised specific-probability of nirS transcriptional
initiation (average $r_{Ni} = 0.004 \text{ h}^{-1}$, Eqs. 4–5 and 6–7), allowing 7.7–22.1% of the population to produce NirS + cNor (Eq. 8) during the available time-window (= 19.5–47.3 h).

**Sensitivity of $r_{Na}$ and $r_{Ni}$ to $ve_{min}$**

Recruitment to denitrification (both nar and nirS transcription) is assumed to continue only as long as the combined $e^-$-flow to $O_2$, NO$_3^-$ and N$_2$O is greater than $ve_{min}$ (Eqs. 1–2, 4–5, and 6–7). To test the model’s sensitivity to this parameter, we estimated $r_{Na}$ and $r_{Ni}$ by optimisation for different values of $ve_{min}$, relative to the default value = 1.95×10$^{-17}$ mol e$^-$ cell$^{-1}$ h$^{-1}$. For all cases, the model was able to adequately simulate the measured N$_2$ kinetics by moderate adjustments of $r_{Na}$ and $r_{Ni}$. Table 5 shows the average optimal values of $r_{Na}$ and $r_{Ni}$, obtained by fitting simulated N$_2$ kinetics to the data, for different values of $ve_{min}$. S2 Fig. shows adequate simulations of measured N$_2$ kinetics assuming $ve_{min} = 0$, with optimised $r_{Na} = 0.033 \text{ h}^{-1}$ and $r_{Ni} = 0.0033 \text{ h}^{-1}$. Thus, although assuming $ve_{min} > 0$ appears logical, it is not necessary to explain the measured data.

**Table 5. Estimated $r_{Na}$ and $r_{Ni}$, depending on $ve_{min}$.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$ve_{min}$ (mol e$^-$ cell$^{-1}$ h$^{-1}$)</th>
<th>Optimal $r_{Na}$ (h$^{-1}$)</th>
<th>Optimal $r_{Ni}$ (h$^{-1}$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 × Default*</td>
<td>0.041</td>
<td>0.0062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Default</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>0.0041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5 × Default</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>0.0035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>0.0033</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Refers to the default value = 1.95×10$^{-17}$ mol e$^-$ cell$^{-1}$ h$^{-1}$.

**N$_2$O kinetics**

To simulate N$_2$O kinetics, we first used $ve_{maxN_2O} = 5.5 \times 10^{-15}$ mol e$^-$ cell$^{-1}$ h$^{-1}$, empirically determined under similar experimental conditions as simulated here (24), and adopted the literature values for $K_{mN_2O}$ (= 5 and 7 µM 41, 42, respectively). But with $K_{mN_2O} = 5$ µM, the model predicted N$_2$O accumulation ~10–20 times higher than measured for the ~0% and ~2–3 times higher for the 7% O$_2$ treatments (Fig. 5). This forced us to simulate the model with the parameter value estimated by optimisation, providing the average $K_{mN_2O} = 0.6$ µM.
The measured N₂O shows a conspicuous increase throughout the entire active denitrification period, and this phenomenon is neatly captured by the model. The reason for this model prediction is that the number of N₂O producing cells (Z\text{NaNi} + Z\text{Ni}, Fig. 2A) is low to begin with compared to the number of N₂O consuming cells (Z⁻ + Z\text{Na} + Z\text{NaNi} + Z\text{Ni}), but the fraction of N₂O producers will increase during the anoxic phase for two reasons: one is the recruitment to Z\text{NaNi} & Z\text{Ni}, another is the fact that the model predicts approximately three times faster cell-specific growth rate for Z\text{NaNi} & Z\text{Ni} than for Z⁻ & Z\text{Na} (v_{\text{N}_2\text{O}}\text{max} is identical for all groups, while } v_{\text{NO}}\text{ and } v_{\text{NO}}\text{ are both zero for Z⁻ but for Z\text{NaNi} & Z\text{Ni}, it holds that } v_{\text{NO}}\text{max} > v_{\text{N}_2\text{O}}\text{. To illustrate this phenomenon, we ran the model, assuming that the Z⁻ & Z\text{Na} cells had no N₂O reductase, resulting in a) constant N₂O concentration throughout the entire anoxic phase and b) much higher N₂O concentrations than measured (Fig 5). The overestimation is a trivial result, easily avoidable by increasing } v_{\text{NO}}\text{max or decreasing } K_{m\text{N}_2\text{O}}\text{ moderately. However, the prediction of a constant N₂O concentration is clearly in conflict with the experimental data, and no parameterisation could force the model to reproduce this phenomenon, other than the differential expression of denitrification genes.}

Hence, although there is room for further refinements, our default assumption regarding differential expression of NirS and NosZ explains the observed N₂O kinetics: 1) abrupt initial accumulation to very low levels due to recruitment of relatively small numbers to the N₂O producing pools (Z\text{NaNi} & Z\text{Ni}), 2) increasing N₂O concentration due to recruitment and faster cell-specific growth of Z\text{NaNi} & Z\text{Ni} than that of the cells only consuming N₂O (Z⁻ + Z\text{Na}).

This modelling exercise sheds some light on the possible role of regulatory biology of denitrification in controlling N₂O emissions from soils. If all cells in soils had the same regulatory phenotype as Pa. denitrificans, their emission of N₂O would probably be miniscule, and soils could easily become strong net sinks for N₂O because the majority of cells would be ‘truncated denitrifiers’ with only N₂O reductase expressed. It remains to be tested, however, if the regulatory phenotype of Pa. denitrificans is a rare or a common phenomenon among full-fledged denitrifiers. We foresee that further exploration of denitrification phenotypes will unravel a plethora of response patterns.
Fig. 5. Comparison of the measured N₂O with that simulated. Each main panel (A–D) compares the measured N₂O (single vial results) with the default simulation using the parameter values given in Table 2, i.e. \( K_{mN_2O} = 0.6 \) µM (estimated through optimisation) and \( v_{maxN_2O} = 5.5 \times 10^{-15} \) mol e⁻ cell⁻¹ h⁻¹ (24). In contrast, each inserted panel shows the simulated N₂O assuming 1) N₂O consumption only by the cells producing N₂O (\( Z^{NaNi} + Z^{Ni} \)), and 2) the literature value for \( K_{mN_2O} = 5 \) µM (41). The results show that the measured N₂O kinetics are best explained by assuming its production by a small fraction (\( Z^{NaNi} + Z^{Ni} \)) and consumption by the entire population (\( Z^- + Z^{Na} + Z^{NaNi} + Z^{Ni} \)).
Conclusion

Using dynamic modelling, we have demonstrated here that the denitrification kinetics in Pa. denitrificans can be adequately explained by assuming low probabilistic transcriptional activation of the nar and nirS genes and a subsequent autocatalytic expression of the enzymes. Such autocatalytic gene expressions are common in prokaryotes, rendering a population heterogeneous because of the stochastic initiation of gene transcription, with a low probability (44). For N₂O kinetics, our hypothesis was that a) the gas is produced by a fraction of the incubated population that is able to initiate nirS transcription with a certain probability, leading to a coordinated expression of nirS + nor via NO (16), and b) N₂O is consumed by the entire population because, in response to anoxia, nosZ is readily induced by FnrP (24). Our model corroborated this hypothesis by reasonably simulating the N₂O kinetics with the specific-probability of nirS transcriptional activation = 0.004 h⁻¹, resulting in 7.7–22.1% of the population producing NirS + cNor (hence N₂O), but all cells producing NosZ (hence equally consuming N₂O).
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S1 Fig. Comparison of measured and simulated data assuming stochastic initiation of nirS transcription with aerobic respiration being the only energy source for producing NirS + cNor. In each panel, NO$_2^-$ depletion (sub-panel) and N$_2$ accumulation (main panel) from three/four replicates of an experimental treatment are compared with simulations. The simulations here are to be compared with the default simulations (Fig. 4), run assuming that the coordinated NirS + cNor production (via nirS transcriptional activation) is sustained by the energy generated by O$_2$ as well as NO$_3^−$ and/or N$_2$O reduction. The default simulations provided an average specific-probability of nirS transcriptional activation ($r_{Ni}$) = 0.004 h$^{-1}$ (Eqs. 4–5 and 6–7) by optimisation, allowing 7.7–22.1% of the population to produce NirS +
cNor (Eq. 8) in 19.5–47.3 h. To match the measured data here, the average $r_{Ni}$ had to be raised to 0.012 h$^{-1}$, since the time available for the enzyme synthesis shrank ($= 3.5–16$ h) due to a rapid exhaustion of O$_2$. Comparatively, the assumption that the ATP from NO$\textsubscript{3}^-$ and/or N$_2$O reduction should help cells produce denitrification enzymes seems logically more convincing and better explains the measured data.

S2 Fig. Measured vs. simulated N$_2$ kinetics assuming $v_{\text{em}}^{-} = 0$. The default simulations are carried out assuming that for a cell to produce first molecules of Nar and NirS, a minimum of $e^-$-flow to an available $e^-$-acceptor ($v_{\text{em}}^{-}$, mol e$^-$ cell$^{-1}$ h$^{-1}$) is necessary to generate a minimum of ATP required for protein synthesis (Eqs. 1–2, 4–5, and 6–7). Although assuming $v_{\text{em}}^{-}$ seems logical, but measured N$_2$ kinetics adequately simulated here with $v_{\text{em}}^{-} = 0$ shows that the assumption is not necessary to explain the measured data.