At-home, cell-free synthetic biology education modules for transcriptional regulation and environmental water quality monitoring

Kirsten J. Jung[a,b,c,d#], Blake J. Rasor[a,b,c,#], Grant A. Rybnicky[b,c,e,#], Adam D. Silverman[a,b,c,d#], Janet Standeven[f], Robert Kuhn[g,h], Teresa Granito[i], Holly M. Ekas[a,b,c], Brenda M. Wang[a,b,c], Ashty S. Karim[a,b,c], Julius B. Lucks[a,b,c,d*], Michael C. Jewett [a,b,c,j,k,l*]

a. Department of Chemical and Biological Engineering, Northwestern University, Evanston, IL 60208, USA
b. Chemistry of Life Processes Institute, Northwestern University, Evanston, IL 60208, USA
c. Center for Synthetic Biology, Northwestern University, Evanston, IL 60208, USA
d. Center for Water Research, Northwestern University, Evanston, IL 60208, USA
e. Interdisciplinary Biological Sciences Graduate Program, Northwestern University, Evanston, IL, 60208, USA
f. Lambert High School, Suwanee, GA 30024, USA
g. Centennial High School, Roswell, GA 30076, USA
h. Fulton County Schools Innovation Academy, Alpharetta, GA 30009, USA
i. Evanston Township High School, Evanston, IL 60201, USA
j. Robert H. Lurie Comprehensive Cancer Center, Northwestern University, Chicago, IL 60611, USA
k. Simpson Querrey Institute, Northwestern University, Chicago, IL 60611, USA
l. Department of Bioengineering, Stanford University, Stanford, CA 94305

[#] These authors contributed equally to this work.
* Corresponding authors

Correspondence
Julius B. Lucks, jblucks@northwestern.edu
Michael C. Jewett, m-jewett@northwestern.edu

Abstract

As the field of synthetic biology expands, the need to grow and train science, technology, engineering, and math (STEM) practitioners is essential. However, the lack of access to hands-on demonstrations has led to inequalities of opportunity and practice. In addition, there is a gap in providing content that enables students to make their own bioengineered systems. To address these challenges, we develop four shelf-stable cell-free biosensing educational modules that work by just-adding-water and DNA to freeze-dried crude extracts of *Escherichia coli*. We introduce activities and supporting curricula to teach the structure and function of the *lac* operon, dose-responsive behavior, considerations for biosensor outputs, and a 'build-your-own' activity for monitoring environmental contaminants in water. We piloted these modules with K-12 teachers and 130 high school students in their classrooms – and at home – without professional laboratory equipment or researcher oversight. This work promises to catalyze access to interactive synthetic biology education opportunities.

Introduction

Incorporating hands-on, active learning teaching methods at the secondary and undergraduate school levels increases student retention and performance across science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) disciplines [1-3]. In particular, biotechnology lab-based research, often done in high schools through inter-institutional joint studies such as the *Wolbachia* Project or SEA-PHAGES program [4, 5] contributes to significant improvement in students' self-reported technical and professional skills [6, 7].

Educational laboratory modules for synthetic biology, the fundamental science and engineering research that engineers biology to tackle global challenges (e.g., access to medicines, sustainable manufacturing), [8, 9] are in particular demand. Indeed, the acceleration of private and public investment in synthetic biology, [10-13] as well as the recent United States Presidential Executive Order on Advancing Biotechnology and Biomanufacturing [14] has heightened the need for supporting student literacy and learning. Such education is essential for long-term field participation, civic engagement, and ethical development [15].

Rapid growth of organizations like the International Genetically Engineered Machines (iGEM) [16, 17] competition, and the availability of do-it-yourself experiments from BioBuilder [18], Amino Labs (https://amino.bio), and the ODIN (https://www.the-odin.com) highlight this potential [19]. However, the high cost, slow pace, and regulatory bottlenecks and biocontainment requirements for experiments using engineered microbes preclude hands-on participation of many aspiring synthetic biologists [9], particularly students in under-resourced communities and schools.

Recently, cell-free gene expression (CFE) [20, 21] has emerged as a useful platform for widening access to synthetic biology education. In CFE systems, protein synthesis is carried out by transcription and translation machinery (polymerases, ribosomes, tRNAs, etc.) that has been harvested from living cells and reconstituted in a test tube [22]. The preparation of extract from *Escherichia coli* cells has been extensively optimized to allow for: high protein synthesis yields [23, 24]; on-demand synthesis of conjugate vaccines [25, 26], antibodies and antibody-drug conjugates [27-29], antibody fragments [30, 31], and antimicrobial peptides [32, 33]; detection of toxic metals and organic pesticides in drinking water [34-38] or nucleic acids in biological samples [39-43]; and rapid prototyping of genetic parts [44], enzyme pathways [45, 46], and post-translational modifications [47-49] using high-throughput liquid-handling robotics.

Cell-free expression systems are particularly suitable for decentralized distribution in low-resource settings, including classrooms, because the reactions are stable in a lyophilized format for months at room temperature [50]. Consequently, protein synthesis can be initiated

3

80   just by adding water and a template DNA [41]. Using freeze-dried CFE reactions, we and others

81   have developed experimental learning modules for high school and undergraduate students,

82   focused on teaching the central dogma [51-53], antibiotic resistance [54], and the mechanism of

83   CRISPR-Cas9 [54, 55]. The simplest of these modules has been commercialized as the

84   BioBits[®] Central Dogma kit [56].

85   Early successes with cell-free education kits nevertheless left several gaps to be

86   addressed. First, because students performed most of the published experiments in well-

87   equipped university labs rather than a high school classroom, widespread access was not

88   guaranteed [51, 54, 55]. The importance of minimal-equipment experiments was made even

89   more apparent by the COVID-19 pandemic, during which many students were unable to attend

90   a classroom. Second, previous work demonstrating student success in the experimental

91   modules was limited to small sets of students and failure modes were not outlined, either for

92   experimental scaleup or for individual student performance. Finally, the proposed experiments

93   did not allow students the creative freedom to design, build, and test their own engineered

94   systems. In a world where the half-life of cutting-edge technology is decreasing, students need

95   learner-led opportunities that afford them the ability to evaluate new material and test potential

96   answers (or at least organize the possibilities) to unsolved problems.

97   Here, we set out to develop freeze-dried, cell-free educational modules that could

98   address these gaps to facilitate both inquiry-based learning and at home usage for expanded

99   access and impact. As a model, we focused on biosensing. Three experimental modules

100   allowed students to interrogate the mechanism of the regulation of the lactose-inducible operon

101   from *E. coli,* measure the dose-response of the LacI repressor protein to isopropyl β- d-1-

102   thiogalactopyranoside (IPTG; lactose analog), and compare the performance of four reporter

103   outputs. To facilitate inquiry-guided learning, we also developed a fourth "design-your-own-

104   biosensor" module, leveraging cascaded genetic circuitry to design, build, and test cell-free

105   biosensors for the detection of toxic contaminants in drinking water. Finally, we investigated the

106   distribution of cell-free education modules at scale. We prepared kits for remote use by 130

107   advanced high school biology students (including several who performed the experiments in

108   their own homes). Overall, the student experimental success rate varied between 60 and 100%,

109   depending on the module and scale. We measured significant improvement in student

110   understanding and engagement after completing the modules, and also identified stumbling-

111   blocks for further scaling out this technology to more schools, teachers, and scientists-in-

112   training.

113

Results and Discussion

Preliminary design of a biosensing education kit

We set out to create cell-free biosensing education modules that could enable students to build their own cell-free biosensors and be carried out in a distributed, at home setting. To start, we designed three simple experiments to explore the design of a cell-free biosensor. We chose the *E. coli* lac operon as a model since it is widely taught as an example of a negative-inducible system [57]. The allosteric transcriptional factor LacI represses transcription initiation at a lactose-inducible promoter (pLac) containing the operator sequence (*lacO*) (**Figure 1A**) [58, 59]. We built a lactose-inducible reporter plasmid in which the coding sequence for monomeric red fluorescent protein (mRFP) is placed downstream of the *lacUV5* promoter. Then, as previously described [34], we pre-enriched an *E. coli* cell extract with LacI by overexpressing the transcription factor during growth (**Figure 1A**).

For the Module 1 experiment (mechanism), we prepared three reaction conditions, each comprising 20 µL cell-free sensors with all requisite CFE reagents, freeze-dried with the extract and reporter plasmid. The first pair of 20 µL reactions included 40 nM of the pLac-mRFP plasmid, but no pre-enriched LacI beyond the genomic copy in our BL21 Star (DE3) *E. coli* chassis strain. In the second pair of reactions, 5% of the reaction's unenriched extract was replaced with an extract pre-enriched with LacI, a fraction that we found was optimal for repression (**Supplemental Figure S1**). However, transcription from the provided reporter plasmid (J23119-mRFP) is constitutive because this promoter lacks an operator site. The third pair of reactions constituted the intact sensor, with both LacI present in the extract and a pLac-mRFP reporter plasmid. We also included positive and negative mRFP calibration controls consisting of lyophilized purified protein at a concentration of 0 or 15 µM. Thus, the full module constituted an eight-strip of PCR strip tubes (**Figure 1B**). When rehydrated with either 0 or 100 µM IPTG inducer, only the third pair of tubes showed both repression and induction: without either the repressor or operator, the sensor was broken and constitutively ON. Conveniently, at a 24-hour endpoint, sufficient mRFP was synthesized in the ON conditions to be visible to the naked eye or under a blue light imager [51].

Following these experimental controls, Module 2 (dose response) was then designed with the aim of teaching students about the concentration dependence of biosensors (simplified, to omit the effects of catabolite repression and cooperativity [60]). Six tubes containing the inducible lactose sensor (containing 5% LacI extract and the pLac-mRFP plasmid) were freeze-dried along with the same calibration controls, and the reactions were rehydrated with

5

148 increasing concentration of IPTG. As expected, a smooth increase in red fluorescence was

149 observed, up to saturation at 100 µM (**Figure 1C**).

150

151

152 **Figure 1. Design of a synthetic biology education module for transcription regulation by**
153 **the lac operon.** (**A**) Overview of cell-free lactose sensor. The Lac repressor (LacI) is over-
154 expressed in *E. coli* used to prepare source extract and represses its target promoter,
155 containing a copy of the lac operator sequence upstream of the reporter protein or RNA gene.
156 (**B**) Laboratory data for a module designed to teach the mechanism for the Lac repressor using
157 an eight-strip of PCR tubes. Tubes 1 and 2 contain lyophilized CFE reactions without LacI (*i.e.*,
158 only blank extract) and 40 nM of the reporter plasmid pLac-mRFP1. Tubes 3 and 4 contain
159 lyophilized reactions with LacI, but the reporter plasmid lacks a *lac* operator (J23119-mRFP1).
160 Tubes 5 and 6 contain the full sensor (LacI-enriched extract and pLac-mRFP). Tubes 7 and 8
161 are controls containing, respectively, 0 and 15 µM of purified mRFP1. Upon rehydration with 20
162 µL either water (tubes 1, 3, 5, 7, and 8) or 100 µM IPTG (tubes 2, 4, and 6), repression is only
163 observed in tube 5, where the repressor and operator are present and no ITPG is supplied.
164 Plotted data represent the average and individual endpoint yields of mRFP1, computed from a
165 fluorescence calibration curve generated by purified mRFP1, from three independent technical
166 replicates for the full eight-strip module, rehydrated in a research laboratory and incubated at 30
167 °C for 24 hours. Sample images of one replicate are shown in white and blue light (using the
168 miniPCR bio^{TM} P51™ Molecular Fluorescence Viewer) from an iPhone photograph. **
169 represents $p < 0.05$; n.s. indicates no significant difference between the + and – IPTG
170 conditions. (**C**) Laboratory data for a module designed to teach the dose response behavior of
171 the LacI sensor. Freeze-dried reactions containing LacI and 40 nM pLac-mRFP1 were
172 rehydrated with the indicated concentration of IPTG, and incubated at 30 °C overnight, then
173 quantified by plate reader. The 0 and 15 µM mRFP controls were maintained in this module. (**D**)
174 Laboratory data for a module designed to teach the advantages and disadvantages of
175 alternative reporter outputs for the LacI sensor. Freeze-dried reactions were prepared with LacI-
176 enriched extract, half containing 0 µM IPTG (tubes 1, 3, 5, and 7), and half containing 100 µM
177 IPTG (tubes 2, 4, 6, and 8). The lyophilized reactions were rehydrated with 20 µL of 40 nM

178   pLac-mRFP1 plasmid (tubes 1 and 2), 20 nM pLac-sfGFP plasmid (tubes 3 and 4), 80 nM pLac-
179   Mango III plasmid + 2 µM T01:biotin (RNA aptamer, tubes 5 and 6), or 10 nM pLac-XylE
180   plasmid + 2 mM catechol and pipetted onto a plate reader to measure the kinetics of sensor
181   activation over four hours at 30 °C. Colored lines represent the average of three (+) IPTG
182   conditions; black lines indicate (-) IPTG. Photos indicate reaction yield at the endpoint in blue
183   light (fluorescent outputs) or white light (XylE).
184
185

186   Finally, in Module 3 (reporter), we explored the choice of output for a putative point-of-

187   use biosensor. In addition to mRFP, we cloned superfolder green fluorescent protein (sfGFP)

188   [61], the RNA aptamer Mango III [62, 63], and the colorimetric enzyme XylE (catechol 2,3-

189   dioxygenase [35]), under transcriptional regulation by the pLac promoter. After optimizing the

190   concentration for each reporter DNA (**Supplemental Figure S2**), we induced activation of each

191   reporter in the presence of IPTG, though with different degrees of sensor leak/background

192   signal and time to result. Predictably, the RNA aptamer was the quickest reporter to be

193   produced, but it was invisible to the naked eye, and its background fluorescence from the

194   T01:biotin dye was high under blue light. Also as expected, sfGFP folded faster than mRFP and

195   generated a signal at an earlier time point; both fluorescent proteins could be observed at the

196   endpoint under white and blue light. XylE activated quickly (measured by the development of

197   yellow color under white light), but it also had the greatest amount of leak due to the enzymatic

198   turnover and unavoidable transcriptional leak through LacI, as previously described (**Figure 1D**)

199   [64].
200

201   **Small-scale implementation of three biosensing education modules in high school**
202   **classrooms**

203   Next, we adapted Modules 1-3 for a classroom setting. We developed a roughly one-

204   week-long curriculum that guided students through the three experiments and developed

205   curricula intended for an advanced secondary school (AP Biology) classroom (all curricula

206   included in **Supplemental File 6**). We then prepared 25 freeze-dried reaction strips for each

207   module, identical to the experiments performed by trained researchers in **Figure 1**. These

208   experimental modules were then performed by 22 AP Biology students in their own classrooms

209   at Evanston Township High School over the course of a week. To simplify the experiment and

210   remove some sources of external error, all students had been previously exposed to

211   micropipettes and cell-free gene expression through the BioBits® Central Dogma kit.

212   For Modules 1 and 2, the rehydrated reactions were incubated at room temperature for

213   48 hours in the classroom and then transported back to our laboratory for image analysis and

214   quantification by plate reader. For Module 3, which was time sensitive, we instead captured

215   images of the rehydrated tubes in white and blue light initially, after 1 hour, and after 24 hours,

216   on-site in the classroom. The resulting experimental data and representative photographs are

217   plotted in **Figure 2**. The full data set from students, including uncropped photographs, are

218   available in **Supplemental Files 1-3**.

219

220

221   **Figure 2. Results of small-scale deployment of biosensing educational kit in advanced**
222   **high school classroom.** (**A**) Implementation of Module 1 (mechanism) experiment in high
223   school classroom. Students added either water or 100 μM IPTG to the indicated tubes using a
224   micropipette, and the reactions were incubated for 48 hours at room temperature. Then, the
225   reactions were collected, and yields were quantified by plate reader. Bars represent the
226   average, and error bars represent the standard error of the mean, from 22 replicates. Inset
227   photos represent white and blue light photos (in P1 imager) of a sample replicate. (Full student
228   data for all modules are available in the **Supplemental Files**) (**B**) Implementation of Module 2
229   (dose response) experiment in high school classroom. Reactions were incubated for 48 hours at
230   room temperature and quantified by plate reader. Data represent the average and standard
231   error of the mean from 19 student replicates, with one representative sample photo taken at
232   endpoint in white and blue light. (**C**) Implementation of Module 3 (reporters) experiment in high
233   school classroom. Students added reporter plasmids as indicated; then, reactions were
234   incubated at 30 °C and photographs were taken in white and blue light at t = 0 hours, 1 hour,
235   and 24 hours for each reaction set. Researchers then qualitatively assigned to each photograph
236   values 0, 1, or 2 to represent "OFF", "FAINT", or "ON", respectively. The indicated bars
237   represent the average score from 21 student replicates of the reporter activity at each time point
238   (indicated by bar shading), for each reporter (indicated by bar color), and in white and blue light
239   (left and right plots, respectively). One sample time-course with paired photos is shown.

240
241

242   The students' data generated in the classroom matched the laboratory data very well.

243   Dispensing either water or IPTG solution from micropipettes, the students generally achieved

244   the expected qualitative results in Modules 1 and 3; somewhat greater variability was observed

245   Module 2, possibly due to errors in serial dilution (the students performed their own dilutions

246   from a 100 µM IPTG stock). Of the 22 students who performed Module 1, 16 had a "perfect"

247   response of ON, ON, ON, ON, OFF, ON, OFF, ON for tubes 1-8, and over 90% of the individual

248   tubes matched the expected behavior. The experiment only failed for one student. Thirteen of

249   the nineteen students who performed Module 2 also observed the expected smooth, monotonic

250   increase in mRFP production between tubes 1-6 as IPTG dose increased.

251   To quantify success rates in Module 3, since we could not take plate reader

252   measurements at intermediate timepoints in the classroom, we instead assigned qualitative

253   brightness scores of 0, 1, or 2 to each reporter, with and without the inducer, at each timepoint,

254   based on the students' photographs in white and blue light. After one hour, most students

255   observed the sfGFP and Mango reporters to be ON in blue light, and the XylE reporter was ON

256   in white light. Increases in both signal and leak were observed for all reporters after 24 hours. In

257   many cases, the XylE signal was stronger in the OFF state than the ON state after 24 hours

258   because the product of the chemical reaction degrades.

259

260   **Evaluation of educational impact of biosensing kits at secondary school level**

261   To assess whether the biosensing kits were effective in inspiring and teaching the

262   students who did the activities in the small-scale implementation, we measured how well the

263   program goals were met through pre- and post- module surveys (**Figure 3A**). The survey

264   consisted of a series of statements and asked the student to rate whether they agree with the

265   statement or not on a scale from 1-5, with a score of 1 indicating that they strongly disagree with

266   the statement, a score of 3 indicating that they neither agree nor disagree, and a score of 5

267   indicating that they strongly agree with the statement. Prior to completing any of the three

268   experimental activities, students were asked to fill out a survey to establish baseline biology

269   knowledge and perceptions. Following each of the experimental activities, but before seeing any

270   material for the next activity, students were asked to take the same survey again to capture

271   changes as a result of participating in that module.

272

Figure 3. Experiential impact on students' learning from biosensing modules. (**A**) Sample timeline for performing Modules 1 through 3 in a week of experimental instructional learning, including pre- and post-lab surveys. (**B**) Survey results from 16 students who performed all three experimental modules. Black dots indicate the average scores (between 1 and 5) to the "comprehension" and "perspective" questions before performing the experiments, and red dots indicate scores afterwards. Bolded questions showed a significant ($p < 0.05$) increase in score across paired student replicates from a Wilcoxon signed-rank paired test. Questions match exactly what was present in the student surveys, with the exception of the first statement which was written in the negative form, "Studying biotechnology requires an expensive lab space", and has been negated here for clarity.

Overall, survey questions were designed to assess two outcomes of the experimental activities: (1) changes in perspective of science and engineering and (2) changes in

287 comprehension of biological and engineering concepts. Generally, participation in the three-
288 activity series increased survey scores across both categories (**Figure 3B**). Participation in the
289 activities significantly increased how likely students were to agree with the perspective
290 statements that: the experiments that they do in school "are based on the most recent science"
291 and are "similar to what scientists and engineers do", as well as that they "understand what
292 synthetic biology is", that they "see themselves as engineers", and that they "would like to do
293 more experiments like this one." Likewise, participation in the activities significantly increased
294 how likely students were to agree with the comprehension statements that they understood and
295 could explain the material.
296

297 **Development of an advanced module for biosensor design**
298   We developed the initial three experimental modules to teach regulation by the *lac*
299 operon because it is a well-understood biosensor in *E. coli.* However, towards the goal of
300 engaging students in synthetic biology, and the known learning benefits of having students
301 solve problems, answer questions, and formulate questions of their own [1, 65, 66], we next
302 created an avenue for students to design, build, and test their own cell-free biosensors. As a
303 model, we developed a biosensor activity to detect water contaminants of public health concern.
304   Previous efforts to engage students in the synthetic biology design-build-test-learn
305 framework have struggled with the build phase due to challenges in DNA assembly and
306 transformation(roadblocks that hold back many iGEM teams as well [67]). Cell-free expression
307 circumvents some of these challenges: PCR-amplified linear DNA can be used in lieu of cloned
308 plasmids, and transformation is unnecessary. However, as a different approach, we decided to
309 use a cascaded amplifier circuit [68] to decouple the genetic linkage between the sensing
310 elements (allosteric transcription factor (aTF) and inducible promoter) and the reporter protein.
311 Briefly, the cascaded amplifier uses an orthogonal T7 RNA polymerase (o-T7 RNAP) as the
312 output of the inducible promoter, and a second plasmid encodes the reporter protein under the
313 control of the corresponding T7 promoter (P_{o-T7}) (**Figure 4A**). The advantage of this setup is that
314 we could lyophilize all sensor elements together (the aTF-enriched extract and its corresponding
315 inducible sensor plasmid, pReg-o-T7 RNAP) to make an arbitrary ligand-sensing reaction, but
316 without a defined transcriptional reporter. Then, to simultaneously build and test the sensor,
317 students could rehydrate the reactions with liquid stocks containing the desired reporter plasmid
318 and any co-substrates: essentially, running any or all of the Module 1-3 experiments as desired
319 for environmentally relevant contaminants, with a single set of reporter plasmids.

320   We developed cascaded cell-free sensors for fluoride (using the *crcB* riboswitch [35]),

321   copper (using the CueR aTF [69]), and lead (using the PbrR aTF [70]) (**Figure S4**). We also

322   made negative and positive controls (in which o-T7 RNAP production is constitutively OFF or

323   ON). When the lyophilized sensors were rehydrated with the respective orthogonal-promoter

324   reporter plasmids (P_{o-T7} regulating expression of mRFP, sfGFP, Mango, or XylE), correct ligand-

325   dependent induction was observed across all 80 possible combinations of five sensor plasmids,

326   four reporter plasmids, and four inducers.

327   Armed with these designs, we asked nine groups of high school students who had

328   already performed the LacI experiments to design and test their own biosensors. We specifically

329   requested that they formulate hypotheses and devise positive and negative controls while

330   allowing them to manipulate variables not tested in Modules 1-3. We provided each group the

331   necessary reagents based on their experimental designs (e.g., reporter plasmids and inducers,

332   freeze-dried sensor reactions containing the requested enriched aTFs/sensor plasmids) and

333   simply requested photographs of the sensors at regular intervals after hydration to evaluate

334   performance. The list of all the student-designed experiments is below in **Table 1**, and

335   annotated pictures of sample experiments are in **Figure 4B**. The full student lab reports,

336   including backgrounds and raw, uncropped photos are provided in the **Supplemental File 4**.

337

338   **Table 1**. **A summary of student-led designs for Module 4 experiments.**

Group	Experiment
1	Detecting lead in vegetable and fruit samples
2	Measuring the limit of detection and leakiness of the lead sensor as a function of reporter output
3	Measuring the kinetics of the lead sensor with enzymatic reporter as a function of incubation temperature and lead concentration
4	Measuring the kinetics and signal of the fluoride sensor as a function of reporter output
5	Comparing the leak, dose response, and stability of response of the copper sensor with aptamer and enzymatic reporters
6	Measuring the dose-response of fluoride sensor with enzymatic reporter output
7	Detecting copper in environmental water samples
8	Measuring the specificity and kinetics of the lead sensor with the aptamer output at 26 and 37 °C
9	Measuring the limit of detection of the lead sensor with the enzymatic reporter

339

340   Student success in Module 4 was varied, and many groups reported explicit sources of

341   experimental error in their lab reports (*e.g.*, contamination, loss of the lyophilized reaction

342   pellet). However, this study provides a powerful proof-of-principle for the versatility of cascaded

343 cell-free sensors, which allow students to detect any target molecule with any reporter output,

344 while testing multiple induction conditions, temperatures, reporter plasmid concentrations, or

345 sources of water samples. For instance, the reporter plasmid library could easily be extended to

346 encompass fluorescent protein libraries [51] or enzymes that produce tactile or olfactory outputs

347 [52]. These would be compatible with any sensed input, without needing to separately clone

348 each inducible promoter.

349

350

351 **Figure 4. Advanced experimental module for student-initiated biosensor design.** (**A**)
352 Overview of Module 4 (advanced design). Students were provided freeze-dried sensor reactions
353 containing cell-free extracts pre-enriched with the allosteric transcription factors PbrR (lead
354 sensor) or CueR (copper sensor) as well as the respective sensor plasmids, in which a
355 regulated, paired promoter (pPbr, pCue), riboswitch (fluoride sensor), or constitutive promoter
356 (positive control) drives expression of orthogonal T7 RNAP in an RNA polymerase cascade. (A
357 negative control sensor reaction lacked a sensor plasmid to synthesize o-T7 RNAP.) They were
358 also provided, in 10X concentrates, plasmids encoding the Module 3 reporters and substrates
359 mRFP1, sfGFP, Mango III + T01:biotin, and XylE + catechol, with the reporters placed under
360 control of the o-T7 promoter. Finally, they were given liquid stocks for copper, lead, and fluoride.
361 By rehydrating the sensor reaction with a reporter plasmid and analyte of choice, students could
362 therefore build, test, and design arbitrary sensor-output pairs for common inorganic water
363 contaminants—all without any cloning. (**B-E**) Sample results from four experiments designed
364 and implemented by student groups. All reactions were designed by high school students, with

365 one round of intermediate feedback; the materials were prepared for nine student groups (30
366 students altogether) and reactions were implemented. Full details of each experiment, including
367 students' submitted reporters and all provided photos, are provided in supplemental materials.
368 (B) Students constructed a cell-free lead sensor with a Mango III aptamer output and tested its
369 activation against four input water sources, at two different times and two different
370 temperatures. (C) Students constructed a cell-free copper sensor with a sfGFP output and
371 tested it against three environmental water samples. (D) Students constructed cell-free fluoride
372 sensors with three reporter outputs and tested the dose-response behavior for Mango, GFP,
373 and XylE outputs. (E) Students constructed a cell-free lead sensor with RFP output and used it
374 to measure lead in fruit juices.
375
376 **Large-scale implementation of biosensing education kits**

377   To the best of our knowledge, all previous cell-free educational studies reported the

378 results from hands-on experiments in professionally equipped laboratories. Our experiments in

379 **Figures 2** and **3** were performed in high school classrooms, but these were still equipped with

380 scientific instruments such as micropipettes. When many American high schools shut down in

381 2020 due to the COVID-19 pandemic and biology classrooms switched overnight to remote

382 learning, we wondered if the intrinsic safety (i.e., no living cells) and thermal stability of freeze-

383 dried cell-free sensors would allow them to be used for at-home experiential learning.

384   To test this possibility, we assembled the largest-scale distributed cell-free expression

385 experiment to our knowledge. This consisted of 120 packaged Module 1 strip-tubes (720 total

386 20-µL CFE reactions, plus controls), which were individually packaged along with single-use,

387 constant-volume pipettes, IPTG and water solution, and a desiccant card (**Figure 5A**). To test

388 the long-term distributed stability of these reactions, we shipped the packages to two high

389 schools in the Atlanta, Georgia metro area and presented the experiments to students along

390 with accompanying curricula and pre- and post-lab surveys. At the time, students in both

391 schools were in a hybrid setting, which meant that 32 students performed the experiments at

392 home and 79 students completed them in a classroom. However, all students used plastic fixed-

393 volume pipettes and incubated the reactions at room temperature. The success rate was

394 measured qualitatively by photographs after 24 hours. These photographs, uncropped, are all

395 available in **Supplemental File 5**.

396

Figure 5. Large-scale implementation of remote learning biosensing module. (**A**) Overview of broad-scale deployment of Module 1, including outside-of-the-classroom learning. 120 Module 1 packages containing fixed-volume pipettes, stocks of IPTG and water, and the freeze-dried reaction eight-strips, were shipped from Northwestern University in desiccant packaging (photo shown) to two high schools in Georgia. 111 students participated, including 79 who performed the experiments in-person and 32 who ran the experiments at home. All students used the constant-volume pipettes to simulate a low-resource setting. (**B**) Overview of Module 1 success. Photos were taken after 24 hours of reaction incubation at room temperature in blue light (as available), and all tubes were scored as 0, 1, or 2 ("OFF", "FAINT", or "ON") by two researchers. The average of each tube assignment was used to indicate a success rate for the whole module, with constitutive ON in tubes 1-4 and 8, OFF in tube 7, and a higher fluorescent signal in tube 6 than in tube 5. Around 60% of the reported photos showed complete success – that is, correct logic in every tube, though pipetting errors and lower-than-expected expression from the pLac-mRFP plasmid reduced the success rate relative to the small-scale local deployment in **Figure 2**. (**C**) Survey data overview, following the same analysis as in Figure 3, from the 67 remote students who completed pre- and post-lab survey for the module. Bolded statements indicate significant improvement (p < 0.05) in score.

The results (**Figure 5B**) from the distributed, large-scale Module 1 were less consistent than what we previously observed at the small scale (**Figure 2A**). Surprisingly low expression of mRFP was observed from both pairs of conditions that used the pLac-mRFP plasmid. In many cases (even in the absence of over-expressed LacI), tubes 1, 2, and 6 showed no visible

420 activation. Among the subset of tubes where mRFP production was visible at endpoint, nearly

421 all students did obtain constitutive expression from tubes 3 and 4 (J23119-mRFP) and observed

422 IPTG-mediated induction in tube 6, compared to tube 5.

423 Overall, by scoring each tube's brightness level as "OFF", "FAINT", or "ON", we

424 assessed around a 60% global success rate for the module, which we considered acceptably

425 comparable to standard biology and chemistry classroom labs. We could not easily ascertain

426 the origin for the failure mode at scale. However, when the remaining reactions were rehydrated

427 by experienced biology teachers using micropipettes, the constitutive reactions activated well,

428 and the fixed-volume pipettes also worked, although they were less accurate (**Figure S5A**).

429 There were also several examples of student tubes that were clearly over-diluted with water or

430 IPTG relative to the nominal pre-lyophilized volume. These effects do inhibit protein synthesis

431 (**Figure 5B**, **Figure S5B**).

432 Considering the scale and purpose of the experiment, we did not repeat it. We instead

433 emphasize that further work should be done to investigate the reproducibility of cell-free

434 reactions at scale. This could include optimization of large-scale extract preparation, reaction

435 assembly, and lyophilization prior to shipment as well as analyzing the impact of environmental

436 fluctuations (e.g., temperature, humidity, *etc*.) between lyophilization and rehydration. Despite

437 the mixed results from the experiment, students reported significant improvements in both

438 "perspective" and "comprehension" fields on the survey after completing the experiment (**Figure**

439 **5C**). Importantly, students reported greater understanding of concentration-dependent behavior

440 in biological systems as well as the benefits of different biological reporters.

441

442

443 **Conclusion**

444 The cell-free biosensor modules developed here represent easy-to-use, low-cost, and

445 distributable biology education labs that achieve learning outcomes through a 1-week

446 curriculum with minimal equipment. After our research team designed and validated

447 experiments based on the canonical *lac* operon, ~20 high school students recapitulated

448 laboratory data in their classrooms as they learned about the mechanisms, dose-responsive

449 behavior, and common reporters for biosensors. Then, students undertook an engineering

450 challenge to design, build, and test their own biosensor experiments using modular inputs

451 (copper, fluoride, or lead ions) with modular outputs (fluorescent proteins, a fluorescent

452 aptamer, or a colorimetric enzyme) for a more creative synthetic biology experience. Finally, we

453 scaled up Module 1 (mechanism) for field testing with deployment to >100 students at schools

454 700 miles away and achieved ~60% success across all modules using disposable pipettes in

16

455 classrooms and home settings during the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic. The effectiveness of these

456 modules was assessed through surveys before and after each set of experiments, revealing

457 significant increases in several perspective and comprehension questions. Students reported

458 increased understanding of biological sensors and reporters and felt that classroom labs were

459 based on modern science after completing the modules.

460 Teaching principles of genetic regulation, biological sensing mechanisms, and field

461 applications of synthetic biology in a hands-on fashion has the potential for significant impact. In

462 total, we reached over 130 students across 3 high schools in 2 states with experiments

463 implemented in classrooms or at home, not in well-equipped laboratories. We anticipate that

464 further expansion of cell-free education modules like the ones described here will facilitate

465 advances in hands-on STEM education by improving access to stimulate greater and earlier

466 interest in biotechnology careers.

467 **Supplemental Files**

468 *Supplemental Figures*

469 Supplemental Figure 1. LacI-enriched extract titration.

470 Supplemental Figure 2. Reporter plasmid titrations.

471 Supplemental Figure 3. True/false survey questions.

472 Supplemental Figure 4. All cascade data pairs.

473 Supplemental Figure 5. Troubleshooting large-scale Module 1 distribution.

474 *Supplemental Files*

475 Supplemental File 1. Uncropped raw photos and scores for Module 1 (Figure 2).

476 Supplemental File 2. Uncropped raw photos and scores for Module 2 (Figure 2).

477 Supplemental File 3. Uncropped raw photos and scores for Module 3 (Figure 2).

478 Supplemental File 4. Uncropped raw photos and scores for Module 1 (Figure 5).

479 Supplemental File 5. All lab reports for Module 4 (Figure 4).

480 Supplemental File 6. Lab curricula.

481

482

483 **Materials and Methods**

484 **DNA assembly and purification**

485 DNA was assembled using a mixture of commercial synthesis, PCR and blunt-end ligation, or

486 isothermal (Gibson) assembly. pJBL7080 and pJBL7084 were synthesized by Twist

487 Biosciences. pJBL7083 was synthesized by Gibson assembly using previously reported

488 pJBL7010 and pJBL7072. pJBL7079 and pJBL7082 were synthesized by Gibson assembly

489 using pJBL7080 and the constitutive expression cassettes as templates. pJBL7081 was

490 assembled using overhang PCR and blunt-end ligation. The Module 4 plasmids were

491 assembled using inverse PCR-blunt end ligation (all reporters: pJBL7056, pJBL7085,

492 pJBL7086, pJBL7087) and Gibson assembly (all aTF expression cassettes and sensor

493 plasmids, pJBL7093, pJBL7061, pJBL7062, pJBL7044, pJBL7045), with the exception of

17

494 pJBL7063, which we could not successfully clone and was synthesized by Twist Biosciences. A

495 list of strains, including descriptions and Addgene accession IDs, are presented below in **Table**

496 **2**. All annotated sequences are available on Addgene or by request.

497

498 **Table 2. Summary of plasmids used in this manuscript.** pLac refers to the *lacUV5* promoter.

499 pT7 refers to the wild-type T7 promoter TAATACGACTCACATATA, and pAKSIRV refers to the

500 orthogonal promoter variant TAATAC**CTGA**CACTATA, with the same 5' UTR. AKSIRV refers to

501 that T7 RNAP variant from [71]. J23119 is a consensus *E. coli* RNAP promoter [72].

502

Plasmid ID	Plasmid Description	Addgene ID
pJBL7044	pT7-PbrR	167215
pJBL7045	pT7-CueR	167216
pJBL7056	pAKSIRV-sfGFP	167225
pJBL7061	pPbr-AKSIRV T7 RNAP	167230
pJBL7062	pCue-AKSIRV T7 RNAP	167231
pJBL7063	J23119-fluoride riboswitch-AKSIRV T7 RNAP	167232
pJBL7079	pLac-sfGFP	167244
pJBL7080	pLac-mRFP1	167245
pJBL7081	pLac-Mango III	167246
pJBL7082	pLac-XylE	167247
pJBL7083	J23119-mRFP1	N/A
pJBL7084	pT7-LacI	167248
pJBL7085	pAKSIRV-mRFP1	167249
pJBL7086	pAKSIRV-Mango III	167250
pJBL7087	pAKSIRV-XylE	167251

503

504 Plasmids were purified by Qiagen Midi Kits (ID 12143), quantified by NanoDrop, and stored

505 long-term in water at -20 °C.

506

507 **Cell extract preparation**

508 Cell extract was prepared to maximize expression from endogenous transcriptional machinery,

509 as previously described [73] with a few modifications. For the laboratory-scale experiments in

510 **Figures 1**, **2**, and **4**, unenriched cell-free extract, 20 mL of a saturated overnight culture of BL21

511 Star (DE3) was inoculated into 1 L of 2X YT+P media (16 g/L tryptone, 10 g/L yeast extract, 5

512 g/L sodium chloride, 7 g/L potassium phosphate dibasic, and 3 g/L potassium phosphate

513 monobasic adjusted to pH 7.2) and grown, shaking at 220 rpm at 37 °C, to optical density 3.0

514 (this required approximately 3 hours and 15 minutes for the base strain). The culture was

515 decanted into 1 L bottles and cells were pelleted by centrifugation at 5,000 X g for 15 minutes at

516 4 °C. The cell pellets were washed once with 25 mL S30A buffer (14 mM Mg-glutamate, 60 mM

517 K-glutamate, 50 mM Tris) and re-centrifuged for 10 minutes at 7,000 X g at 4 °C, following a

518 report that one wash is sufficient to maintain good expression activity in the final extract [74].

519 The pellets were resuspended in S30A buffer at a ratio of 1 mL buffer/g pellet, transferred to 1.7

520 mL Eppendorf tubes, and sonicated on ice at 50% amplitude for 1 minute in six 10-second

521 pulses using a QSonica Q125 small-tip probe. Immediately after sonication, 1 M dithiotreitol

522 (DTT) was added to each tube to a final concentration of 3 mM. The lysate was clarified by

523 centrifugation at 12,000 X g for 10 minutes at 4 °C. The top (supernatant) layer was removed,

524 pipetted into a fresh tube, and incubated, shaking at 37 °C and 220 rpm, for 80 minutes for the

525 ribosomal runoff reaction. After this time, the extract was centrifuged again at 12,000 X g for 10

526 minutes at 4 °C. 3 mL supernatant was transferred to a 10 kDa molecular-weight cutoff

527 membrane and dialyzed against 600 mL S30B buffer (14 mM Mg-glutamate, 60 mM K-

528 glutamate, 5 mM Tris, 1 mM DTT, pH 7.7) for 3 hours without exchange. After dialysis, the

529 extract was transferred back to 1.7 mL Eppendorf tubes, clarified by one additional spin at

530 12,000 X g for 10 minutes at 4 °C, and the supernatant was removed, aliquoted, and flash

531 frozen in liquid nitrogen.

532

533 For the enriched extracts (LacI, CueR, PbrR), a similar protocol was used. Chemically

534 competent BL21 Star (DE3) cells were transformed with plasmids pJBL7084, pJBL7045, or

535 pJBL7044 respectively, which encode the transcription factors under a T7 promoter. Overnight

536 saturated cultures of these strains in LB were used to inoculate 1 L of 2X YT + P media and

537 grown shaking, as before. Between optical density 0.4-0.5, 0.5 mM IPTG was added to induce

538 protein synthesis. The strains were grown for 4-5 hours after induction and harvested as before.

539 Extract was prepared identically, with the exception that no dialysis was performed on the

540 enriched extracts. Instead, after the runoff reaction, the extracts were centrifuged, then directly

541 aliquoted and flash frozen.

542

543 **Cell-free expression reaction**

544 Cell-free gene expression was carried out as previously described[73], in a mixture composed of

545 30 v/v% S12 extract; 8 mM magnesium glutamate, 10 mM ammonium glutamate, and 60 mM

546 potassium glutamate; 1.2 mM ATP and 825 µM of CTP, GTP, and UTP; 34 mg/L folinic acid;

547 171 mg/L tRNA; 2.5 mM each amino acid; 30 mM phosphoenolpyruvate (PEP); 330 µM

19

548   nicotinamide adenine dinucleotide (NAD); 270 µM coenzyme A; 4 mM potassium oxalate; 1 mM

549   putrescine; 1.5 mM spermidine; 57 mM HEPES; plasmid DNA prepared with Qiagen Midi Kits;

550   and the remainder water. Module 3 assays were performed with the addition of 1 mM catechol

551   or 10 nM T01:biotin. Plasmid was added at 40 nM concentration in Modules 1-3 and was

552   supplied in a 10X stock at 50 nM in Module 4.

553

554   **Lyophilization and storage**

555   Prior to lyophilization, PCR strip tube flat caps (Axygen PCR-02-FCP-C) were punctured with a

556   pin to create a hole, and PCR tube strips (Axygen PCR-02C) were placed into pre-chilled

557   aluminum blocks on ice. Lyophilization was then performed by assembling the components of

558   cell-free reactions as described above and placing them into pre-chilled PCR tube strips.

559   Reaction tubes were then closed with the perforated PCR tube caps, submerged in liquid

560   nitrogen, and transferred to a FreeZone 2.5 L Bench Top Freeze Dry System (Labconco). The

561   reactions were then lyophilized for overnight with a condenser temperature of –85° C and 0.04

562   millibar pressure.

563

564   Unless rehydrated immediately, freeze-dried reactions were packaged as follows. About 2 - 5

565   strips of reactions (16 - 40 tubes total) were placed in a light-protective bag (Mylar open-ended

566   food bags, Uline #S-11661) with a desiccant (Dri-Card Desiccants, Uline #S-19582). The

567   reactions were then heat-sealed (Metronic 8-inch Impulse Bag Sealer, Amazon #8541949845)

568   and stored in a cool, shaded area until usage.

569

570   **mRFP1 purification**

571   mRFP1 purification was performed using a pET28c(+) expression plasmid pKJJ0062 (pT7-

572   6XHis-TEV-mRFP). The sequence-verified plasmid was transformed into chemically competent

573   Rosetta 2 (DE3) pLysS *E. coli*. A saturated overnight culture was inoculated into 1 L of LB

574   media and grown at 37° C, then induced with 0.5 mM of IPTG at an optical density (600 nm) of

575   ~0.5 and grown for four additional hours at 37° C. Cultures were then pelleted by centrifugation

576   at 5000 x g and were resuspended in lysis buffer (10 mM Tris-HCl pH 8, 500 mM NaCl, 1 mM

577   TCEP, and protease inhibitor (cOmplete EDTA-free Protease Inhibitor Cocktail, Roche)).

578   Resuspended cells were lysed on ice through ultrasonication, and insoluble material was

579   removed by centrifugation. Clarified supernatant containing mRFP1 was then purified using His-

580   tag affinity chromatography with a gravity column charged with Ni-NTA Agarose (Qiagen

581   #30210). The elution from the gravity column was concentrated and buffer exchanged (25 mM

582 Tris-HCl, 100 mM NaCl, 1mM TCEP, 50% glycerol v/v) using centrifugal filtration (Amicon Ultra-

583 0.5, Millipore Sigma). Protein concentrations were determined using the Qubit Protein Assay Kit

584 (Invitrogen #Q33212). The purity and size of the proteins were validated on an SDS-PAGE gel

585 (Mini-PROTEAN TGX and Mini-TETRA cell, Bio-Rad). Purified proteins were stored at 4° C.

586

587 **Visual analysis of student reactions**

588 Photographic student data was collected by imaging the reactions using a smartphone camera

589 after approximately 24 hours incubation at room temperature. Photos were taken both in white

590 light and in blue light using the miniPCR bio™ P51™ Molecular Fluorescence Viewer and were

591 paired with (anonymized) tube identification numbers. We attempted but failed to quantitatively

592 estimate RFP concentration relative to the 15 µM control tube from each photo, due to the poor

593 image quality and unreliable lighting. Instead, we manually and qualitatively assigned each tube

594 a value of "OFF", "LOW", and "ON". Each tube in each photograph was ranked by at least two

595 researchers to avoid bias. Examples of tubes ranked in each category are in **Figure 5**, and the

596 full data set for each set of tubes is in the **Supplementary Files**. We then took the average of

597 each qualitative measurement and used it to assign a success rate for the module.

598

599 **Survey analysis**

600 Pre- and post-survey responses were paired for individuals according to their sample ID

601 numbers, keeping student responses anonymous. Raw data sets were scrubbed to include only

602 include paired, complete surveys, resulting in smaller sample sizes than the number of students

603 who participated in the activities. For the binary questions, the asymptotic McNemar test with no

604 continuity correction was used to assess statistical significance. For the categorical questions,

605 the non-parametric Wilcoxon signed-rank paired test was used. This research was reviewed by

606 the Northwestern Institutional Review Board Office and was determined to not be human

607 research.

608
609 **CONFLICT OF INTEREST**

610 A.D.S, K. J. J., M.C.J., and J.B.L have filed provisional patent applications in the field of cell-free

611 biosensing. J.B.L. and M.C.J. are co-founders and have financial interest in Stemloop, Inc.

612 These latter interests are reviewed and managed by Northwestern University in accordance with

613 their conflict of interest policies.

614

615 **Data Availability**

616 Source data for all figures will be available in the Northwestern University Arch Institutional
617 Repository or upon request.
618

636

References

638

639 1.   Freeman, S., et al., *Active learning increases student performance in science,*
640   *engineering, and mathematics.* Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 2014.
641   **111**(23): p. 8410-8415.
642 2.   Christensen, R., G. Knezek, and T. Tyler-Wood, *Alignment of Hands-on STEM*
643   *Engagement Activities with Positive STEM Dispositions in Secondary School Students.*
644   Journal of Science Education and Technology, 2015. **24**(6): p. 898-909.
645 3.   Hossain, Z., et al., *Interactive and scalable biology cloud experimentation for scientific*
646   *inquiry and education.* Nature Biotechnology, 2016. **34**(12): p. 1293-1298.
647 4.   Lemon, A., S.R. Bordenstein, and S.R. Bordenstein, *Discover the Microbes Within! The*
648   *Wolbachia Project: Citizen Science and Student-Based Discoveries for 15 Years and*
649   *Counting.* Genetics, 2020. **216**(2): p. 263-268.
650 5.   Temple, L. and L. Lewis, *Phage on the stage.* Bacteriophage, 2015. **5**(3): p. e1062589.
651 6.   Micklos, D. and L. Barone, *Asking the Wrong Questions About American Science*
652   *Education: Insights from a Longitudinal Study of High School Biotechnology Lab*
653   *Instruction.* bioRxiv, 2021: p. 2021.11.29.470152.

7. Mueller, A.L., N.A. Knobloch, and K.S. Orvis, *Exploring the effects of active learning on high school students' outcomes and teachers' perceptions of biotechnology and genetics instruction.* Journal of Agricultural Education, 2015. **56**(2): p. 138-152.

8. Khalil, A.S. and J.J. Collins, *Synthetic biology: applications come of age.* Nature Reviews Genetics, 2010. **11**(5): p. 367-379.

9. Perry, E., et al., *How to grow (almost) anything: a hybrid distance learning model for global laboratory-based synthetic biology education.* Nature Biotechnology, 2022. **40**(12): p. 1874-1879.

10. Gallup, O., H. Ming, and T. Ellis, *Ten future challenges for synthetic biology.* Engineering Biology, 2021. **5**(3): p. 51-59.

11. Clarke, L. and R. Kitney, *Developing synthetic biology for industrial biotechnology applications.* Biochemical Society transactions, 2020. **48**(1): p. 113-122.

12. Aurand, E., et al., *Engineering Biology: A Research Roadmap for the Next-Generation Bioeconomy.* 2019.

13. Baker, B., *Synthetic Biology and the Marketplace: Building the new bioeconomy.* BioScience, 2017. **67**(10): p. 877-883.

14. *Executive Order on Advancing Biotechnology and Biomanufacturing Innovation for a Sustainable, Safe, and Secure American Bioeconomy.* 2022.

15. Walker, J.T., *Middle School Student Knowledge of and Attitudes Toward Synthetic Biology.* Journal of Science Education and Technology, 2021. **30**(6): p. 791-802.

16. Vilanova, C. and M. Porcar, *iGEM 2.0—refoundations for engineering biology.* Nature Biotechnology, 2014. **32**(5): p. 420-424.

17. Kelwick, R., et al., *Promoting microbiology education through the iGEM synthetic biology competition.* FEMS Microbiology Letters, 2015. **362**(16).

18. Bernstein, R., K. Ingram, and K.M. Hart, *BioBuilder: Synthetic biology in the lab.* 2015: " O'Reilly Media, Inc.".

19. Dymond, J.S., et al., *Teaching Synthetic Biology, Bioinformatics and Engineering to Undergraduates: The Interdisciplinary Build-a-Genome Course.* Genetics, 2009. **181**(1): p. 13-21.

20. Silverman, A.D., A.S. Karim, and M.C. Jewett, *Cell-free gene expression: an expanded repertoire of applications.* Nature Reviews Genetics, 2020. **21**(3): p. 151-170.

21. Garenne, D., et al., *Cell-free gene expression.* Nature Reviews Methods Primers, 2021. **1**(1): p. 49.

22. Carlson, E.D., et al., *Cell-free protein synthesis: applications come of age.* Biotechnol Adv, 2012. **30**(5): p. 1185-94.

23. Garenne, D., et al., *The all-E. coliTXTL toolbox 3.0: new capabilities of a cell-free synthetic biology platform.* Synthetic Biology, 2021. **6**(1).

24. Des Soye, B.J., et al., *A Highly Productive, One-Pot Cell-Free Protein Synthesis Platform Based on Genomically Recoded Escherichia coli.* Cell Chem Biol, 2019. **26**(12): p. 1743-1754.e9.

25. Stark, J.C., et al., *On-demand biomanufacturing of protective conjugate vaccines.* Science Advances, 2021. **7**(6): p. eabe9444.

26. Warfel, K.F., et al., *A Low-Cost, Thermostable, Cell-Free Protein Synthesis Platform for On-Demand Production of Conjugate Vaccines.* ACS Synthetic Biology, 2022.

27. Martin, R.W., et al., *Development of a CHO-Based Cell-Free Platform for Synthesis of Active Monoclonal Antibodies.* ACS Synth Biol, 2017. **6**(7): p. 1370-1379.

28. Yin, G., et al., *Aglycosylated antibodies and antibody fragments produced in a scalable in vitro transcription-translation system.* mAbs, 2012. **4**(2): p. 217-225.

29. Groff, D., et al., *Development of an E. coli strain for cell-free ADC manufacturing.* Biotechnol Bioeng, 2022. **119**(1): p. 162-175.

30. Stech, M., et al., *Cell-free synthesis of functional antibodies using a coupled in vitro transcription-translation system based on CHO cell lysates.* Scientific Reports, 2017. **7**(1): p. 12030.

31. Hunt, A.C., et al., *A high-throughput, automated, cell-free expression and screening platform for antibody discovery.* bioRxiv, 2021: p. 2021.11.04.467378.

32. Pardee, K., et al., *Portable, On-Demand Biomolecular Manufacturing.* Cell, 2016. **167**(1): p. 248-259.e12.

33. Pandi, A., et al., *Cell-free biosynthesis combined with deep learning accelerates de novo-development of antimicrobial peptides.* bioRxiv, 2022: p. 2022.11.19.517184.

34. Silverman, A.D., et al., *Design and Optimization of a Cell-Free Atrazine Biosensor.* ACS Synthetic Biology, 2020. **9**(3): p. 671-677.

35. Thavarajah, W., et al., *Point-of-Use Detection of Environmental Fluoride via a Cell-Free Riboswitch-Based Biosensor.* ACS Synth Biol, 2020. **9**(1): p. 10-18.

36. Jung, J.K., et al., *Cell-free biosensors for rapid detection of water contaminants.* Nature Biotechnology, 2020. **38**(12): p. 1451-1459.

37. Didovyk, A., et al., *Rapid and Scalable Preparation of Bacterial Lysates for Cell-Free Gene Expression.* ACS synthetic biology, 2017. **6**(12): p. 2198-2208.

38. Wang, X., et al., *Monitoring arsenic using genetically encoded biosensors in vitro: The role of evolved regulatory genes.* Ecotoxicology and Environmental Safety, 2021. **207**: p. 111273.

39. Ma, D., et al., *Low-cost detection of norovirus using paper-based cell-free systems and synbody-based viral enrichment.* Synthetic Biology, 2018. **3**(1).

40. Sadat Mousavi, P., et al., *A multiplexed, electrochemical interface for gene-circuit-based sensors.* Nature Chemistry, 2020. **12**(1): p. 48-55.

41. Pardee, K., et al., *Paper-Based Synthetic Gene Networks.* Cell, 2014. **159**(4): p. 940-954.

42. Hong, F., et al., *Precise and Programmable Detection of Mutations Using Ultraspecific Riboregulators.* Cell, 2020. **180**(5): p. 1018-1032.e16.

43. Pardee, K., et al., *Rapid, Low-Cost Detection of Zika Virus Using Programmable Biomolecular Components.* Cell, 2016. **165**(5): p. 1255-1266.

44. Moore, S.J., et al., *Rapid acquisition and model-based analysis of cell-free transcription–translation reactions from nonmodel bacteria.* Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 2018. **115**(19): p. E4340-E4349.

45. Karim, A.S., et al., *In vitro prototyping and rapid optimization of biosynthetic enzymes for cell design.* Nature Chemical Biology, 2020. **16**(8): p. 912-919.

46. Liew, F.E., et al., *Carbon-negative production of acetone and isopropanol by gas fermentation at industrial pilot scale.* Nature Biotechnology, 2022. **40**(3): p. 335-344.

47. Kightlinger, W., et al., *A cell-free biosynthesis platform for modular construction of protein glycosylation pathways.* Nature Communications, 2019. **10**(1): p. 5404.

48. Kightlinger, W., et al., *Design of glycosylation sites by rapid synthesis and analysis of glycosyltransferases.* Nat Chem Biol, 2018. **14**(6): p. 627-635.

49. Oza, J.P., et al., *Robust production of recombinant phosphoproteins using cell-free protein synthesis.* Nature Communications, 2015. **6**(1): p. 8168.

50. Huang, A., et al., *Implementing Hands-On Molecular and Synthetic Biology Education Using Cell-Free Technology.* Methods Mol Biol, 2022. **2433**: p. 413-432.

51. Stark, J.C., et al., *BioBits™ Bright: A fluorescent synthetic biology education kit.* Science Advances, 2018. **4**(8): p. eaat5107.

52. Huang, A., et al., *BioBits™ Explorer: A modular synthetic biology education kit.* Science Advances, 2018. **4**(8): p. eaat5105.

53. Williams, L.C., et al., *The Genetic Code Kit: An Open-Source Cell-Free Platform for Biochemical and Biotechnology Education.* Front Bioeng Biotechnol, 2020. **8**: p. 941.

54. Stark, J.C., et al., *BioBits Health: Classroom Activities Exploring Engineering, Biology, and Human Health with Fluorescent Readouts.* ACS Synthetic Biology, 2019. **8**(5): p. 1001-1009.

55. Collias, D., et al., *An educational module to explore CRISPR technologies with a cell-free transcription-translation system.* Synthetic Biology, 2019. **4**(1).

56. Cumbers, J. *Cell-Free Technology Comes Of Age: BioBits Is Changing The Way We Teach Biology.* 2020; Available from: https://www.forbes.com/sites/johncumbers/2020/11/05/cell-free-technology-comes-of-age-biobits-is-changing-the-way-we-teach-biology/?sh=3fdf3a282316.

57. Charczenko, R., et al., *LacOp: A free web-based lac operon simulation that enhances student learning of gene regulation concepts.* Biochem Mol Biol Educ, 2022. **50**(4): p. 360-368.

58. Karig, D.K., et al., *Expression optimization and synthetic gene networks in cell-free systems.* Nucleic Acids Res, 2012. **40**(8): p. 3763-74.

59. Pardee, A.B., F. Jacob, and J. Monod, *The genetic control and cytoplasmic expression of "Inducibility" in the synthesis of β-galactosidase by E. coli.* Journal of Molecular Biology, 1959. **1**(2): p. 165-178.

60. Stamatakis, M. and N.V. Mantzaris, *Comparison of deterministic and stochastic models of the lac operon genetic network.* Biophys J, 2009. **96**(3): p. 887-906.

61. Pédelacq, J.-D., et al., *Engineering and characterization of a superfolder green fluorescent protein.* Nature Biotechnology, 2006. **24**(1): p. 79-88.

62. Autour, A., et al., *Fluorogenic RNA Mango aptamers for imaging small non-coding RNAs in mammalian cells.* Nature Communications, 2018. **9**(1): p. 656.

63. Dolgosheina, E.V., et al., *RNA Mango Aptamer-Fluorophore: A Bright, High-Affinity Complex for RNA Labeling and Tracking.* ACS Chemical Biology, 2014. **9**(10): p. 2412-2420.

64. Liu, X., et al., *Design of a Transcriptional Biosensor for the Portable, On-Demand Detection of Cyanuric Acid.* ACS Synthetic Biology, 2020. **9**(1): p. 84-94.

65. Banerjee, A., *Teaching Science Using Guided Inquiry as the Central Theme: A Professional Development Model for High School Science Teachers.* Science Educator, 2010. **19**(2): p. 1-9.

66. Bell, T., et al., *Collaborative Inquiry Learning: Models, tools, and challenges.* International Journal of Science Education, 2010. **32**(3): p. 349-377.

67. Morales, L.G., et al., *Ten simple rules for building an enthusiastic iGEM team.* PLOS Computational Biology, 2022. **18**(3): p. e1009916.

68. Silverman, A.D., M.C. Jewett, and J.B. Lucks, *Ultrasensitive and multiplexed cell-free biosensors using cascaded amplification and positive feedback* 2021, Northwestern University: United States.

69. Stoyanov, J.V., J.L. Hobman, and N.L. Brown, *CueR (YbbI) of Escherichia coli is a MerR family regulator controlling expression of the copper exporter CopA.* Mol Microbiol, 2001. **39**(2): p. 502-11.

70. Nourmohammadi, E., et al., *Construction of a sensitive and specific lead biosensor using a genetically engineered bacterial system with a luciferase gene reporter controlled by pbr and cadA promoters.* Biomed Eng Online, 2020. **19**(1): p. 79.

71. Meyer, A.J., J.W. Ellefson, and A.D. Ellington, *Directed Evolution of a Panel of Orthogonal T7 RNA Polymerase Variants for in Vivo or in Vitro Synthetic Circuitry.* ACS Synthetic Biology, 2015. **4**(10): p. 1070-1076.

72. Kelly, J.R., et al., *Measuring the activity of BioBrick promoters using an in vivo reference standard.* Journal of Biological Engineering, 2009. **3**(1): p. 4.

804 73. Silverman, A.D., et al., *Deconstructing Cell-Free Extract Preparation for in Vitro*
805   *Activation of Transcriptional Genetic Circuitry.* ACS Synthetic Biology, 2019. **8**(2): p.
806   403-414.
807 74. Levine, M.Z., et al., *Escherichia coli-Based Cell-Free Protein Synthesis: Protocols for a*
808   *robust, flexible, and accessible platform technology.* JoVE, 2019(144): p. e58882.
809