Supplemental Information for

At-Home, Cell-Free Synthetic Biology Education Modules for Transcriptional Regulation and Environmental Water Quality Monitoring

Jaeyoung K. 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 Granitoⁱ, 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, mjewett@stanford.edu

Figure S1. LacI-enriched extract titration. CFE reactions with 20 nM pLac-mRFP1 plasmid were constructed with varying proportions of unenriched extract and LacI-enriched extract. 5% LacI extract was selected for Modules 1-3 to have maximum signal and minimal leak.

Figure S2. Reporter plasmid titrations. CFE reactions with 5% LacI-enriched extract were constructed with varying concentrations of expression templates for sfGFP (**A**), Mango III aptamer (**B**), and XylE (**C**) to maximize signal and minimize leak. The data in panel C represent time to a threshold absorbance of 1.0, linearly interpolated from absorbance measurements every two minutes over four hours, where the lower value indicates a faster time-to-result. The corresponding kinetic traces for two of the concentrations tested (1 nM and 5 nM) are shown in panel D, and the threshold absorbance of 1.0 is indicated with a solid black line.

Figure S3. True/False survey questions. Students at Evanston Township High School completed true/false questions along with the perspective and comprehension questions in the survey. Most students correctly answered the first and third questions prior to completing the experiment modules, but the curricula did result in more students correctly answering the second question.

Figure S4. All cascade data pairs. Transcriptional cascades were run for all combinations of sensor and reporter plasmids available to students for Module 4 to verify modularity and effective construction of many unique sensing reactions. Plotted data represent the individual trajectories from three replicates of every possible lyophilized sensor reaction (5 sensor conditions rehydrated with each of 4 reporter plasmids and each of 4 inducer conditions).

Figure S5. Troubleshooting large-scale Module 1 distribution. (**A**) Before the Georgia students performed Module 1, their teachers rehydrated the remaining reactions and observed results consistent with laboratory data (2 strip-tube replicates from each school). (**B**) The rehydration volume is a key consideration for CFE output. Plotted data represent the endpoint mRFP yield after four-hours when a 20 µL lyophilized IPTG-sensing reaction is rehydrated with varying volumes of a 100 µM IPTG stock. Significantly over- or under-diluting the CFE reactions can result in repressed protein synthesis. This is one of the main drawbacks of disposable pipettes that are less accurate and reliable than laboratory micropipettes.

Table S1. Estimated cost of extract production at laboratory scale. Based on our previous analysis from the literature [1], we estimate a cost of \$83 USD/mL extract. This assumes a labor cost of 20 \$USD/hr and 12 person-hours/batch to yield \$240 USD/batch of extract with 3 mL of extract yield per batch. Generating extract from higher cell density cultures (e.g., harvesting at 30 OD₆₀₀ or more, instead of 3 OD₆₀₀ as was done by Zawada et al. [2, 3]) would further reduce extract costs.

Table S2. Estimated cost of module production at laboratory scale. Based on our previous analysis from the literature [1], we include a labor cost of \$1.50 USD/module, noting that it required roughly four minutes for the preparation of a single set of reactions from the prepared reagents per scientist.

References

- 1. 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.
- 2. Zawada, J. and J. Swartz, *Maintaining rapid growth in moderate-density Escherichia coli fermentations.* Biotechnology and Bioengineering, 2005. **89**(4): p. 407-415.
- 3. Zawada, J. and J. Swartz, *Effects of growth rate on cell extract performance in cell-free protein synthesis.* Biotechnology and Bioengineering, 2006. **94**(4): p. 618-624.