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Highlights
• We characterized the signal of HyPer, a fluorescent probe for peroxide, in E. coli.
• Each strain requires its own specific signal characterization.
• HyPer’s signal is reversible rather than real-time.
• Expression of HyPer reduced the rate of peroxide scavenging by the expression host.
• Careful, controlled use of HyPer facilitates quantitative comparisons across studies.

Abstract
Genetically encoded, fluorescent biosensors have been developed to probe the activities of various signaling molecules inside cells ranging from changes in intracellular ion concentrations to dynamics of lipid second messengers. HyPer is a member of this class of biosensors and is the first to dynamically respond to hydrogen peroxide (H₂O₂), a reactive oxygen species that functions as a signaling molecule. However, detailed characterization of HyPer’s signal is not currently available within the context of bacteria exposed to external oxidative stress, which occurs in the immunological response of higher organisms against invasive pathogenic bacteria. Here, we performed this characterization, specifically in Escherichia coli exposed to external H₂O₂. We found that the temporal behavior of the signal does not correspond exactly to peroxide concentration in the system as a function of time and expression of the sensor decreases the peroxide scavenging activity of the cell. We also determined the effects of cell
number, both before and after normalization of externally added \( \text{H}_2\text{O}_2 \) to the number of cells. Finally, we report quantitative characteristics of HyPer’s signal in this context, including the dynamic range of the signal, the signal-to-noise ratio, and the half saturation constant. These parameters show statistically meaningful differences in signal between two commonly used strains of *E. coli*, demonstrating how signal can vary with strain. Taken together, our results establish a systematic, quantitative framework for researchers seeking to better understand the role of \( \text{H}_2\text{O}_2 \) in the immunological response against bacteria, and for understanding potential differences in the details of HyPer’s quantitative performance across studies.
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1. **Introduction**

Genetically-encoded fluorescent biosensors have been developed to observe and measure many different signaling molecules inside cells [1], including the ions zinc and calcium [2], cyclic adenophosphate [3,4], and lipid second messengers [5], among others. Such sensors rely on conformational changes in a sensor domain induced by the analyte, which then causes a shift in the attached green fluorescent protein family member(s) that can be monitored using spectroscopy. If the binding interaction between the sensor and analyte is reversible or if the sensor is regenerated following a chemical reaction with the analyte, researchers may view and study the dynamics of different signaling processes inside cells.

HyPer is the first genetically-encoded sensor to respond to changes in concentration of hydrogen peroxide (\( \text{H}_2\text{O}_2 \)) [6], a reactive oxygen species (ROS) involved in inflammation, immunological responses, and signaling that leads to proliferation and apoptosis in higher organisms [7–11]. The sensor is derived from circularly permuted yellow fluorescent protein and OxyR, an *E. coli* transcription factor that reacts with \( \text{H}_2\text{O}_2 \) with high specificity. \( \text{H}_2\text{O}_2 \) oxidizes one of two key Cys residues, after which the two Cys residues form a disulfide bond [6]. This last step occurs with a conformational change, whereupon cpYFP exhibits an increase in the excitation spectral feature at 500 nm and a decrease at 420 nm (F500 and F420, respectively) when emission is monitored at 530 nm; thus, the ratiometric signal can be correlated with the amount of \( \text{H}_2\text{O}_2 \) present.

Fluorescent dyes such as derivatives of dichlorofluorescein previously used to measure \( \text{H}_2\text{O}_2 \) and other ROS suffer from lack of specificity and artifacts in the signal due to generation of ROS by the dyes themselves when oxidized [12–14]; HyPer does not suffer from these limitations, is genetically encoded and ratiometric, and can be returned to its reduced state by cellular disulfide reductase activity. Because of its numerous advantageous properties, HyPer holds promise for understanding the biological roles of \( \text{H}_2\text{O}_2 \), and its signal has been characterized to an extent and used in many different contexts [15–21].

However, little work has been performed to quantitatively characterize HyPer’s fluorescent signal in bacteria when exposed to environmental oxidative stress, which occurs in the immunological response against pathogenic bacteria. While Belousov et al. demonstrated that the spectrum of HyPer expressed in *E. coli* changes as a function of externally added \( \text{H}_2\text{O}_2 \) [6], the behavior of the signal over time in this particular biological context and the effects of assay variables on the signal have yet to be reported. Furthermore, as HyPer’s signal in *E. coli* has only been demonstrated by one sample and one spectrum per concentration, the variation of
the signal over the course of multiple biological and technical replicates is not known. Thus, the statistically meaningful quantitative properties of this response, such as the dynamic range of the signal, the signal-to-noise ratio, and the half saturation constant (\(K_{1/2}\)) have yet to be formally reported. The above characterization would be valuable in showing how HyPer can be used in this biological context in a quantitative manner. This would enhance HyPer’s utility in the burgeoning field of quantitative redox biology [22] and the potential development of mathematical models of redox biology in bacteria.

In this study, we highlight the extent to which HyPer may be considered a real-time sensor of \(\text{H}_2\text{O}_2\) in the context of bacteria and its effects on the cell’s ability to scavenge \(\text{H}_2\text{O}_2\). We ask how the choice of several variables that the researcher controls during the development of an assay impacts HyPer’s signal and whether the response varies with cell strain. Finally, we examine the performance of the sensor with biological and technical replicates to draw statistically meaningful conclusions about its analytical capabilities.

2. Materials and methods

2.1. Expression of HyPer

A recombinant pQE30 plasmid containing the HyPer construct was obtained from Evrogen. \(E. \text{coli}\) BL21(DE3) and DH5a cells were transformed with the recombinant HyPer plasmid via electroporation. To express the protein in a bacterial culture, a single colony was used to inoculate 5 ml of Luria-Bertani medium (Becton Dickinson) in a 14 ml culture tube (17 x 100 mm, VWR) and incubated at 37 °C with orbital shaking of 250 rpm overnight. This overnight culture was then used to inoculate 50 ml of Terrific Broth medium (Becton Dickinson) in a non-baffled 250 ml Erlenmeyer flask (VWR) and incubated at 37 °C with orbital shaking of 250 rpm. When cultures reached an OD\(_{600}\) of 0.6, cytoplasmic recombinant protein expression was induced by addition of isopropyl \(\beta\)-D-1-thiogalactopyranoside (0.05 mM; Omega Bio-Tek), after which cultures were incubated for 17 hours at 20 °C with orbital shaking of 250 rpm.

2.2. Measurement of HyPer's signal in \(E. \text{coli}\) over time

After expression of HyPer, cells were centrifuged at 4 °C and 14000 rcf for 5 minutes. The supernatant was discarded and cells were resuspended in Tris buffer (25 mM Tris-HCl obtained from MP Biomedicals, LLC, 150 mM NaCl obtained from Mallinckrodt Pharmaceuticals, pH 8). Cells were washed twice to remove traces of interfering fluorescent components of the growth medium and aliquoted in cell concentrations of 60, 240, and 480 x 10\(^6\) cells per 195 \(\mu\)l based on optical density at 600 nm. A stock solution of \(\text{H}_2\text{O}_2\) (VWR) was quantified based on absorbance at 240 nm (\(\varepsilon = 43.6 \text{ M}^{-1} \text{ cm}^{-1}\)) and used to prepare serial dilutions of \(\text{H}_2\text{O}_2\). Cells were added (195 \(\mu\)l) to \(\text{H}_2\text{O}_2\) (5 \(\mu\)l) in a 96-well microtiter plate (Greiner) to final cell concentrations of 60, 240, and 480 x 10\(^6\) per 200 \(\mu\)l and final \(\text{H}_2\text{O}_2\) concentrations of 0, 1, 1.5, 2, 2.5, 3, 5, 10, and 20 \(\mu\)M; given the final volume of 200 \(\mu\)l, these concentrations equate to 0, 0.2, 0.3, 0.4, 0.5, 0.6, 1, 2, and 4 nmol. Fluorescence emission intensity was measured upon excitation at 500 nm (9 nm bandwidth) and 420 nm (9 nm bandwidth) with emission monitored at 545 nm (20 nm bandwidth) at 30 second intervals for 20 minutes using a Tecan Infinite M200 plate reader. Measurements were performed at room temperature (~22 °C) and pH 8. To examine whether the kinetics of HyPer's response changed with the availability of an energy source, the above measurement was repeated with the same buffer containing glucose for HyPer expressed in DH5a at a cell density of 60 x 10\(^6\) per 200 \(\mu\)l in response to 20 \(\mu\)M \(\text{H}_2\text{O}_2\); all conditions were identical except for addition of D-glucose (25 mM, Macron Fine Chemicals) to the assay buffer.
With or without glucose, measurements of the signal showed that both F500 and F420 increased over time, even when no H$_2$O$_2$ was exogenously added to the cell suspension (Figures S1 and S2). Both spectral features should in principle remain unchanged when no H$_2$O$_2$ is introduced; additionally, the cell suspensions used to measure different amounts of H$_2$O$_2$ (0-4 nmol/60 x 10$^6$ cells) were all taken from the same aliquot of cells. Thus, the increases in F500 and F420 with no exogenous H$_2$O$_2$ were subtracted from the time-course plots for F500 and F420 measured with non-zero amounts of exogenously added H$_2$O$_2$; all F500/F420 time-course plots were then derived after this treatment of the data.

2.3. Kinetics of H$_2$O$_2$ scavenging

Rates of removal of H$_2$O$_2$ from solution by DH5α, DH5α expressing HyPer, and BL21(DE3) expressing HyPer were measured using a horseradish peroxidase assay. Cells were washed twice in Tris-glucose buffer (25 mM Tris-HCl obtained from MP Biomedicals, LLC, 150 mM NaCl obtained from Mallinkrodt Pharmaceuticals, 25 mM D-glucose obtained from Macron Fine Chemicals, pH 8) in the manner described in section 2.2. Glucose was added to this resuspension buffer to ensure regeneration of antioxidants such as catalase and alkyl hydroperoxide reductase [23].

For experimental reactions, cells were added (195 µl) to H$_2$O$_2$ (5 µl) to a final cell concentration of 60 x 10$^6$ per 200 µl and a final H$_2$O$_2$ concentration of 20 µM (4 nmol). In another set of solutions to determine a standard curve, final H$_2$O$_2$ concentrations of 20, 16, 12, 8, 4, and 0 µM were prepared in a volume of 200 µl; these concentrations equate to 4, 3.2, 2.4, 1.6, 0.8, and 0 nmol, respectively.

To quench the experimental reactions at certain time points, 10 µl of hydrochloric acid (HCl, 5 N; Mallinkrodt Pharmaceuticals) was added to a sample containing cells at 2, 4, 6, 8, and 10 minutes. 10 µl of HCl was also added to each standard curve reaction. All samples, both experimental reactions and standard curve reactions, were centrifuged at 4 °C and 14000 rcf for 10 minutes. 160 µl of the supernatant of each sample was added to a 96-well microtiter plate (Greiner). 50 µl of potassium phosphate buffer (1 M, pH 8; VWR) was added to each sample in the plate, followed by 50 µl of 2,2’-azino-bis(3-ethylbenzothiazoline-6-sulphonic acid) (ABTS, 2.5 mM; Tokyo Chemical Industry, Co., Ltd.) in potassium phosphate (0.1 M, pH 8, composed of monopotassium phosphate and dipotassium phosphate obtained from VWR). 10 µl of horseradish peroxidase (HRP, 3 mg/ml; Thermo Scientific) in potassium phosphate (0.1 M, pH 8) was then added. All samples were mixed and the absorbance at 405 nm was measured using a Tecan Infinite M200 plate reader. All samples were repeated twice for a total of three technical replicates for each time point in the experimental runs and each concentration in the standard curve solutions.

The absorbances of the standard curve reactions, i.e. samples without cells were plotted against the final concentrations of H$_2$O$_2$ in those samples (Figure S5). Linear least squares regression was performed using Origin software; this calibration was used to determine H$_2$O$_2$ amounts in the experimental reactions, i.e. samples containing cells at each time point. Origin software was used to fit a model of exponential decay to the data for each strain to calculate the rate constant for H$_2$O$_2$ scavenging (section 2.5).

Two separate biological replicates (independent cultures) were analyzed by repeating the above described measurements, both standard curve reactions and experimental reactions at all time points, for a total of N=6 for each strain.
2.4. **Measurement of HyPer’s spectrum in E. coli at selected time points**

To reduce the parameter space, HyPer’s signal was determined at single, selected time points (Table S1) by measuring spectra at 5 nm intervals from 400 to 510 nm, with emission at 545 nm. The measurement was repeated for three total trials at the same experimental conditions used to measure the signal over time (section 2.2) except only at the aforementioned selected time points. The resulting dose-response curves were characterized by using Origin software (Origin Labs) to fit the Hill equation to the curves (section 2.5). The dynamic range was calculated by dividing the maximum ratiometric signal $F_{500}/F_{420}$ by the signal with no exogenous $H_2O_2$ added, i.e. the signal at basal levels of $H_2O_2$ ($F_{500}/F_{420}_{basal}$). The signal-to-noise ratio was calculated by dividing the maximum ratiometric signal by the standard deviation of $F_{500}/F_{420}_{basal}$.

2.5. **Statistical analysis**

Each data point in the dose-response curves and time-course plots of $H_2O_2$ scavenging represents mean ± standard deviation of replicate trials.

Origin software was used to fit the following exponential decay function to time-course plots of $H_2O_2$ scavenging:

$$[\text{nmol } H_2O_2 \text{ per } 60 \times 10^6 \text{ cells}] = [\text{initial nmol } H_2O_2 \text{ per } 60 \times 10^6 \text{ cells}] e^{-at}$$

where $t$ is time in minutes and $a$ is the time constant of $H_2O_2$ decay in min$^{-1}$. Origin software was also used to fit the following Hill equation to dose-response curves:

$$\frac{F_{500}}{F_{420}} = \frac{F_{500}}{F_{420}_{basal}} + \left(\frac{F_{500}}{F_{420}_{max}} - \frac{F_{500}}{F_{420}_{basal}}\right) \frac{[\text{nmol } H_2O_2 \text{ per } 60 \times 10^6 \text{ cells}]}{K_{1/2} + [\text{nmol } H_2O_2 \text{ per } 60 \times 10^6 \text{ cells}]}^n$$

where $F_{500}/F_{420}_{max}$ is the maximum signal upon saturation of the sensor, $n$ is the Hill coefficient, and $K_{1/2}$ is the half saturation constant, i.e. the amount of $H_2O_2$ per $60 \times 10^6$ cells when signal reaches half of its maximum.

All parameters determined by Origin in the fitting of the Hill equation and exponential decay are reported as the calculated parameter ± standard error. To determine the statistical significance of any discrepancies, two-tailed Student’s t-tests were used to compare $H_2O_2$ scavenging time constants between the strains (Table S2), as well as the time constants for the same strain between the two different trials (Table S3). Two-tailed Welch’s t-tests were used to compare measured data points in the dose-response curves (Tables S4 to S11). Finally, two-tailed Student’s t-tests were used to compare parameters from the Hill equation for each strain measured at $60 \times 10^6$ cells (Table S12).

3. **Results and discussion**

HyPer’s signal in the cytoplasm of *E. coli* in response to exogenously added $H_2O_2$ was measured for BL21(DE3) and DH5α. For each strain, cell numbers of 60, 240, and $480 \times 10^6$ were tested to determine the impact of cell density on the signal. Each combination of strain and cell number was incubated with different amounts of $H_2O_2$, and the ratiometric signal ($F_{500}/F_{420}$) was measured both over time (section 2.2) and at selected time points to reduce the parameter space (section 2.3 and Table S1).
We report HyPer’s signal in two ways common among users of the probe: the raw ratio F500/F420 and the fold change. Fold change is calculated by dividing the ratio F500/F420 measured in response to a non-zero amount of H₂O₂ by the raw ratio F500/F420basal, i.e. the ratio for which no exogenous H₂O₂ was added.

3.1. Temporal behavior of HyPer’s signal

HyPer’s signal was measured over time after an exogenous addition of hydrogen peroxide (Figure 1). On the basis of existing literature, we expected the ratio F500/F420 to reach a peak value and then decay toward the initial ratio. Figure 1 shows that the rise and decay time scales are not identical for every condition examined. For most combinations of cell number and peroxide amount (Figures 1a,b,c,e) the rise and decay were captured. However, in Figure 1d, the curves for the two highest peroxide concentrations did not decay on the time scale of the experiment, and in Figure 1f, only the tail end of the decay was captured. The rise and peak for this set of conditions likely occurred on a faster time scale than was accessible for these spectroscopic readings. Figure 1 demonstrates that the kinetics of HyPer’s response are complex and non-linear in some regimes when the number of cells and the amount of peroxide are varied. Figure S3 shows that for BL21(DE3) measured at 60 x 10⁶ cells and DH5α measured at 240 x 10⁶ cells, as the amount of H₂O₂ increased, the time required to reach a peak response increased. As a consequence of the observation that the signal can peak at different times in response to the addition of different H₂O₂ amounts, the dose-response curve can evolve over time (Figure S4); hence, the quantification of H₂O₂ depends heavily in some cases upon the timing of the measurement.

Figure 1 (double column)
Figure 1. Time-course plots of F500/F420 at cell numbers of 60 (a, d), 240 (b, e), and 480 x 10^6 (c, f) per 200 uL for BL21(DE3) (a, b, c) and DH5α (d, e, f).

To examine the extent to which HyPer acts as a real-time sensor of H₂O₂ concentration and perturbs the H₂O₂ scavenging capacity of the cell, an additional measurement technique was used to measure the concentration of H₂O₂ as a function of time in the cell suspension. BL21(DE3) and DH5α expressing HyPer and DH5α without HyPer were incubated with H₂O₂. The scavenging of H₂O₂ by cells was then stopped via acidification of the entire solution using HCl at different time points, and the amount of remaining H₂O₂ was measured using an HRP/ABTS assay (Figures 2 and S6). 60 x 10^6 cells were used for this measurement because the scavenging rate for this number of cells was slow enough for several time points to be assayed. Higher scavenging rates are expected for cell numbers of 240 and 480 x 10^6. The kinetic measurements of HyPer’s signal in BL21(DE3) and DH5α at 60 x 10^6 cells were repeated as described in section 3.1 in buffer supplemented with glucose to compare the temporal behavior of HyPer’s signal with the rate at which external H₂O₂ is scavenged by cells.

The data show that the behavior of HyPer’s signal as a function of time differs significantly from the exponential decay of peroxide concentration after bolus, exogenous addition indicated by the ABTS signal. This temporal behavior is due to HyPer’s reliance on oxidation and reduction of two key Cys residues to exhibit its signal. The oxidation reaction competes with scavenging by antioxidants such as catalase and alkyl hydroperoxide reductase [23]. After oxidation, slow reduction of HyPer due to disulfide reductase activity within the cell occurs, which leads to eventual decreases in the signal (Figure 1). The observation that oxidation occurs more rapidly than reduction is consistent with previous characterization of HyPer’s signal in mammalian cells [24,25]. Because of its mechanism of action, HyPer can function as an intracellular, reversible sensor, but researchers should note that its signal reverses well after peroxide has been removed from the system by cellular antioxidants. We also note that HyPer’s signal was elevated when measured with glucose present in the assay buffer, with the basal signal and the signal at 4 nmol H₂O₂/60 x 10^6 cells each increased by 2-3 fold; buffer composition is thus another assay variable that must be carefully controlled in measurements of HyPer’s signal.

Figure 2 (single column)
Figure 2. Time-course plots of H$_2$O$_2$ scavenging (squares) and F500/F420 (circles) measured at cell number of 60 x 10$^6$. An absorbance-based horseradish peroxidase assay was used to measure peroxide concentration in solution as a function of time for an initial 20 µM addition of H$_2$O$_2$ (4 nmol). Absorbance values were converted to amounts of peroxide using a standard curve (Figure S5). F500/F420 signal is shown in response to this same exogenous addition on the y-axis on the right. Data shown from 2 to 10 minutes.

The calculated H$_2$O$_2$ scavenging rate constants are shown in Table 1. Two separate biological replicates were performed to determine culture-to-culture variability of H$_2$O$_2$ scavenging by *E. coli* (Figure S6). While BL21(DE3) and DH5α without HyPer exhibited H$_2$O$_2$ scavenging rate constants that were consistent between the two separate trials, DH5α with HyPer had two statistically different rate constants (Table S2). In both trials, the scavenging rate constant of each strain was statistically different from the other two (Table S3), with BL21(DE3) being the slowest, followed by DH5α, and then DH5α without HyPer (Table 1). Although HyPer could be considered a scavenger because of its reaction with H$_2$O$_2$, its expression in *E. coli* results in decreased overall peroxide scavenging activity, as DH5α without HyPer exhibited higher H$_2$O$_2$ scavenging rate constants than DH5α with HyPer in both trials. Given the effects of HyPer expression on H$_2$O$_2$ scavenging, the difference in rate constant between the two different trials for DH5α with HyPer but lack of any significant difference for BL21(DE3) suggests that HyPer expression has more variability in DH5α than in BL21(DE3).

**Table 1. H$_2$O$_2$ scavenging rate constants (min$^{-1}$) for each strain in each trial.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strain</th>
<th>BL21(DE3) +HyPer</th>
<th>DH5α +HyPer</th>
<th>DH5α -HyPer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trial #1</td>
<td>0.17 ± 0.003</td>
<td>0.25 ± 0.01</td>
<td>0.44 ± 0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trial #2</td>
<td>0.17 ± 0.01</td>
<td>0.34 ± 0.02</td>
<td>0.42 ± 0.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, timing of the measurement clearly has an impact on the dose-response curve developed due to the kinetics of HyPer’s signal. Furthermore, HyPer appears to significantly perturb the cell’s scavenging capacity; this effect should also be taken into account when integrating HyPer’s signal into a quantitative model of redox biology. Dose-response curves were measured at selected time points (Table S1) to further investigate the effects of two other assay variables (cell number and cell strain) and also capture statistically meaningful parameters that quantitatively characterize HyPer’s signal, as discussed in sections 3.2 and 3.3.

### 3.2. Effects of cell number on dose-response curves

Dose-response curves often correlate the signal from cells expressing HyPer with the molar concentration of H$_2$O$_2$ added to the cell suspension, as shown in the left-hand panels of Figure 3. The right-hand panels of Figure 3 show the same data in the left-hand panels but correlate the signal with the amount of H$_2$O$_2$ per number of cells, rather than the concentration of H$_2$O$_2$ of the entire system. The left-hand panels would suggest that the signal, when calculated by either the raw ratio (Figures 3a and 3e) or the fold change (Figures 3c and 3g), has different dynamic ranges at different cell numbers. However, when accounting for the number of cells in the right-hand panels, the signal across different cell numbers collapses such that the dose-response curves for different cell numbers tend to more closely match for both strains at higher amounts of H$_2$O$_2$ as evidenced by two-tailed Welch’s t-tests (Tables S4 to S11).

**Figure 3 (double column)**
Figure 3. Dose-response curves of F500/F420 or fold change vs $\text{[H}_2\text{O}_2\text{]}$ or $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2$ amount normalized to number of cells in assay solution. $\text{[H}_2\text{O}_2\text{]}$ is concentration of the entire assay solution. Curves for both strains (BL21(DE3) and DH5α) at three different cell numbers (60, 240, and 480 x 10^6) are shown. F500/F420 is shown for BL21(DE3) (a, b) and DH5α (e, f). Fold change is also shown for BL21(DE3) (c, d) and DH5α (g, h).
It should be noted that even though the amount of exogenously added H$_2$O$_2$ is normalized to the number of cells in the right-hand panels of Figure 3, some slight differences in the signal still persist across different cell numbers. However, these differences do not show different dynamic ranges as in the left-hand panels; rather, the differences lie in the fact that the raw ratio increases with the number of *E. coli* at lower amounts of H$_2$O$_2$, even when no H$_2$O$_2$ is added (F500/F420$_{basal}$). Given that measurements at all cell numbers were performed on cells taken from the same solution, the increase in signal for higher cell numbers may be due to light scattering by *E. coli*; Kiefer et al., for instance, showed that the absorbance at 500 nm increases more than at 420 nm when the number of cells in solution is increased from 70 x 10$^6$ to 700 x 10$^6$ [26]. Thus, it is quite feasible that increases in cell number from 60 x 10$^6$ to 240 x 10$^6$ and then to 480 x 10$^6$ may lead to greater increases in scattering at 500 nm than at 420 nm, which would explain why F500/F420$_{basal}$ and other raw ratios at low H$_2$O$_2$ levels generally increase with cell number. The use of fold change to measure the signal takes this variation in raw ratio across different cell numbers into account and effectively eliminates statistically significant differences in the signal (Tables S7 and S11). Thus, while the raw ratio may vary with cell number at particularly low levels of H$_2$O$_2$ likely due to light scattering, the fold change can be used to somewhat account for this variation.

The differences in dose-response curve behavior between the left-hand and right-hand panels of Figure 3 demonstrate the importance of controlling the number of cells when measuring HyPer’s signal in response to oxidative stress. Given a fixed number of cells and fixed amount of externally added H$_2$O$_2$, each cell is exposed to a fraction of the H$_2$O$_2$; thus, HyPer exhibits a signal within the cell in response to this fraction of the H$_2$O$_2$. Therefore, the amount of H$_2$O$_2$ added when measuring HyPer’s signal should, in principle, be normalized to the number of cells. Furthermore, even when the number of cells is accounted for in measurement of the signal, light scattering as a function of the number of cells can also impact the raw ratio, particularly at relatively low levels of H$_2$O$_2$. The amount of H$_2$O$_2$ per some fixed number of cells as well as the total number of cells being measured in a given volume are both variables to which dose-response curves can be quite sensitive.

### 3.3. Effects of expression host strain on dose-response curves and formal quantitative characterization of the signal

The proof-of-concept work by Belousov et al. [6] did not address the question of whether and how the strain of *E. coli* used affects the signal. The difference in the kinetics of H$_2$O$_2$ scavenging between the two strains in this study (Figure 2), as well as the apparent differences in the dose-response curves in the right-hand panels of Figure 3, suggest that that the use of HyPer in two different *E. coli* strains does have an effect on the resulting dose-response curve. To further quantify the differences in the signal between the two strains, we focused on the dose-response curves measured using 60 x 10$^5$ cells and fitted the Hill equation (section 2.5) to the raw ratiometric signal (Figure 4). The parameters quantifying the dose-response curve according to a fit with an unconstrained Hill coefficient are shown in Table 2.

*Figure 4 (single column)*
The dose-response curves in each strain differ in dynamic range, $K_{1/2}$, and signal-to-noise ratio, while the difference in the Hill coefficient $n$ is not statistically significant (Table S12). Also notable is that the Hill coefficient $n$ is greater than 1 for both strains. This suggests positive cooperativity in the reaction between HyPer and $H_2O_2$, which in turn suggests that oxidized HyPer may interact in some way with another HyPer molecule that is reduced, facilitating its oxidation by $H_2O_2$; this would be consistent with the behavior of the OxyR transcription factor [27]. While purified HyPer has been characterized as a monomer, it is also known that it can exist as a mixture of dimers and monomers at higher concentrations [24,25].

The results of assuming the reaction of HyPer with $H_2O_2$ to be an independent event, fixing $n$ at 1, and fitting the Hill equation accordingly are also shown in Figure 4. To fit the equation to the data, the parameter reduced $\chi^2$ was minimized, and was 2.5 and 1.1 for BL21(DE3) and DH5α, respectively, when $n$ was fixed at 1; when $n$ was not fixed, the reduced $\chi^2$ was 0.17 and 0.059 for BL21(DE3) and DH5α, respectively, showing that the equation converged to a better fit.

Overall, Figure 4 and Tables 2 and S12 confirm the differences in signal between the two strains suggested by other data in this work. The apparent differences between two different strains of *E. coli* also suggest that other microbes, with possible differences in scavenging

---

**Figure 4.** Dose-response curves of F500/F420 vs $H_2O_2$ amount normalized to number of cells in assay solution. Curves for both strains BL21(DE3) and DH5α at cell number of 60 x $10^6$ are shown. The Hill equation was fit to the data, with $n$ fixed at 1 (dashed) and not fixed but allowed to be fitted to the data (solid).

**Table 2.** Quantitative parameters of the fluorescent signal of HyPer in *E. coli* measured at 60 x $10^6$ cells.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><em>E. coli</em> strain</th>
<th>BL21(DE3)</th>
<th>DH5α</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dynamic range</td>
<td>2.45 ± 0.06</td>
<td>2.71 ± 0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>($[F500/F420_{max}]/[F500/F420_{basal}]$)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$K_{1/2}$ (nmol $H_2O_2/60 \times 10^6$ cells)</td>
<td>0.86 ± 0.04</td>
<td>0.71 ± 0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hill coefficient $n$</td>
<td>1.72 ± 0.09</td>
<td>1.62 ± 0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signal-to-noise ratio</td>
<td>120.4</td>
<td>57.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
capacity, disulfide reductase activity, and HyPer expression level, may also exhibit different dose-response curves. Thus, dose-response curves should be developed specific to the expression host, without preemptively assuming that a single HyPer molecule reacts with $H_2O_2$ in an independent fashion.

3.4. Possible factors underlying the differences in HyPer's signal between strains

One possible reason for the difference in HyPer's signal measured in DH5α and BL21(DE3) is the presence of the recA null mutation in the former, which results in as low as 50% cell viability at the time of measurement [28]. While expressed HyPer may still be able to detect $H_2O_2$ in dead cells, the disulfide reductase machinery is no longer active; thus, HyPer in the oxidized state in dead cells can no longer be reduced to reverse its signal and may also become overoxidized. Because of the recA null mutation, this would be more frequent in the DH5α strain than in BL21(DE3).

Figure 2 clearly showed that the strains also have different scavenging rates, suggesting that they have different expression levels of peroxide scavengers. The primary scavengers in *E. coli* are the catalases KatG and KatE and alkyl hydroperoxide reductase (Ahp) [29]. Ahp is the primary scavenger of endogenously produced $H_2O_2$ in routine growth conditions [23], while KatE and KatG are better suited for scavenging much higher levels of exogenously introduced $H_2O_2$ [23]. The scavenging activity of cells containing only Ahp with *katE* and *katG* null mutations, for instance, became saturated at an extracellular $H_2O_2$ concentration of 20 µM with 45 x 10⁶ cells (assuming that an OD₆₀₀ of 1 approximately equates to 10⁹ cells/ml) present in a 0.45 ml volume (6.75 nmol $H_2O_2$/60 x 10⁶ cells), and was limited by the availability of NADH. In contrast, the scavenging activity of cells expressing only catalase did not become saturated even in the presence of millimolar concentrations of $H_2O_2$ [23]. Given the concentrations of $H_2O_2$ used in our study, it is likely that KatG and KatE were the primary scavengers in our measurements, and possible that the expression levels of these scavengers differ between different strains. KatE, for instance, is induced by the RpoS system [30]; because the level of RpoS can vary between strains and isolates of the same strain, this may result in different expression levels of KatE. The expression levels and thus total activities of the primary scavengers in *E. coli* may vary between strains, which would affect the signal due to potential kinetic competition between scavengers and HyPer for $H_2O_2$.

We also note that the induction of certain genes in *E. coli* depend on growth conditions. Expression of Ahp and KatG are primarily regulated by the OxyR transcription factor [31], while KatE is strongly expressed only in the stationary phase and induced by the RpoS system [30]. In our experiments, the cultures were grown to stationary phase and introduced to exogenous $H_2O_2$, meaning that all three scavengers were induced. Thus, a different set of conditions in which HyPer might have been expressed could have changed the expression levels of the primary scavengers and consequently their competition with HyPer and the resulting fluorescent signal. If the cultures had not been grown to stationary phase, for instance, then the KatE catalase could have been removed as a potential contributor to scavenging activity. Because growth conditions affect the expression levels of the primary scavengers, growth conditions are also an important variable to consider when measuring HyPer’s signal in cells in response to exogenous $H_2O_2$.

4. Conclusions
Overall, our study shows the importance of controlling several variables when assaying HyPer’s intracellular signal in response to external oxidative stress. The timing of the measurement is important in the generation of a dose-response curve and the resolution it provides, since this curve evolves over time after exposure to oxidative insult. Furthermore, expression of HyPer may reduce the cell’s peroxide scavenging capacity; this effect should be taken into account by measuring the scavenging rate both with and without HyPer. The number of cells should also be controlled to allow normalization of the amount of exogenously added H$_2$O$_2$ and also to account for variations in the signal due to possible light scattering by the cells themselves, particularly at low levels of H$_2$O$_2$ per cell. The expression host used also affects the signal, likely due to differences in scavenging capacity, disulfide reductase activity, HyPer expression, and cell viability. Growth conditions also influence scavenging capacity by affecting which scavengers are expressed and to what levels, making growth conditions for HyPer expression another important variable to control.

We establish a framework for systematically measuring dose-response curves in this physiological context and generating statistically meaningful properties of the response. When the variables mentioned above – timing of measurement, effects of HyPer expression on the cell’s scavenging capacity, number of cells, and expression host – are well controlled and accounted for, the parameters obtained from a dose-response curve should facilitate meaningful comparisons of the signal across different studies. This framework should enable reproducible use of HyPer in more quantitative studies of biological processes in which cells are exposed to external oxidative stress.

Acknowledgements

J.B.L. acknowledges support from a National Science Foundation Graduate Research Fellowship. H.D.S. acknowledges support from a Burroughs Wellcome Fund Career Award at the Scientific Interface, the Joseph R. Mares endowed chair in chemical engineering, and the James H. Ferry Fund for Innovation. We thank Joy Lee and Sohail F. Ali for helpful discussions during this work.

References


