Biotech Beer Brewing
Final report

Dominik Schmidt
Jakob Wittmann

***Abstract*—Bla Blubb**

I. Introduction

Alcohol fermentation in beer or wine production is a highly complex process as the quality of the product plays a major role in defining its price. On the other hand the process itself underlies strict laws which guarantee transparency for the customers [2] [3]. Additionally the growing organic food market calls for products with even more strict processing standards [4]. Compared to other sectors in the food industry where alcohol fermentation is applied all these constraints increases the effort dramatically of finding optimal ways of controlling product quality. As experimental development in laboratories is very costly and not affordable by smaller breweries, simulation methods are gaining popularity.

A well established group of methods uses Genome-Scale Models (GEM) to model metabolic fluxes in bacteria [22]. GEMs are created by analysing the information in the genome of a bacteria about its enzymatical processes and extrapolating a network of metabolites and metabolite reactions which represents the internal fluxes of this bacteria. Based on this model possible flux distributions can be predicted using linear optimization methods, known as flux balance analysis (FBA) [].

In its basic form describes FBA the bahavior of only one bacteria in a constant environment. Zomorri et al. summarizes some approaches to extend FBA to multispecies simulations (*steady-state models*) in time variant environments (*dynamic models*) and even considering spacial variations (*spatio-temporal models*) [22].

The simulation of co-cultures using GEMs is still an emerging field. Every approach has its strengths and weaknesses and must be chosen dependent on the application. In *Steady-state models* like compartmentalized community-level metabolic modeling a common objective function for all involved species must be formulated. This approach has a relatively low computational effort but shows drawbacks in competitive co-cultures where a common objective can not easily be formulated. The spacial dimension of *Spatio-temporal models* results in very high computational effort and it has to be evaluated if this enhances the accuracy of the estimated behavior in that case.

The class of *dynamic models* described by Zomorrodi et al. uses a system of ordinary differential equations (ODE) to extend the static simulation approach of FBA with external system dynamics like the exchange of metabolites and bacteria growth and is called dynamic flux balance analysis (DFBA) [22].

Mehadevan et al. describes two basic categories of DFBA approaches: *dynamic optimization approach* (DOA) and *static optimization approach* (SOA) [16].

In DOA the linear programming (LP) problem to predict the behavior of the bacteria and the differential equations are reformulized to a non-linear programming problem (NLP). This approach has a very high computational effort [11] compared to SOA and has only been used for relatively small GEMs with up to 13 modeled fluxes and 8 metabolites [15] [14].

In SOA the simulation time is discretised by a defined time interval and a FBA is executed for each time point. The results are used to iteratively solve the discretised differential equations to update the environmental conditions at each time point. The described integration method in SOA is similar to Euler-Cauchy. In this approach it is assumed that the cell internal dynamics are much faster than the external dynamics.

Höffner et al. basically generalizes SOA to arbitrary integration methods for solving the system of ODEs by using a third-party solver and names it *direct approach* (DA) [11].

Henson et al. introduces a further method which shows similarities to SOA and DA but enhances the efficiency of the algorithm [11] by reformulating the LP and ODE to a differential-algebraic equation system [9].

The DA described by Höffner et al. has been successfully applied to simulate alcohol fermentation in a wine approximating setup [18] [17] and to predict growth of bacteria in a co-culture [7]. Zhuang et al. implemented the method in the *Dynamic Multispecies Metabolic Modeling* (DMMM) framework which is publicly accessible and written for Matlab [20]. The method developed by Henson et al. compared to DMMM has the potential to increase the accuracy by fixed calculation runtime but since the implementation of DMMM is publicly accessible and relatively simple to implement, this method shall be used in this work.

II. Methods

A. Genome-Scale Models

- How are they created?
  - genome or annotated genome are automatically translated to a GEM
  - tools: Pathway Tools [13], SEED [8]
  - [19]
- What does they contain?

B. Flux Balance Analysis

C. Simulation Algorithm

Table I: Overview of implemented features compared to DMMM

Feature	DMMM	This project
Model		
arbitrary many GEMs	yes	yes
arbitrary many metabolites in environment	yes	yes
mortablility of bacteria	yes (in output flux)	yes
input/output flux of bacteria and metabolites	yes	no
parameterized initial state of environment composition	yes	yes
Michaelis-Menten kinetics	yes	yes
Algorithm		
ODE solver	yes	yes
different ODE solvers	yes	no
analytical solver	yes	no

As described by Zhuang et al. in [21] the algorithm uses a ODE solver with embedded FBA. A FBA is solved for each GEM in the model and for each time step in the discretised simulation time interval considering the changed metabolite and bacteria densities in the shared environment. The results of the FBAs are used by the ODE solver to solve the differential equations

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}x_j}{\mathrm{d}t} = \mu_j x_j \tag{1}$$

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}s_i}{\mathrm{d}t} = \sum_{j=1}^{N} v_{i,j} x_j \tag{2}$$

which models the dynamics of the bacteria's environment [20] where $i = 1...N$ is the index of metabolites in the shared environment and $j = 1...M$ is the index of bacteria. The bacteria density is modeled in x_j with $[x_j] = \frac{g}{l}$ and μ_j is the bacteria's growth rate with $[\mu_j] = \frac{mmol}{g_{DW}h}$. Input and output fluxes of the bacteria's models are modeled in $v_{i,j}$ with $[v_{i,j}] = \frac{mmol}{g_{DW}h}$, the densities of metabolites in the shared environment in s_i with $[s_i] = \frac{mmol}{l}$.

In each time step each bacteria's metabolite intake must be changed dependent on the densities of the metabolites in the shared environment. To model saturation of metabolite intake for high metabolite densities Zhuang et al. implemented Michaelis-Menten kinetics [12]

$$v_{max,i,j} = \frac{v_{mm,i,j} s_i}{s_i + k_{mm,i,j}} \frac{1}{1 + \frac{s_a}{k_{a,i,j}}} \tag{3}$$

This formula describes the upper bound of the input flux $v_{max,i,j}$ for metabolite i of bacteria j dependent on the metabolite density s_i. The formula is characterized by to constants $[v_{mm,i,j}] = \frac{mmol}{g_{DW}h}$ and $[k_{mm,i,j}] = \frac{mmol}{l}$ for each bacteria and metabolite. s_a is the metabolite density of metabolite a, $k_{a,i,j}$ is the inhibition constant of metabolite a and describes the inhibition of the intake of metabolite i by metabolite a at species j.

Mortality is considered using a constant $[\mu_{mort,j}] = \frac{mmol}{g_{DW}h}$ for each bacteria j in this implementation while Zhuang et al. modeled this using the output flux of bacteria out of the system.

Algorithm 1 shows a basic implementation of the differential equations solved by an ODE solver during the simulation similar to DMMM [21].

The algorithm expects a list of bacteria models consisting of

- GEM of this bacteria: A, $\boldsymbol{v_{min}}$, $\boldsymbol{v_{max}}$, $\boldsymbol{w_{growth}}$
- $\boldsymbol{v_{mm}}$ (Michaelis-Menten V_{max}) for each exchange metabolite and species
- $\boldsymbol{k_{mm}}$ (Michaelis-Menten K) for each exchange metabolite and species
- mortality μ_{mort}
- inhibition constants k_a

Furthermore a list of all exchange metabolites in the environment, the bacteria and metabolite densities.

Algorithm 1: Differential equation with embedded FBA

function step$(model_1...model_M, m_1...m_N, x_1...M, s_1...s_N)$;

Input : bacteria models $model_j$, exchange metabolites m_i in environment, bacteria densities x_j, metabolite densities s_i

Output : slope of bacteria and metabolite densities $\dot{x}_j, \dot{s}_i$

for $j := 1$ **to** M **do**
  for $i := 1$ **to** M **do**
    $model_j := update\_intake\_bounds(model_j, s_j, m_i)$
  end
end
for $j := 1$ **to** M **do**
  $\mu_j, \boldsymbol{v_j} := FBA(model_j, \boldsymbol{w_{growth}})$
end
$\boldsymbol{\mu} := \boldsymbol{\mu} - \boldsymbol{\mu_{mort}}$
$\dot{\boldsymbol{x}} := diag(\boldsymbol{\mu})\, \boldsymbol{x}$
for $j := 1$ **to** M **do**
  for $i := 1$ **to** N **do**
    $\dot{\boldsymbol{s}}[m_i] := \dot{\boldsymbol{s}}[m_i] + \boldsymbol{v_j}[m_i] x_j$
  end
end
return $\dot{\boldsymbol{x}}$, $\dot{\boldsymbol{s}}$

In a first step the upper bounds of the intake fluxes are updated for each bacteria j and exchange metabolite i. The function $update\_intake\_bounds(model_j, s_j, m_i)$ calculates the upper bounds using the formula 3 if the metabolite m_i is contained in $model_j$ as a exchange metabolite and updates this value in the model.

In a next step the GEMs are optimized for growth using FBA, the results are used as growth rate μ_j and actual input and output fluxes $\boldsymbol{v_j}$ of bacteria j in this time step.

The mortality is considered by subtracting the constants $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ from the growth rates $\boldsymbol{\mu}$.

At last step the slopes $\dot{\boldsymbol{x}}$ and $\dot{\boldsymbol{s}}$ are calculated according to 1 and 2 and returned to the ODE solver.

D. Simulation Setup

The goal of the simulation is to validate the basic functionality of the simulator using a simplified setup of a realistic future simulation scenario. As defined in our project goals, this simulation scenario is the dynamic flux balance analysis (DFBA) of a co-culture of Saccharomyces cerevisiae and Lactobacillus plantarum.

As genome-scale models a model of Lactobacillus plantarum published by Teusink et al. [**?**]. A decision about a yeast model is not made yet.

The simulation will consider two input metabolites: oxygen and glucose. Table II and table III contain all values needed to define the initial metabolite conditions and kinetics.

Table II: Model constants used in the simulation setup

Constant	S. cerevisiae	L. plantarum
Maximum glucose uptake rate (mmol/g/h)	18.5	18.5
Maximum oxygen uptake rate (mmol/g/h)	2.5	2.5
Glucose uptake saturation constant (g/l)	0.5	0.5
Oxygen uptake saturation constant (mmol/l)	0.005	0.005
Mortability (?)	?	?
Glucose uptake inhibition by ethanol constant (g/l)	10 [10]	-
Glucose uptake inhibition by lactic acid constant (mol/mol ?)	TBD	-

Table III: Simulation parameters used in the simulation setup

Parameter	value	reference
Initial glucose density (mmol/l)	272.9 ... 1230.755	equation 6, table IV
Initial oxygen density (mmol/l)	0.5039	equation 7, table IV
Initial density of S. cerevisiae (mmol/l)	?	-
Initial density of L. plantarum (mmol/l)	?	-

To verify the basic functionality of the simulator the resulting bacteria densities and metabolite densities of ethanol, d- and l-lactate, oxygen and glucose will be compared to existing data.

III. Results

IV. Conclusions

APPENDIX A

The following approximation is used to convert °C ("degree plato") to a density measure (g/l) [6].

$$d_{total} = 4.13\frac{g}{l\ {}^{\circ}P}p + 997\frac{g}{l} \tag{4}$$

As the simulation framework expects metabolite densities relative to the total volume of the solution (mmol of metabolite per liter solution, mmol/l) the total density d_{total} must to converted to a density s_{glc}. It is assumed that $V_{total} = V_{glc} + V_W$.

$$d_{total} = \frac{m_{total}}{V_{total}}$$

$$d_{total} = \frac{m_{glc} + m_w}{V_{total}}$$

$$d_{total} = \frac{m_{glc} + d_w V_w}{V_{total}}$$

$$d_{total} = \frac{m_{glc} + d_w \left(V_{total} - V_{glc}\right)}{V_{total}}$$

$$d_{total} = \frac{m_{glc} + d_w \left(V_{total} - \frac{m_{glc}}{d_{glc}}\right)}{V_{total}}$$

$$s_{glc} = \frac{m_{glc}}{V_{total}} = \frac{d_{total} - d_w}{1 - \frac{d_w}{d_{glc}}} \tag{5}$$

Combining equation 4 and 5, including all constants and converting it to mmol/l leads to:

$$s_{glc} = \left(63.857\frac{1}{{}^{\circ}P}p - 46.385\right)\frac{mmol}{l} \tag{6}$$

Table IV: Constants used in this document

Constant	symbol	value	reference
Oxygen saturation of water at 20°C (mg/l)	-	9.077	[1]
Molar mass of water (g/mol)	-	18.015	[5]
Molar mass of glucose (g/mol)	-	180.156	[5]
Density of water (g/l)	d_w	1.00	[5]
Density of glucose (g/l)	d_{glc}	1.56	[5]
Typical glucose/water solution density to brew beer (°P)	-	5...20	-

To calculate the initial oxygen density in the solution it is assumed that the solution is at 20 °C and fully saturated with oxygen:

$$s_{init,ox} = 9.077\frac{mg}{l} = 9.077\ 10^{-3}\frac{g}{l} = \frac{9.077\ 10^{-3}\frac{g}{l}}{18.015\ 10^{-3}\frac{g}{mmol}} = 0,5039\frac{mmol}{l} \tag{7}$$

APPENDIX B

Table V: Rating of considered DFBA methods

Method	comp. effort	impl. complexity	flexibility
dynamic optimization approach (DOA)	high	medium-high	?
static optimization approach (SOA)	low	low	low
direct approach (DA)	medium	low	medium
reformulation to a differential-glgebraic equation system	low-medium	high	?

REFERENCES

[1] "Chemical features of water," 1987. [Online]. Available: http://www.fao.org/docrep/field/003/AC183E/AC183E04.htm

[2] "Vorläufiges biergesetz, bundesgesetzblatt 1993 teil i seite 1400," 1993. [Online]. Available: http://archiv.jura.uni-saarland.de/BGBl/TEIL1/1993/19931400.1.HTML

[3] "Weingesetz nach änderung durch artikel 9 des gesetzes vom 27. juni 2017 (bgbl. i s. 1966)," 1994. [Online]. Available: https://www.gesetze-im-internet.de/weing_1994/BJNR146710994.html

[4] "Demeter processing standards," 2017. [Online]. Available: http://www.demeter.net/sites/default/files/di_processing_stds_demeter_biodynamic_17_-_e.pdf

[5] "Pubchem: Open chemistry database," 2018. [Online]. Available: https://pubchem.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/

[6] Z. Bubnk, P. Kadlec, D. Urban, and M. Bruhns, *Sugar technologists manual: chemical and physical data for sugar manufacturers and users*. Bartens, 1995.

[7] T. J. Hanly and M. A. Henson, "Dynamic flux balance modeling of microbial co-cultures for efficient batch fermentation of glucose and xylose mixtures," *Biotechnology and Bioengineering*, vol. 108, pp. 376–385, 2011.

[8] C. S. Henry, M. DeJongh, A. A. Best, P. M. Frybarger, B. Linsay, and R. L. Stevens, "High-throughput generation, optimization and analysis of genome-scale metabolic models," *Nature biotechnology*, vol. 28, no. 9, p. 977, 2010.

[9] M. A. Henson and T. J. Hanly, "Dynamic flux balance analysis for synthetic microbial communities," *IET Systems Biology*, vol. 8, pp. 214–229, 2014.

[10] J. L. Hjersted, M. A. Henson, and R. Mahadevan, "Genome-scale analysis ofsaccharomyces cerevisiae metabolism and ethanol production in fed-batch culture," vol. 97, pp. 1190–1204, 2007.

[11] K. Höffner, S. M. Harwood, and P. I. Barton, "A reliable simulator for dynamic flux balance analysis," *Biotechnology and Bioengineering*, vol. 110, no. 3, pp. 792–802, 2013.

[12] K. A. Johnson and R. S. Goody, "The original michaelis constant: translation of the 1913 michaelis–menten paper," *Biochemistry*, vol. 50, no. 39, pp. 8264–8269, 2011.

[13] P. D. Karp, S. M. Paley, M. Krummenacker, M. Latendresse, J. M. Dale, T. J. Lee, P. Kaipa, F. Gilham, A. Spaulding, L. Popescu *et al.*, "Pathway tools version 13.0: integrated software for pathway/genome informatics and systems biology," *Briefings in bioinformatics*, vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 40–79, 2009.

[14] R. Luo, H. Wei, L. Ye, K. Wang, F. Chen, L. Luo, L. Liu, Y. Li, M. J. C. Crabbe, L. Jin, Y. Li, and Y. Zhong, "Photosynthetic metabolism of c3 plants shows highly cooperative regulation under changing environments: A systems biological analysis," *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, vol. 106, pp. 847–852, 2009.

[15] R.-Y. Luo, S. Liao, G.-Y. Tao, Y.-Y. Li, S. Zeng, Y.-X. Li, and Q. Luo, "Dynamic analysis of optimality in myocardial energy metabolism under normal and ischemic conditions," *Molecular Systems Biology*, vol. 2, 2006.

[16] R. Mahadevan, J. S. Edwards, and F. J. Doyle, "Dynamic Flux Balance Analysis of Diauxic Growth in Escherichia coli," *Biophysical Journal*, vol. 83, pp. 1331–1340, 2002.

[17] F. Pizarro, C. Varela, C. Martabit, C. Bruno, J. R. Pérez-Correa, and E. Agosin, "Coupling kinetic expressions and metabolic networks for predicting wine fermentations," *Biotechnology and Bioengineering*, vol. 98, pp. 986–998, 2007.

[18] J. Sainz, F. Pizarro, J. R. Pérez-Correa, and E. Agosin, "Modeling of yeast metabolism and process dynamics in batch fermentation: Modeling yeast metabolism," *Biotechnology and Bioengineering*, vol. 81, pp. 818–828, 2003.

[19] F. Santos, J. Boele, and B. Teusink, "A practical guide to genome-scale metabolic models and their analysis." Elsevier, 2011, vol. 500, pp. 509–532.

[20] K. Zhuang, E. Ma, D. R. Lovley, and R. Mahadevan, "The design of long-term effective uranium bioremediation strategy using a community metabolic model," *Biotechnology and Bioengineering*, vol. 109, pp. 2475–2483, 2012.

[21] K. Zhuang, M. Izallalen, P. Mouser, H. Richter, C. Risso, R. Mahadevan, and D. R. Lovley, "Genome-scale dynamic modeling of the competition between rhodoferax and geobacter in anoxic subsurface environments," *The ISME Journal*, vol. 5, pp. 305–316, 2011.

[22] A. R. Zomorrodi and D. Segrè, "Synthetic ecology of microbes: Mathematical models and applications," *Journal of Molecular Biology*, vol. 428, pp. 837–861, 2016.