

# Fundamental limits on the rate of bacterial cell division

Nathan M. Belliveau<sup>†, 1</sup>, Griffin Chure<sup>†, 2</sup>, Christina L. Hueschen<sup>3</sup>, Hernan G. Garcia<sup>4</sup>, Jane Kondev<sup>5</sup>, Daniel S. Fisher<sup>6</sup>, Julie A. Theriot<sup>1, 7, \*</sup>, Rob Phillips<sup>8, 9, \*</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Biology, University of Washington, Seattle, WA, USA; <sup>2</sup>Department of Applied Physics, California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, CA, USA; <sup>3</sup>Department of Chemical Engineering, Stanford University, Stanford, CA, USA; <sup>4</sup>Department of Molecular Cell Biology and Department of Physics, University of California Berkeley, Berkeley, CA, USA; <sup>5</sup>Department of Physics, Brandeis University, Waltham, MA, USA; <sup>6</sup>Department of Applied Physics, Stanford University, Stanford, CA, USA; <sup>7</sup>Allen Institute for Cell Science, Seattle, WA, USA; <sup>8</sup>Division of Biology and Biological Engineering, California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, CA, USA; <sup>9</sup>Department of Physics, California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, CA, USA; \*Co-corresponding authors. Address correspondence to phillips@pboc.caltech.edu and jtheriot@uw.edu; <sup>†</sup>These authors contributed equally to this work

14

**Abstract** Recent years have seen a deluge of experiments dissecting the relationship between bacterial growth rate, cell size, and protein content, quantifying the abundance of proteins across growth conditions with unprecedented resolution. However, we still lack a rigorous understanding of what sets the scale of these quantities and when protein abundances should (or should not) depend on growth rate. Here, we seek to quantitatively understand this relationship across a collection of *Escherichia coli* proteomic data sets covering  $\approx$  4000 proteins and 36 growth rates. We estimate the basic requirements for steady-state growth by considering key processes in nutrient transport, energy generation, cell envelope biogenesis, and the central dogma. From these estimates, ribosome biogenesis emerges as a primary determinant of growth rate. We expand on this assessment by exploring a model of ribosomal regulation as a function of the nutrient supply, revealing a mechanism that ties cell size and growth rate to ribosomal content.

25

## Introduction

The observed range of bacterial growth rates is enormously diverse. In natural environments, some microbial organisms may double only once per year (*Mikucki et al., 2009*) while in comfortable laboratory conditions, growth can be rapid with several divisions per hour (*Schaechter et al., 1958*). This six order-of-magnitude difference in time scales encompasses different microbial species and lifestyles, yet even for a single species such as *Escherichia coli*, the growth rate can be modulated over a comparably large scale by tuning the type and amount of nutrients in the growth medium. This remarkable flexibility in growth rate illustrates the intimate relationship between environmental conditions and the rates at which cells convert nutrients into new cellular material – a relationship that has remained a major topic of inquiry in bacterial physiology for over a century (*Jun et al., 2018*).

Jacques Monod once remarked that “the study of the growth of bacterial cultures does not constitute a specialized subject or branch of research, it is the basic method of Microbiology.” Those words ring as true today as they did when they were written 70 years ago (*Monod, 1949*) with the quantitative power of this “method” recently undergoing renaissance. Many of the key questions addressed by the pioneering efforts in the middle of the last century can be revisited by examining them through the lens of the increasingly refined molecular census that is available for bacteria such as the microbial workhorse *E. coli*.

Several of the evergreen questions about bacterial growth and physiology that were originally raised by

42 microbiologists in the middle of the 20th century can now be reframed in light of this newly available data. For  
43 example, what biological processes are the primary determinants for how quickly bacterial cells can grow and  
44 reproduce? How do cells modulate the absolute numbers and relative ratios of their molecular constituents as  
45 a function of changes in growth rate or nutrient availability? In this paper, we begin by considering these two  
46 questions from two distinct angles. First, as a result of an array of high-quality proteome-wide measurements of *E.*  
47 *coli* under diverse growth conditions, we have a census that allows us to explore how the number of key molecular  
48 players change as a function of growth rate. Here, we have assembled a singular data set using measurements  
49 collected over the past decade via mass spectrometry (*Schmidt et al., 2016; Peebo et al., 2015; Valgepea et al.,  
50 2013*) or ribosomal profiling (*Li et al., 2014*) of the composition of the *E. coli* proteome across 36 unique growth  
51 rates (see Appendix Experimental Details Behind Proteomic Data for further discussion of the data). Second,  
52 by compiling molecular turnover rate measurements for many of the fundamental processes associated with  
53 bacterial growth, we make quantitative estimates of key cellular processes (schematized in *Figure 1*) to determine  
54 whether our current understanding of the dynamics of these processes are sufficient to explain the magnitude  
55 of the observed protein copy numbers across conditions. The census, combined with these estimates, provide a  
56 window into the question of whether the rates of central processes such as energy generation or DNA synthesis  
57 are regulated systematically as a function of cell growth rate by altering protein copy number.

58 Throughout our estimates, we consider an archetypal growth rate of  $\approx 0.5 \text{ hr}^{-1}$  corresponding to a doubling  
59 time of  $\approx 5000$  seconds, as the data sets examined here heavily sample this growth regime. While we formulate  
60 point estimates for the protein abundances at this division time, we also consider how these values will vary  
61 at other growth rates due to changes in cell size, surface area, and chromosome copy number (*Taheri-Araghi  
62 et al., 2015*). Broadly, we find that the protein copy numbers appeared tuned for the task of cell doubling across  
63 a continuum of growth rates for the majority of the processes estimated here. Thus, our understanding of the  
64 kinetics of myriad biological processes is sufficient to quantitatively explain the observed abundances of these  
65 proteins.

66 From these estimates, it emerges that translation, particularly the synthesis of ribosomal proteins, is a plausible  
67 candidate that limits the rate of cell division. We reach this conclusion by considering that ribosome synthesis is  
68 1) a rate limiting step for the *fastest* bacterial division, and 2) a major determinant of bacterial growth across the  
69 nutrient conditions we have considered under steady state, exponential growth. This enables us to suggest that the  
70 long-observed correlation between growth rate and cell size (*Schaechter et al., 1958; Si et al., 2017*) can be simply  
71 attributed to the increased absolute number of ribosomes per cell under conditions supporting extremely rapid  
72 growth. To better understand how the observed alterations in absolute protein abundances, and in particular,  
73 changes in ribosome copy number, influence growth rate across different nutrient conditions we consider a  
74 minimal model of cellular growth. Our conclusions from these analyses provide important insight into how *E.*  
75 *coli* regulates growth across conditions of differing nutrient availability and identifies fundamental constraints in  
76 bacterial growth more broadly.

## 117 Nutrient Transport

118 We begin by considering the critical transport processes diagrammed in *Figure 1(A)*. In order to build new cellular  
119 mass, the molecular and elemental building blocks must be scavenged from the environment in different forms.  
120 Carbon, for example, is acquired via the transport of carbohydrates and sugar alcohols with some carbon sources  
121 receiving preferential treatment in their consumption (*Monod, 1947*). Phosphorus, sulfur, and nitrogen, on the  
122 other hand, are harvested primarily in the forms of inorganic salts, namely phosphate, sulfate, and ammonia (*Jun  
123 et al., 2018; Assentoft et al., 2016; Stasi et al., 2019; Antonenko et al., 1997; Rosenberg et al., 1977; Willsky et al.,  
124 1973*). All of these compounds have different membrane permeabilities (*Phillips, 2018*) and most require some  
125 energetic investment either via ATP hydrolysis or through the proton electrochemical gradient to bring the material  
126 across the hydrophobic cell membrane.

127 The elemental composition of *E. coli* has received much quantitative attention over the past half century  
128 (*Neidhardt et al., 1991; Taymaz-Nikerel et al., 2010; Heldal et al., 1985; Bauer and Ziv, 1976*), providing us with  
129 a starting point for estimating how many atoms of each element must be scavenged from the environment. A  
130 synthesis of these studies presents an approximate dry mass composition of  $\approx 50\%$  carbon (BNID: 100649, see  
131 *Box 1*),  $\approx 15\%$  nitrogen (BNID: 106666),  $\approx 3\%$  phosphorus (BNID: 100653), and 1% sulfur (BNID: 100655) with


78 **Box 1. The Rules of Engagement for Order-Of-Magnitude Estimates**

79 This work relies heavily on "back-of-the-envelope" estimates to understand the growth-rate dependent  
80 abundances of molecular complexes. This moniker arises from the limitation that any estimate should be  
81 able to fit on the back of a postage envelope. As such, we must draw a set of rules governing our precision  
82 and sources of key values.

83 **The rule of "one, few, and ten".** The philosophy behind order-of-magnitude estimates is to provide a estimate  
84 of the appropriate scale, not a prediction with many significant digits. We therefore define three different  
85 scales of precision in making estimates. The scale of "one" is reserved for values that range between 1 and 2.  
86 For example, If a particular process has been experimentally measured to transport 1.87 protons for a process  
87 to occur, we approximate this process to require 2 protons per event. The scale of "few" is reserved for values  
88 ranging between 3 and 7. For example, we will often use Avogadro's number to compute the number of  
89 molecules in a cell given a concentration and a volume. Rather than using Avogadro's number as  $6.02214 \times 10^{23}$ ,  
90 we will approximate it as  $5 \times 10^{23}$ . Finally, the scale of "ten" is reserved for values which we know within an  
91 order of magnitude. If a particular protein complex is present at 883 copies per cell, we say that it is present  
92 in approximately  $10^3$  copies per cell. These different scales will be used to arrive at simple estimates that  
93 report the expected scale of the observed data. Therefore, the estimates presented here should not be viewed  
94 as hard-and-fast predictions of precise copy numbers, but as approximate lower (or upper) bounds for the  
95 number of complexes that may be needed to satisfy some cellular requirement.  
96 Furthermore, we use equality symbols (=) sparingly and frequently defer to approximation ( $\approx$ ) or scaling ( $\sim$ )  
97 symbols when reporting an estimate. When  $\approx$  is used, we are implicitly stating that we are confident in this  
98 estimate within a factor of a few. When a scaling symbol  $\sim$  is used, we are stating that we are confident in our  
99 estimate to within an order of magnitude.

100 **The BioNumbers Database as a source for values.** In making our estimates, we often require approximate  
101 values for key cellular properties, such as the elemental composition of the cell, the average dry mass, or  
102 approximate rates of synthesis. We rely heavily on the BioNumbers Database ([bionumbers.hms.harvard.edu](http://bionumbers.hms.harvard.edu),  
103 *Milo et al. (2010)*) as a repository for such information. Every value we draw from this database has an  
104 associated BioNumbers ID number, abbreviated as BNID, and we provide this reference in grey-boxes in each  
105 figure.

106 **Uncertainty in the data sets and the accuracy of an estimate.** The data sets presented in this work are the  
107 products of careful experimentation with the aim to report, to the best of their ability, the absolute copy  
108 numbers of proteins in the cell. These data, collected over the span of a few years, come from different  
109 labs and use different internal standards, controls, and even techniques (discussed further in Appendix  
110 Experimental Details Behind Proteomic Data). As a result, there is notable disagreement in the measured copy  
111 numbers for some complexes across data sets. In assessing whether our estimates could explain the observed  
112 scales and growth-rate dependencies, we also considered the degree of variation between the different data  
113 sets. For example, say a particular estimate undercuts the observed data by an order of magnitude. If all  
114 data sets agree within a factor of a few of each other, we revisit our estimate and consider what me may  
115 have missed. However, if the data sets themselves disagree by an order of magnitude, we determine that our  
116 estimate is appropriate given the variation in the data.




**Figure 1. Transport and synthesis processes necessary for cell division.** We consider an array of processes necessary for a cell to double its molecular components, broadly grouped into four classes. These categories are (A) nutrient transport across the cell membrane, (B) cell envelope biogenesis, (C) energy production (namely, ATP synthesis), and (D) processes associated with the central dogma. Numbers shown are the approximate number of complexes of each type observed at a growth rate of  $0.5 \text{ hr}^{-1}$ , or a cell doubling time of  $\approx 5000$  s.

132 remainder being attributable to oxygen, hydrogen, and various transition metals. We use this stoichiometric  
 133 breakdown to estimate the abundance and growth rate dependence of a variety of transporters responsible for  
 134 carbon uptake, and provide more extensive investigation of the other critical elements – phosphorus, sulfur, and  
 135 nitrogen – in the Appendix Additional Estimates of Fundamental Biological Processes.

136 Using  $\approx 0.3 \text{ pg}$  as the typical *E. coli* dry mass at a growth rate of  $\approx 0.5 \text{ hr}^{-1}$  (BNID: 103904), coupled with an  
 137 approximation that  $\approx 50\%$  of this mass is carbon, we estimate that  $\sim 10^{10}$  carbon atoms must be brought into  
 138 the cell in order to double all of the carbon-containing molecules (Figure 2(A), top). Typical laboratory growth  
 139 conditions provide carbon as a single class of sugar (such as glucose, galactose, or xylose) often transported cross  
 140 the cell membrane by a transporter complex specific to that particular sugar. One such mechanism of transport  
 141 is via the PTS system which is a highly modular system capable of transporting a diverse range of sugars with  
 142 high specificity (Escalante *et al.*, 2012). The glucose-specific component of this system transports  $\approx 200$  glucose  
 143 molecules ( $\approx 1200$  carbon atoms) per second per transporter (BNID: 114686). Making the assumption that this is a  
 144 typical sugar transport rate for the PTS system, coupled with the need to transport  $\sim 10^{10}$  carbon atoms, we then  
 145 expect on the order of  $\approx 1000$  transporters must be expressed per cell in order to bring in enough carbon atoms  
 146 (Figure 2(A), top).

147 However, we find this estimate to be exceeded by several fold by experimental measurements (Figure 2(A),  
 148 bottom), implying that the cell is capable of transporting more carbon atoms than strictly needed for biosynthesis.  
 149 While we estimate  $\approx 1000$  transporters are needed with a 5000 second division time, we can abstract this calculation  
 150 to consider any particular growth rate given knowledge of the cell density and volume as a function of growth rate  
 151 and direct the reader to the Appendix Extending Estimates to a Continuum of Growth Rates for more information.  
 152 This abstraction, shown as a grey line in Figure 2(A), reveals an excess of transporters even at faster growth rates.  
 153 This contrasts with our observations for uptake of phosphorus and sulfur, which align well with our expectations  
 154 across different growth conditions (Figure 2–Figure Supplement 1 and discussed further in Appendix Additional  
 155 Estimates of Fundamental Biological Processes).

156 It is important to note, however, that this estimate neglects any specifics of the regulation of the carbon  
 157 transport system. Using the diverse array of growth conditions available in the data, we can explore how individual  
 158 carbon transport systems depend on specific carbon availability. In Figure 2(B), we show the total number of  
 159 carbohydrate transporters specific to different carbon sources. A striking observation, shown in the top-left plot of  
 160 Figure 2(B), is the constancy in the expression of the glucose-specific transport systems, an observation that stands  
 161 in contrast with other species of transporters. Additionally, we note that the total number of glucose-specific  
 162 transporters is tightly distributed at  $\approx 10^4$  per cell, the approximate number of transporters needed to sustain  
 163 rapid growth of several divisions per hour. This illustrates that *E. coli* maintains a substantial number of complexes



**Figure 2. The abundance of carbon transport systems across growth rates.** (A) A simple estimate for the minimum number of generic carbohydrate transport systems (top) assumes  $\sim 10^{10}$  C are needed to complete division, each transported sugar contains  $\approx 5$  C, and each transporter conducts sugar molecules at a rate of  $\approx 200$  per second. Bottom plot shows the estimated number of transporters needed at a growth rate of  $\approx 0.5$  per hr (light-brown point and dashed lines). Colored points correspond to the mean number of complexes involved in carbohydrate import (complexes annotated with the Gene Ontology terms GO:0009401 and GO:0098704) for different growth conditions across different published datasets. (B) The abundance of various specific carbon transport systems plotted as a function of the population growth rate. The rates of substrate transport differ between these transporter species. To compute the continuum growth rate estimate (grey line), we used the following transport rates for each transporter species: 200 glucose·s<sup>-1</sup> (BNID: 103693), 2000 glycerol·s<sup>-1</sup> (*Lu et al., 2003*), 200 fructose·s<sup>-1</sup> (assumed to be similar to PtsI, BNID: 103693), and 50 xylose·s<sup>-1</sup> (assumed to be comparable to LacY, BNID: 103159). Red points and highlighted text indicate conditions in which the only source of carbon in the growth medium induces expression of the transport system. Grey lines in (A) and (B) represent the estimated number of transporters per cell at a continuum of growth rates.

**Figure 2-Figure supplement 1.** Estimates and observed abundances of phosphate and sulfate transporters.

164 present for transporting glucose regardless of growth condition, which is known to be the preferential carbon  
165 source (*Monod, 1947; Liu et al., 2005; Aidelberg et al., 2014*).

166 Many metabolic operons are regulated with dual-input logic gates that are only expressed when glucose  
167 concentrations are low and the concentration of other carbon sources are elevated (*Gama-Castro et al., 2016;*  
168 *Zhang et al., 2014b; Gama-Castro et al., 2016; Belliveau et al., 2018; Ireland et al., 2020*). Points colored in red in  
169 *Figure 2(B)* (labeled by red text-boxes) correspond to growth conditions in which the specific carbon source (glycerol,  
170 xylose, or fructose) is present as the sole source of carbon. The grey lines in *Figure 2(B)* show the estimated number  
171 of transporters needed at each growth rate to satisfy the cellular carbon requirement, adjusted for the specific  
172 carbon source in terms of number of carbon atoms per molecule and the rate of transport for the particular  
173 transporter species. These plots show that, in the absence of the particular carbon source, expression of the  
174 transporters is maintained on the order of  $\sim 10^2$  per cell. The low but non-zero abundances may reflect the specific  
175 regulatory logic involved, requiring that cells are able to transport some minimal amount of an alternative carbon  
176 source in order to induce expression of these alternative carbon-source systems.

### 177 **Limits on Transporter Expression**

178 If acquisition of nutrients was a limiting process in cell division under the typical growth conditions explored  
179 here, the growth rate could be theoretically increased simply by expressing more transporters, but is this feasible  
180 at a physiological level? A way to approach this question is to compute the amount of space in the bacterial  
181 membrane that could be occupied by nutrient transporters. Considering a rule-of-thumb for the surface area  
182 of *E. coli* of about  $5 \mu\text{m}^2$  (BNID: 101792), we expect an areal density for 1000 transporters to be approximately  
183 200 transporters/  $\mu\text{m}^2$ . For a typical transporter occupying about  $50 \text{ nm}^2$ , this amounts to about only  $\approx 1\%$  of the  
184 total inner membrane area (*Szenk et al., 2017*). Additionally, bacterial cell membranes typically have densities  
185 of  $10^5$  proteins/ $\mu\text{m}^2$  (*Phillips, 2018*), implying that the cell could accommodate more membrane and this places  
186 additional limitations on cell size and surface area that we will consider further in the coming sections.

### 187 **Cell Envelope Biogenesis**

188 In contrast to nutrient transporters, which support the synthesis of biomolecules throughout the cell and therefore  
189 need to scale with the cell size, here we must consider the synthesis of components that will need to scale with  
190 the surface area of the cell. *E. coli* is a rod-shaped bacterium with a remarkably robust length-to-width aspect  
191 ratio of  $\approx 4:1$  (*Harris and Theriot, 2018; Ojic et al., 2019*). At modest growth rates, the total cell surface area is  
192  $\approx 5 \mu\text{m}^2$  (BNID: 101792). Assuming this surface area is approximately the same between the inner and outer  
193 membranes of *E. coli*, and the fact that each membrane is itself a lipid bilayer, cells have a the total membrane  
194 surface area of  $\approx 20 \mu\text{m}^2$  (see Appendix Estimation of Cell Size and Surface Area for a description of the calculation  
195 of cell surface area as a function of cell size). In this section, we will estimate the number of protein complexes  
196 needed to produce this membrane surface area as well as the complexes involved in assembling the peptidoglycan  
197 scaffold it encapsulates.

### 198 **Lipid Synthesis**

199 The dense packing of the membrane with proteins means that the cell membranes are not composed entirely of  
200 lipid molecules, with only  $\approx 40\%$  of the membrane area is occupied by lipids (BNID: 100078). Using a rule-of-thumb  
201 of  $0.5 \text{ nm}^2$  as the surface area of the typical lipid (BNID: 106993), we can estimate  $\sim 2 \times 10^7$  lipids per cell, which is  
202 in close agreement with experimental measurements (BNID: 100071, 102996).

203 The membranes of *E. coli* are composed of a variety of different lipids, each of which are unique in their  
204 structures and biosynthetic pathways (*Sohlenkamp and Geiger, 2016*). Recently, a combination of stochastic kinetic  
205 modeling (*Ruppe and Fox, 2018*) and *in vitro* kinetic measurements (*Ranganathan et al., 2012; Yu et al., 2011*)  
206 have revealed remarkably slow steps in the fatty acid synthesis pathways which may serve as the rate limiting  
207 reactions for making new membrane phospholipids. One such step is the removal of hydroxyl groups from the  
208 fatty-acid chain by ACP dehydratase that leads to the formation of carbon-carbon double bonds. This reaction,  
209 catalyzed by proteins FabZ and FabA in *E. coli* (*Yu et al., 2011*), have been estimated to have kinetic turnover  
210 rates of  $\approx 1$  dehydration per second per enzyme (*Ruppe and Fox, 2018*). Thus, given this rate and the need to  
211 synthesize  $\approx 2 \times 10^7$  lipids over 5000 seconds, one can estimate that a typical cell requires  $\approx 4000$  ACP dehydratases.

212 This is in reasonable agreement with the experimentally observed copy numbers of FabZ and FabA (*Figure 3(A)*).  
213 Furthermore, we can extend this estimate to account for the change in membrane surface area as a function of the  
214 growth rate (grey line in *Figure 3(A)*), which captures the observed growth rate dependent expression of these two  
215 enzymes.

## 216 Peptidoglycan Synthesis

217 Bacterial cells demonstrate exquisite control over their cell shape. This is primarily due to the cell wall, a stiff, several  
218 nanometer thick meshwork of polymerized disaccharides. The formation of the peptidoglycan is an intricate  
219 process involving many macromolecular players (*Shi et al., 2018; Morgenstein et al., 2015*), whose coordinated  
220 action maintains cell shape and integrity even in the face of large-scale perturbations (*Harris and Theriot, 2018;*  
221 *Shi et al., 2018*). The peptidoglycan alone comprises  $\approx 3\%$  of the cellular dry mass (BNID: 1019360, making it  
222 the most massive molecule in *E. coli*). The polymerized unit of the peptidoglycan is a N-acetylglucosamine and  
223 N-acetylmuramic acid disaccharide, of which the former is functionalized with a short pentapeptide. With a mass  
224 of  $\approx 1000$  Da, this unit, which we refer to as a murein monomer, it is polymerized to form long strands in the  
225 periplasm which are then attached to each other via their peptide linkers. Together, these quantities provide an  
226 estimate of  $\approx 5 \times 10^6$  murein monomers per cell.

227 The crosslinking of the pentapeptides between adjacent glycan strands is responsible for maintaining the  
228 structural integrity of the cell wall and, in principle, each murein monomer can be involved in such a crosslink.  
229 In some microbes, such as in gram-positive bacterium *Staphylococcus aureus*, the extent of crosslinking can be  
230 large with  $> 90\%$  of pentapeptides forming a connection between glycan strands. In *E. coli*, however, a much  
231 smaller proportion ( $\approx 20\%$ ) of the peptides are crosslinked, resulting in a weaker and more porous cell wall *Vollmer*  
232 *et al. (2008); Rogers et al. (1980)*. The formation of these crosslinks occurs primarily during the polymerization  
233 of the murein monomers and is facilitated by a family of enzymes called transpeptidases. The four primary  
234 transpeptidases of *E. coli* have only recently been quantitatively characterized *in vivo* via liquid chromatography  
235 mass spectrometry which revealed a notably slow kinetic turnover rate of  $\approx 2$  crosslinking reactions formed per  
236 second per enzyme (*Catherwood et al., 2020*).

237 Assembling these quantities permits us to make an estimate that on the order of  $\approx 100$  transpeptidases per cell  
238 are needed for complete maturation of the peptidoglycan, given a division time of  $\approx 5000$  seconds; a value that is  
239 comparable to experimental observations (*Figure 3(B)*). Expanding this estimate to account for the changing mass  
240 of the peptidoglycan as a function of growth rate (grey line in *Figure 3(B)*) also qualitatively captures the observed  
241 dependence in the data, though systematic disagreements between the different data sets makes the comparison  
242 more difficult.


## 243 Limits on Cell Wall Biogenesis

244 While the processes we have considered represent only a small portion of proteins devoted to cell envelope  
245 biogenesis, we find it unlikely that they limit cellular growth in general. The relative amount of mass required  
246 for lipid and peptidoglycan components decrease at faster growth rates due to a decrease in their surface area  
247 to volume (S/V) ratio (*Ojkic et al., 2019*). Furthermore, despite the slow catalytic rate of FabZ and FabA in lipid  
248 synthesis, experimental data and recent computational modeling has shown that the rate of fatty-acid synthesis  
249 can be drastically increased by increasing the concentration of FabZ (*Yu et al., 2011; Ruppe and Fox, 2018*). With  
250 a proteome size of  $\approx 3 \times 10^6$  proteins, a hypothetical 10-fold increase in expression from 4000 to 40,000 ACP  
251 dehydratases would result in a paltry  $\approx 1\%$  increase in the size of the proteome. In the context of peptidoglycan  
252 synthesis, we note that our estimate considers only the transpeptidase enzymes that are involved lateral and  
253 longitudinal elongation of the peptidoglycan. This neglects the presence of other transpeptidases that are present  
254 in the periplasm and also involved in remodeling and maturation of the peptidoglycan. It is therefore possible that  
255 if this was setting the speed limit for cell division, the simple expression of more transpeptidases may be sufficient  
256 to maintain the structural integrity of the cell wall.

## 257 Energy Production

258 Cells consume and generate energy predominantly in the form of nucleoside triphosphates (NTPs) in order to  
259 grow. The high-energy phosphodiester bonds of (primarily) ATP power a variety of cellular processes that drive

## CELL ENVELOPE BIOSYNTHESIS



**Figure 3.** (A) Top panel shows an estimation for the number of ACP dehydratases necessary to form functional phospholipids, which is assumed to be a rate-limiting step on lipid synthesis. The rate of ACP dehydratases was inferred from experimental measurements via a stochastic kinetic model described in [Ruppe and Fox \(2018\)](#). Bottom panel shows the experimentally observed complex copy numbers using the stoichiometries  $[\text{FabA}]_2$  and  $[\text{FabZ}]_2$ . (B) An estimate for the number of peptidoglycan transpeptidases needed to complete maturation of the peptidoglycan. The mass of the murein monomer was estimated by approximating each amino acid in the pentapeptide chain as having a mass of 110 Da and each sugar in the disaccharide having a mass of  $\approx 250$  Da. The *in vivo* rate of transpeptidation  $r_{\text{transpeptidase}}$  in *E. coli* was taken from recent analysis by [Catherwood et al. \(2020\)](#). The bottom panel shows experimental measurements of the transpeptidase complexes in *E. coli* following the stoichiometries  $[\text{MrcA}]_2$ ,  $[\text{MrcB}]_2$ ,  $[\text{MrdA}]_1$ , and  $[\text{MrdB}]_1$ . Grey curves in each plot show the estimated number of complexes needed to satisfy the synthesis requirements scaled by the surface area as a function of growth rate.

260 biological systems away from thermodynamic equilibrium. We next turn to the synthesis of ATP as a potential  
261 process that may limit growth, which also requires us to consider the maintenance of the electrochemical proton  
262 gradient which powers it.

263 **ATP Synthesis**


264 Hydrolysis of the terminal phosphodiester bond of ATP into ADP (or alternatively GTP and GDP) and an inorganic  
265 phosphate provides the thermodynamic driving force in a wide array of biochemical reactions. One such reaction  
266 is the formation of peptide bonds during translation, which requires  $\approx 2$  ATPs for the charging of an amino acid  
267 to the tRNA and  $\approx 2$  GTP for the formation of each peptide bond. Assuming the ATP costs associated with error  
268 correction and post-translational modifications of proteins are negligible, we can make the approximation that each  
269 peptide bond has a net cost of  $\approx 4$  ATP (BNID: 101442, *Milo et al. (2010)*). Formation of GTP from ATP is achieved  
270 via the action of nucleoside diphosphate kinase, which catalyzes this reaction without an energy investment  
271 (*Lascu and Gonin, 2000*) and therefore consider all NTP requirements of the cell to be functionally equivalent to  
272 being exclusively ATP. In total, the energetic costs of peptide bond formation consume  $\approx 80\%$  of the cells ATP  
273 budget (BNID: 107782; 106158; 101637; 111918, *Lynch and Marinov (2015); Stouthamer (1973)*). The pool of ATP is  
274 produced by the F<sub>1</sub>-F<sub>0</sub> ATP synthase – a membrane-bound rotary motor which under ideal conditions can yield  $\approx$   
275 300 ATP per second (BNID: 114701; *Weber and Senior (2003)*).

276 To estimate the total number of ATP equivalents consumed during a cell cycle, we will make the approximation  
277 that there are  $\approx 3 \times 10^6$  proteins per cell with an average protein length of  $\approx 300$  peptide bonds (BNID: 115702;  
278 108986; 104877). Taking these values together, coupled with an estimate of  $\approx 4$  ATP equivalents per peptide bond,  
279 we find that the typical *E. coli* cell consumes  $\sim 5 \times 10^9$  ATP per cell cycle on protein synthesis alone. Assuming  
280 that each ATP synthases operates at its maximal speed (300 ATP per second per synthase),  $\approx 3000$  ATP synthases  
281 are needed to keep up with the energy demands of the cell. This estimate is comparable with the experimental  
282 observations, shown in *Figure 4* (A). We note that this estimate assumes all ATP is synthesized via ATP synthase  
283 and neglects synthesis via fermentative metabolism. This assumption may explain why at the fastest growth rates  
284 ( $\approx 2$  hr<sup>-1</sup>), our continuum estimate predicts more synthase than is experimentally observed (gray line in *Figure 4*).  
285 At rapid growth rates, *E. coli* enters a type of overflow metabolism where fermentative metabolism becomes  
286 pronounced (*Szenk et al., 2017*).

287 **Generating the Proton Electrochemical Gradient**

288 In order to produce ATP, the F<sub>1</sub>-F<sub>0</sub> ATP synthase itself must consume energy. Rather than burning through its  
289 own product (and violating thermodynamics), this intricate macromolecular machine has evolved to exploit the  
290 electrochemical potential established across the inner membrane through cellular respiration. This electrochemical  
291 gradient is manifest by the pumping of protons into the intermembrane space via the electron transport chains as  
292 they reduce NADH. In *E. coli*, this potential difference is  $\approx -200$  mV (BNID: 102120). A simple estimate of the inner  
293 membrane as a capacitor with a working voltage of -200 mV reveals that  $\approx 2 \times 10^4$  protons must be present in the  
294 intermembrane space. However, each rotation of an ATP synthase shuttles  $\approx 4$  protons into the cytosol (BNID:  
295 103390). With a few thousand ATP synthases producing ATP at their maximal rate, the potential difference would  
296 be rapidly abolished in a few milliseconds if it were not being actively maintained.

297 The electrochemistry of the electron transport complexes of *E. coli* have been the subject of intense biochemical  
298 and biophysical study (*Ingledew and Poole, 1984; Khademian and Imlay, 2017; Cox et al., 1970; Henkel et al., 2014*).  
299 A recent work (*Szenk et al., 2017*) examined the respiratory capacity of the *E. coli* electron transport complexes  
300 using structural and biochemical data, revealing that each electron transport chain rapidly pumps protons into the  
301 intermembrane space at a rate of  $\approx 1500$  protons per second (BIND: 114704; 114687). Using our estimate of the  
302 number of ATP synthases required per cell [*Figure 4(A)*], coupled with these recent measurements, we estimate  
303 that  $\approx 3000$  electron transport complexes would be necessary to facilitate the  $\sim 5 \times 10^6$  protons per second diet of  
304 the cellular ATP synthases. This estimate is in agreement with the number of complexes identified in the proteomic  
305 datasets (plot in *Figure 4(B)*). This suggests that every ATP synthase must be accompanied by  $\approx 1$  functional electron  
306 transport chain.



**Figure 4. The abundance of F<sub>1</sub>-F<sub>0</sub> ATP synthases and electron transport chain complexes as a function of growth rate.**

(A) Estimate of the number of F<sub>1</sub>-F<sub>0</sub> ATP synthase complexes needed to accommodate peptide bond formation and other NTP dependent processes. Points in plot correspond to the mean number of complete F<sub>1</sub>-F<sub>0</sub> ATP synthase complexes that can be formed given proteomic measurements and the subunit stoichiometry [AtpE]<sub>10</sub>[AtpF]<sub>2</sub>[AtpB][AtpC][AtpH][AtpA]<sub>3</sub>[AtpG][AtpD]<sub>3</sub>. (B) Estimate of the number of electron transport chain complexes needed to maintain a membrane potential of -200 mV given estimate of number of F<sub>1</sub>-F<sub>0</sub> ATP synthases from (A). Points in plot correspond to the average number of complexes identified as being involved in aerobic respiration by the Gene Ontology identifier GO:0019646 that could be formed given proteomic observations. These complexes include cytochromes *bd1* ([CydA][CydB][CydX][CydH]), *bdII* ([AppC][AppB]), *bo<sub>3</sub>*,([CyoD][CyoA][CyoB][CyoC]) and NADH:quinone oxioreductase I ([NuoA][NuoH][NuoJ][NuoK][NuoL][NuoM][NuoN][NuoB][NuoC][NuoE][NuoF][NuoG][NuoI]) and II ([Ndh]). Grey lines in both (A) and (B) correspond to the estimate procedure described, but applied to a continuum of growth rates. We direct the reader to the Supporting Information for a more thorough description of this approach.

307 Limits on Biosynthesis in a Crowded Membrane

308 Our estimates thus far have focused on biochemistry at the periphery of the cell and have generally been  
309 concordant with the abundances predicted by our estimates. However, as surface area and volume do not scale  
310 identically, it is necessary to consider the physical limits for transport and energy production given the S/V ratio,  
311 which as we've noted will decrease at faster growth rates.

312 In our estimate of ATP production above we found that a cell demands about  $5 \times 10^9$  ATP per cell cycle or  $10^6$   
313 ATP/s. With a cell volume of roughly 1 fL (BNID: 100004), this corresponds to about  $2 \times 10^{10}$  ATP per fL of cell volume,  
314 in line with previous estimates (*Stouthamer and Bettenhausen, 1977; Szenk et al., 2017*). In **Figure 5 (A)** we plot  
315 this ATP demand as a function of the S/V ratio in green, where we have considered a range of cell shapes from  
316 spherical to rod-shaped with an aspect ratio (length/width) equal to 4. In order to consider the maximum ATP that  
317 could be produced, we consider the amount of ATP that can be generated by a membrane filled with ATP synthase  
318 and electron transport complexes, which provides a maximal production of about 3 ATP / (nm<sup>2</sup>·s) (*Szenk et al.,*  
319 *2017*). This is shown in blue in **Figure 5(A)**, which shows that at least for the growth rates observed (right column  
320 in plot), the energy demand is roughly an order of magnitude less. Interestingly, *Szenk et al. (2017)* also found  
321 that ATP production by respiration is less efficient than by fermentation per membrane area occupied due to the  
322 additional proteins of the electron transport chain. This suggests that, even under anaerobic growth, there will be  
323 sufficient membrane space for ATP production.

324 The analysis highlights the diminishing capacity to provide resources as the cell increases in size. However,  
325 the maximum energy production in **Figure 5(A)** does represent a somewhat unachievable limit since the inner  
326 membrane must also include other proteins including those required for lipid and membrane synthesis. To  
327 better understand the overall proteomic makeup of the inner membrane, we therefore used Gene Ontology (GO)  
328 annotations (*Ashburner et al., 2000; The Gene Ontology Consortium, 2018*) to identify all proteins embedded or  
329 peripheral to the inner membrane (GO term: 0005886). Those associated but not membrane-bound include  
330 proteins like MreB and FtsZ and must nonetheless be considered as a vital component occupying space on the  
331 membrane. In **Figure 5(B)**, we find that the total protein mass per  $\mu\text{m}^2$  is nearly constant across growth rates.  
332 Interestingly, when we consider the distribution of proteins grouped by their Clusters of Orthologous Groups (COG)  
333 (*Tatusov et al., 2000*), the relative abundance for those in metabolism (including ATP synthesis via respiration) is  
334 also relatively constant across growth rates, suggesting that no one process (energy production, nutrient uptake,  
335 etc.) is particularly dominating even at fast growth rates **Figure 5(C)**.

336 **Processes of the Central Dogma**


337 Up to this point, we have considered a variety of transport and biosynthetic processes that are critical to acquiring  
338 and generating new cell mass. While there are of course many other metabolic processes we could consider, we  
339 now turn our focus to some of the most central processes which *must* be undertaken irrespective of the growth  
340 conditions – those of the central dogma.

341 **DNA Replication**


342 Most bacteria (including *E. coli*) harbor a single, circular chromosome and can have extra-chromosomal plasmids  
343 up to  $\sim 100$  kbp in length. While we consider the starting material dNTPs in **Figure 6–Figure Supplement 1** and  
344 discussed further in Appendix Additional Process of the Central Dogma, here we focus our quantitative thinking on  
345 the chromosome of *E. coli* which harbors  $\approx 5000$  genes and  $\approx 5 \times 10^6$  base pairs.

346 To successfully divide and produce viable progeny, this chromosome must be faithfully replicated and seg-  
347 regated into each nascent cell. Replication is initiated at a single region of the chromosome termed the *oriC*  
348 locus at which a pair of replisomes, each consisting of two DNA polymerase III, begin their high-fidelity replication  
349 of the genome in opposite directions (*Fijalkowska et al., 2012*). *In vitro* measurements have shown that DNA  
350 Polymerase III copies DNA at a rate of  $\approx 600$  nucleotides per second (BNID: 104120). Therefore, to replicate a single  
351 chromosome, two replisomes moving at their maximal rate would copy the entire genome in  $\approx 4000$  s. Thus, with  
352 a division time of 5000 s, there is sufficient time for a pair of replisomes complexes to replicate the entire genome.

353 In rapidly growing cultures, bacteria like *E. coli* can initiate as many as 10 - 12 replication forks at a given time  
354 (*Bremer and Dennis, 2008; Si et al., 2017*), we expect only a few DNA polymerases ( $\approx 10$ ) are needed. However, as



**Figure 5. Influence of cell size and S/V ratio on ATP production and inner membrane composition.** (A) Scaling of ATP demand and maximum ATP production as a function of S/V ratio. Cell volumes of 0.5 fL to 50 fL were considered, with the dashed (—) line corresponding to a sphere and the dash-dot line (---) reflecting a rod-shaped bacterium like *E. coli* with a typical aspect ratio (length / width) of 4 (Shi et al., 2018). Approximately 50% of the bacterial inner membrane is assumed to be protein, with the remainder lipid. The right plot shows the measured growth rates, and their estimated S/V ratio using growth rate dependent size measurements from Si et al. (2017) (See Appendix Estimation of Cell Size and Surface Area on calculation). (B) Total protein mass per  $\mu\text{m}^2$  calculated for proteins with inner membrane annotation (GO term: 0005886). (C) Relative protein abundances by mass based on COG annotation. Metabolic proteins are further separated into respiration ( $F_1$ - $F_0$  ATP synthase, NADH dehydrogenase I, succinate:quinone oxidoreductase, cytochrome bo<sub>3</sub> ubiquinol oxidase, cytochrome bd-I ubiquinol oxidase) and carbohydrate transport (GO term: GO:0008643). Note that the elongation factor EF-Tu can also associate with the inner membrane, but was excluded in this analysis due to its high relative abundance (roughly identical to the summed protein shown in part (B)).



**Figure 6. Complex abundance estimates for dNTP synthesis and DNA replication.** An estimate for the minimum number of DNA polymerase holoenzyme complexes needed to facilitate replication of a single genome. Points in the left-hand plot correspond to the total number of DNA polymerase III holoenzyme complexes ( $[DnaE]_3[DnaQ]_3[HolE]_3[DnaX]_5[HolB][HolA][DnaN]_4[HolC]_4[HolD]_4$ ) per cell. Right-hand plot shows the effective concentration of DNA polymerase III holoenzyme (See Appendix Estimation of Cell Size and Surface Area for calculation of cell size). Grey lines in left-hand panel show the estimated number of complexes needed as a function of growth, the details of which are described in the Supplemental Information.

**Figure 6-Figure supplement 1.** Estimate and observations of the abundance of ribonucleotide reductase, a key component in dNTP synthesis.

355 shown in **Figure 6** DNA polymerase III is nearly an order of magnitude more abundant. This discrepancy can be  
 356 understood by considering its binding constant to DNA. *In vitro* characterization has quantified the  $K_D$  of DNA  
 357 polymerase III holoenzyme to single-stranded and double-stranded DNA to be 50 and 200 nM, respectively (Ason  
 358 et al., 2000). The right-hand plot in **Figure 6** shows that the concentration of DNA polymerase III across all data  
 359 sets is within this range. Thus, its copy number appears to vary such that its concentration is approximately  
 360 equal to the dissociation constant to the DNA. While the processes regulating the initiation of DNA replication are  
 361 complex and involve more than just the holoenzyme, these data indicate that the kinetics of replication rather than  
 362 the explicit copy number of the DNA polymerase III holoenzyme is the more relevant feature of DNA replication  
 363 to consider. In light of this, the data in **Figure 6** suggests that for bacteria like *E. coli*, DNA replication does not  
 364 represent a rate-limiting step in cell division. However, it is worth noting that for bacterium like *C. crescentus*  
 365 whose chromosomal replication is initiated only once per cell cycle (Jensen et al., 2001), the time to double their  
 366 chromosome indeed represents an upper limit to their growth rate.

### 367 RNA Synthesis

368 We now turn our attention to the next stage of the central dogma – the transcription of DNA to form RNA. We  
 369 consider three major groupings of RNA, namely the RNA associated with ribosomes (rRNA), the RNA encoding the  
 370 amino-acid sequence of proteins (mRNA), and the RNA which links codon sequence to amino-acid identity during  
 371 translation (tRNA).

372 rRNA serves as the catalytic and structural component of the ribosome, comprising approximately 2/3 of the  
 373 total ribosomal mass, and is decorated with  $\approx 50$  ribosomal proteins. Each ribosome contains three rRNA molecules  
 374 of lengths 120, 1542, and 2904 nucleotides (BNID: 108093), meaning each ribosome contains  $\approx 4500$  nucleotides  
 375 overall. *In vivo* measurements of the kinetics of rRNA transcription have revealed that RNA polymerases are loaded  
 376 onto the promoter of an rRNA gene at a rate of  $\approx 1$  per second (BNID: 111997, 102362). If RNA polymerases are  
 377 constantly loaded at this rate, then we can assume that  $\approx 1$  functional rRNA unit is synthesized per second per  
 378 rRNA operon. While *E. coli* possesses 7 of these operons per chromosome, the fact that chromosome replication  
 379 can be parallelized means that the average dosage of rRNA genes can be substantially higher (up to  $\approx 70$  copies) at  
 380 fast growth rates. At a growth rate of  $\approx 0.5 \text{ hr}^{-1}$ , however, the average cell has  $\approx 1$  copy of its chromosome and  
 381 therefore approximately  $\approx 7$  copies of the rRNA operons, therefore producing  $\approx 7$  rRNA units per second. With a  
 382 5000 second division time, this means the cell is able to generate around  $3 \times 10^4$  functional rRNA units, comparable  
 383 within an order of magnitude to the number of ribosomes per cell.

384 How many RNA polymerases are then needed to constantly transcribe the required rRNA? If one polymerase is  
385 loaded per second, and the transcription rate is  $\approx$  40 nucleotides per second (BNID: 101094), then the typical  
386 spacing between polymerases will be  $\approx$  40 nucleotides. However, we must note that the polymerase itself has a  
387 footprint of  $\approx$  40 nucleotides (BNID: 107873), meaning that one could expect to find one RNA polymerase per 80  
388 nucleotide stretch of an rRNA gene. With a total length of  $\approx$  4500 nucleotides per operon and 7 operons per cell,  
389 the number of RNA polymerases transcribing rRNA at any given time is then  $\approx$  500 per cell.

390 As outlined in **Figure 7**, and discussed further the Appendix Additional Process of the Central Dogma, synthesis  
391 of mRNA and tRNA together require on the order of  $\approx$  400 RNAP. Thus, in total, one would expect the typical  
392 cell to require  $\approx$  1000 RNAP to satisfy its transcriptional demands. As is revealed in **Figure 7(B)**, this estimate  
393 is about an order of magnitude below the observed number of RNA polymerase complexes per cell ( $\approx$  5000 -  
394 7000). The difference between the estimated number of RNA polymerase needed for transcription and these  
395 observations, however, are consistent with recent literature revealing that  $\approx$  80 % of RNA polymerases in *E. coli* are  
396 not transcriptionally active (**Patrick et al., 2015**).

397 Our estimates also neglect other mechanistic features of transcription and transcriptional initiation more  
398 broadly. For example, we acknowledge that some fraction of the RNAP pool is nonspecifically bound to DNA  
399 during its search for promoters from which to begin transcription. Furthermore, we ignore the obstacles that RNA  
400 polymerase and DNA polymerase present to each other as they move along the DNA (**Finkelstein and Greene,**  
401 **2013**). Finally, we neglect the fact that RNA polymerase also require  $\sigma$ -factors for promoter recognition and  
402 transcription initiation (**Browning and Busby, 2016**).


403 While they are the machinery for transcription, RNA polymerase is not sufficient to initiate transcription.  
404 Promoter recognition and initiation of transcription is dependent on the presence of  $\sigma$ -factors, protein cofactors  
405 which bind directly to the polymerase (**Browning and Busby, 2016**). In **Figure 7–Figure Supplement 1**, we show that  
406 the predicted RNA polymerase copy number indeed is more comparable with the abundance of  $\sigma$ -70 (RpoD), the  
407 primary sigma factor in *E. coli*. There therefore remains more to be investigated as to what sets the observed  
408 abundance of RNA polymerase in these proteomic data sets. However, we conclude that our the observed excess  
409 in abundance for RNA polymerase abundances are generally in excess of what appears to be needed for growth,  
410 suggesting that the abundance of RNA polymerase itself is not particularly limiting.

## 411 Protein Synthesis

412 We conclude our dialogue between back-of-the-envelope estimates and comparison with the proteomic data by  
413 examining the final process in the central dogma – translation. In doing so, we will begin with an estimate of the  
414 number of ribosomes needed to replicate the cellular proteome. While the rate at which ribosomes translate is  
415 well known to be dependent on the growth rate (**Dai et al. (2018)**, a phenomenon we consider later in this work) we  
416 will make the approximation that translation occurs at a modest rate of  $\approx$  15 amino acids per second per ribosome  
417 (BNID: 100233) Under this approximation and our previous estimate of  $10^9$  peptide bonds per cell at a growth rate  
418 of  $0.5 \text{ hr}^{-1}$ , we can easily arrive at an estimate of  $\approx 10^4$  ribosomes needed per cell to replicate the entire protein  
419 mass (**Figure 8(A)**, top). This point estimate, as well as the corresponding estimate across a continuum of growth  
420 rates, proves to be notably comparable to the experimental observations, shown in the bottom panel of **Figure 8(A)**.  
421 While the ribosome is responsible for the formation of peptide bonds, we do not diminish the importance of  
422 charging tRNAs with their appropriate amino acid, a process with occurs with remarkable fidelity. In the Appendix  
423 and in **Figure 8–Figure Supplement 1**, we consider the process of ligating tRNAs to their corresponding amino acid  
424 and again find notable accord between the data and our quantitative expectations.

425 Having completed our circuit through key processes of cellular growth outlined in **Figure 1**, we can now take stock  
426 of our understanding of the observed growth rate dependence and abundances of various protein complexes. We  
427 note that, broadly speaking, these simple estimates have been reasonably successful in quantitatively describing  
428 the observations in the proteomic data, suggesting that the proteome is tuned in composition and absolute  
429 abundance to match the growth rate requirements without any one process representing a singular bottleneck or  
430 rate limiting step in division. However, in our effort to identify key limitations on growth, there are two notable  
431 observations that we wish to emphasize.

432 The first is a recurring theme throughout our estimates. Of those investigated here, any inherent biochemical  
433 rate limitation can be overcome by expressing more proteins. We can view this as a parallelization of each



**Figure 7. Estimation of the RNA polymerase demand and comparison with experimental data.** (A) Estimations for the number of RNA polymerase needed to synthesize sufficient quantities of rRNA, mRNA, and tRNA from left to right, respectively.(B) The RNA polymerase core enzyme copy number as a function of growth rate. Colored points correspond to the average number RNA polymerase core enzymes that could be formed given a subunit stoichiometry of  $[RpoA]_2[RpoC][RpoB]$ .

**Figure 7-Figure supplement 1.** Abundance and growth rate dependence of  $\sigma$ -70.

biosynthesis task, which helps explain why bacteria tend to increase their protein content (and cell size) as growth rate increases (*Ojkic et al., 2019*). The second, and ultimately the most significant in defining the cellular growth rate, is that the synthesis of ribosomal proteins presents a special case where parallelization is *not* possible and thereby imposes a limit on the fastest possible growth rate. Each ribosome has  $\approx$  7500 amino acids across all of its protein components which must be strung together as peptide bonds through the action of another ribosome. Once again using a modest elongation rate of  $\approx$  15 amino acids per second, we arrive at an estimate of  $\approx$  500 seconds or  $\approx$  7 minutes to replicate a single ribosome. This limit, as remarked upon by others (*Dill et al., 2011*), serves as a hard theoretical boundary for how quickly *E. coli* could replicate. As each ribosome would therefore need to copy itself, this 7 minute speed limit is independent of the number of ribosomes per cell (*Figure 8(B)*), yet assumes that the only proteins that need to be replicated for division to occur are ribosomal proteins, an unrealistic regime not met in biological reality. This poses an optimization problem for the cell – how are the translational demands of the entire proteome met without investing resources in the production of an excess of ribosomes?

This question, more frequently presented as a question of optimal resource allocation, has been the target of an extensive dialogue between experiment and theory over the past decade. In a now seminal work, *Scott et al. (2010)* present an elegant treatment of resource allocation through partitioning of the proteome into sectors – one of which being ribosome-associated proteins whose relative size ultimately defines the total cellular growth rate. In more recent years, this view has been more thoroughly dissected experimentally (*Klumpp and Hwa, 2014; Basan et al., 2015; Dai et al., 2018, 2016; Erickson et al., 2017*) and together have led to a paradigm-shift in how we think of cellular physiology at the proteomic-level. However, the quantitative description of these observations is often couched in terms of phenomenological constants and effective parameters with the key observable features of expression often computed in relative, rather than absolute, abundances. Furthermore, these approaches often exclude or integrate away effects of cell size and chromosome content, which we have found through our estimates to have important connections to the observed cellular growth rate.

In the closing sections of this work, we explore how ribosomal content, total protein abundance, and chromosomal replication are intertwined in their control over the cellular growth rate. To do so, we take a more careful view of ribosome abundance, increasing the sophistication of our analysis by exchanging our order-of-magnitude estimates for a minimal mathematical model of growth rate control. This is defined by parameters with tangible connections to the biological processes underlying cellular growth and protein synthesis. Using this model, we interrogate how the size of the ribosome pool and its corresponding translational capacity enable cells to maintain a balance between the consumption of amino acids via metabolism and catabolism and their consumption through the peptide bond formation required for growth.

## Maximum Growth Rate is Determined by the Ribosomal Mass Fraction


The 7 minute speed limit shown in *Figure 8(B)* assumes all proteins in the cell are ribosomes. In order to connect this to the experimental data (and physiological reality more broadly), we first need to relax this assumption and determine a translation-limited growth rate. Here, we will assume that the cell is composed of  $N_{\text{pep}}$  peptide bonds and  $R$  ribosomes, whose precise values will depend on the growth rate  $\lambda$ . The protein subunits of each ribosomal protein sum to a total of  $\approx$  7500 amino acids as noted earlier, which we denote by  $L_R$ . With an average mass of an amino acid of  $m_{\text{AA}} \approx 110$  Da (BNID: 104877), the total ribosomal mass fraction  $\Phi_R$  is given by

$$\Phi_R = \frac{m_{\text{ribosomes}}}{m_{\text{proteome}}} \approx \frac{m_{\text{AA}} \times R \times L_R}{m_{\text{AA}} \times N_{\text{pep}}} = \frac{R \times L_R}{N_{\text{pep}}}. \quad (1)$$

For exponentially growing cells (*Godin et al., 2010*), the rate of cellular growth will be related to the rate of protein synthesis via

$$\lambda N_{\text{pep}} = r_t \times R \times f_a, \quad (2)$$

where  $r_t$  is the translation rate. Here, we've introduced a multiplicative factor  $f_a$  which represents the fraction of the ribosomes that are actively translating. This term allows us to account for immature or non-functional ribosomes or active sequestration of ribosomes through the action of the secondary messenger alarmone (p)ppGpp in poorer nutrient conditions (*Hauryliuk et al. (2015)*).



**Figure 8. Estimation of the required number of ribosomes and the speed limit for bacterial replication.** (A) Estimation of the number of ribosomes required to synthesize  $10^9$  peptide bonds with an elongation rate of 15 peptide bonds per second. The average abundance of ribosomes is plotted as a function of growth rate. Our estimated values are shown for a growth rate of  $0.5 \text{ hr}^{-1}$ . Grey lines correspond to the estimated complex abundance calculated at different growth rates. (B) Estimation for the time to replicate a ribosome. This rate is independent of the number of ribosomes  $R$  and instead is limited by the time required to double an individual ribosome.

**Figure 8—Figure supplement 1.** Estimate and observed abundance and growth rate dependence of tRNA ligases.

478 Combining **Equation 1** and **Equation 2** results in an expression for a translation-limited growth rate, which is  
479 given by

$$\lambda_{\text{translation-limited}} = \frac{r_i \times \Phi_R \times f_a}{L_R}. \quad (3)$$

480 This result, derived in a similar manner in *Klumpp et al. (2013)*, reflects mass-balance under steady state growth  
481 and has long provided a rationalization of the apparent linear increase in *E. coli*'s ribosomal content as a function  
482 growth rate (*Maaløe, 1979; Dennis et al., 2004; Scott et al., 2010*). The left-hand panel of **Figure 9(A)** shows this  
483 growth rate plotted as a function of the ribosomal mass fraction. In the regime where all ribosomes are active  
484 ( $f_a = 1$ ) and the entire proteome is composed of ribosomal proteins ( $\Phi_R = 1$ ), indeed, we arrive at the maximum  
485 theoretical growth rate of  $r_i/L_R$ , and  $\approx 7 \text{ min}$  for *E. coli*.

486 Connecting **Equation 3** to the proteomic data serving as the centerpiece of our work, however, requires  
487 knowledge of  $f_a$  at each growth rate as proteomic measurements only provide a measure of  $\Phi_R$ . Recently, *Dai et al.*  
488 (2016) determined  $f_a$  as a function of the growth rate (**Figure 9(A)**, right-hand panel, inset), revealing that  $f_a \approx 1$  at  
489 growth rates above  $0.75 \text{ hr}^{-1}$  and  $f_a < 1$  as the growth rate slows. Using these data, we inferred the approximate  
490 active fraction (see Appendix Calculation of active ribosomal fraction) at each growth rate and used this to compute  
491  $\Phi_R \times f_a$  (**Figure 9(A)**, colored points in right-hand panel). In general, these data skirt the translation-limited growth  
492 rate determined using **Equation 3** with  $r_i$  taken to be the maximal elongation rate of 17 amino acids per second  
493 measured by *Dai et al. (2016)*. There is a notable discrepancy between the data collected in *Schmidt et al. (2016)*;  
494 *Li et al. (2014)* and that collected from *Valgepea et al. (2013); Peebo et al. (2015)*. When compared to other  
495 measurements (non-proteomic with significantly lower resolution) of the active ribosome mass fraction (**Figure 9(B)**,  
496 grey points in right-hand panel), the data from *Valgepea et al. (2013)* and *Peebo et al. (2015)* are notably aberrant,  
497 suggesting a systematic error in these data. These additional measurements come from a number of recent studies  
498 and are determined from measurements of total RNA to total protein mass ratios (**Figure 9—Figure Supplement 1**).

499 Together, these results illustrate that the growth rates observed across the amalgamated data sets are close to  
500 the translation-limited growth rate determined through their ribosomal activity, at least for the data reported in

501 Schmidt et al. (2016) and Li et al. (2014). While this is a useful framework to consider how the relative abundance of  
502 ribosomes (compared to all other proteins) defines the growth rate, it is worth noting that as growth rate increases,  
503 so does the cell size and therefore so will the total proteomic mass (Basan et al., 2015). With a handle on how  
504 elongation rate and the total number of peptide bonds per proteome is related to the growth rate, we now expand  
505 this description to account for the increasing cell size and ribosome copy number at faster growth rates, enabling  
506 us to identify a potential bottleneck in the synthesis of rRNA.

### 507 rRNA Synthesis Presents a Potential Bottleneck During Rapid Growth

508 Even under idealized experimental conditions, *E. coli* rarely exhibits growth rates above  $2 \text{ hr}^{-1}$  (Bremer and Dennis,  
509 2008), which is still well-below the synthesis rate of a single ribosome, and below the maximum growth rates  
510 reported for several other bacteria (Roller et al., 2016). While we have considered potential limits imposed by  
511 translation of ribosomal proteins, here we consider potential limiting regimes for the production of rRNA.

512 Due to multiple initiations of chromosomal replication per cell doubling, the effective number of rRNA operons  
513 increases with growth rate and will do so in proportion to the average number of origins per cell,  $\langle \# \text{ ori} \rangle$ . This later  
514 parameter is set by how often replication must be initiated in order to keep up with cell doubling times  $\tau$  whose  
515 time may be shorter than the cell cycle time  $t_{\text{cyc}}$  (referring to the time from replication initiation to cell division)  
516 Dennis et al. (2004). This is quantified by

$$\langle \# \text{ ori} \rangle = 2^{\tau_{\text{cyc}}/\tau} = 2^{\tau_{\text{cyc}}\lambda/\log(2)}. \quad (4)$$


517 We used the experimental measurements of  $\tau_{\text{cyc}}$  (the timescale of chromosome replication and cell division) and  $\tau$   
518 (the timescale of a cell doubling) from Si et al. (2017) (Figure 9–Figure Supplement 1(B)) to calculate  $\langle \# \text{ ori} \rangle$  with  
519 Equation 4 as a function of growth rates. For growth rates above about  $0.5 \text{ hr}^{-1}$ ,  $t_{\text{cyc}}$  is approximately constant  
520 at about 70 minutes, implying that  $\langle \# \text{ ori} \rangle$  will grow exponentially with growth rates beyond  $0.5 \text{ hr}^{-1}$ . As the  
521 rRNA operons are predominantly located close to origin of replication (BNID: 100352), we make the simplifying  
522 assumption that that the number of rRNA operons will be directly proportional to  $\langle \# \text{ ori} \rangle$ .

523 Returning to our rule-of-thumb of 1 functional rRNA unit per second per transcribing operon, we estimate the  
524 maximum number of ribosomes that could be made as a function of growth rate (Figure 9(B), blue curve). Although  
525 we expect this estimate to significantly overestimate rRNA abundance at slower growth rates ( $\lambda < 0.5 \text{ hr}^{-1}$ ), this  
526 provides a useful reference alongside the proteomic measurements particularly in the regime of fast growth. For  
527 growth rates above about  $1 \text{ hr}^{-1}$ , for example, we find that cells will need to transcribe rRNA near their maximal  
528 rate. As a counter example, if *E. coli* did not initiate multiple rounds of replication, but managed to replicate their  
529 chromosome within the requisite time limit, they would be unable to make enough rRNA for the observed number  
530 of ribosomes (dashed blue curve in Figure 9(C)). The convergence between the maximum rRNA production and  
531 measured ribosome copy number suggests rRNA synthesis may begin to present a bottleneck at the fastest growth  
532 rates due to the still-limited copies of rRNA genes.

### 533 Rapid Growth Requires *E. coli* to Increase Both Cell Size and Ribosomal Mass Fraction


534 In Figure 9(B, right-hand side) we find that above about  $0.75 \text{ hr}^{-1}$ , the growth rate is determined by the ribosomal  
535 mass fraction  $\Phi_R$ , since  $f_a$  is close to 1, and  $r_i$  is near its maximal rate (Dai et al., 2016). While  $\Phi_R$  will need to  
536 increase in order for cells to grow faster, the fractional dependence in Equation 3 gives little insight into how this is  
537 actually achieved in the cell.

538 It is now well-documented that *E. coli* cells add a constant volume per origin of replication, which is robust  
539 to a remarkable array of cellular perturbations (Si et al., 2017). Given the proteomic measurements featured in  
540 this work, it becomes apparent that the ribosome copy number is also scaled in proportion to  $\langle \# \text{ ori} \rangle$  Figure 10(A).  
541 Importantly, however, it will only be due to an increase in  $\Phi_R$  at these moderate to fast growth rates that cells  
542 can achieve an increase in their growth rate. Indeed, we find that the deviations in protein expression with  $\langle \# \text{ ori} \rangle$   
543 are largely restricted to regions of ribosomal protein genes Figure 10(B). Here we have calculated the position-  
544 dependent protein expression across the chromosome by a running Gaussian average of protein copy number (20  
545 kbp st. dev. averaging window) based on each gene's transcriptional start site. These were median-subtracted to  
546 account for the change in total protein abundance with  $\langle \# \text{ ori} \rangle$ . This result suggests that  $\Phi_R$  is also being tuned in



**Figure 9. Translation-limited growth rate.** (A) *left*: Translation-limited growth as a function of the ribosomal fraction. The solid line is calculated for an elongation rate of 17 aa per second. The dashed line corresponds to the maximum rate of ribosomal protein synthesis ( $\approx 7$  min). *right*: Translation-limited growth rate as a function of the actively translating ribosomal fraction. The actively translating ribosomal fraction is calculated using the estimated values of  $f_a$  from [Dai et al. \(2016\)](#) (shown in inset; see Appendix Calculation of active ribosomal fraction for additional detail). Gray data points show additional measurements from literature and consider further in the supplemental figure part (A). (B) Maximum number of rRNA units that can be synthesized as a function of growth rate. Solid curve corresponding to the rRNA copy number is calculated by multiplying the number of rRNA operons by the estimated number of (# ori) at each growth rate. The quantity (# ori) was calculated using Equation 4 and the measurements from [Si et al. \(2017\)](#). The dashed line shows the maximal number of functional rRNA units produced from a single chromosomal initiation per cell cycle.

**Figure 9–Figure supplement 1.** Comparison of  $\Phi_R f_a$  with literature and estimation of (# ori).



**Figure 10. Cells increase both absolute ribosome abundance and  $\Phi_R$  with (# ori).** (A) Plot of the ribosome copy number estimated from the proteomic data against the estimated (# ori) (see Appendix Estimation of  $\langle \# \text{ori} \rangle / \langle \# \text{ter} \rangle$  and  $\langle \# \text{ori} \rangle$  for additional details). (B) A running Gaussian average (20 kbp st. dev.) of protein copy number is calculated for each growth condition considered by (Schmidt et al., 2016) based on each gene's transcriptional start site. Since total protein abundance increases with growth rate, protein copy numbers are median-subtracted to allow comparison between growth conditions. (# ori) are estimated using the data in (A) and Equation 4.

547 proportion to (# ori) under nutrient-limited growth, and in particular, it is through this additional dependence on  
548  $\Phi_R$  that *E. coli* exhibits an exponential increase in cell size with growth rate.

#### 549 A Minimal Model of Nutrient-Mediated Growth Rate Control

550 While the preceding subsections highlight a dominant role for ribosomes in setting the growth rate, our analysis on  
551 the whole emphasizes that the total proteomic content must also change in response to variable growth conditions  
552 and growth rate. In this final section we use a minimal model of growth rate control to better understand how this  
553 interconnection between ribosomal abundance and total protein influences the observed growth rate.


554 Here we propose that cells modulate their protein abundance in direct response to the availability of nutrients  
555 in their environment. As noted earlier, bacteria can modulate ribosomal activity through the secondary-messenger  
556 molecules like (p)ppGpp in poorer nutrient conditions (Figure 9(C) - inset; Dai et al. (2016)). Importantly, these  
557 secondary-messengers also cause global changes in transcriptional and translational activity (Hauryliuk et al.,  
558 2015; Zhu and Dai, 2019; Büke et al., 2020). In *E. coli*, amino acid starvation leads to the accumulation of de-acetylated  
559 tRNAs at the ribosome's A-site and a strong increase in (p)ppGpp synthesis activity by the enzyme RelA (Hauryliuk  
560 et al., 2015). Along with this, there is increasing evidence that (p)ppGpp also acts to inhibit the initiation of DNA  
561 replication (Kraemer et al., 2019), providing a potential mechanism to lower (# ori) and maintain a smaller cell size  
562 in poorer growth conditions (Fernández-Coll et al., 2020).

563 To consider this quantitatively, we assume that cells modulate their proteome ( $N_{\text{pep}}$ ,  $R$ ,  $\Phi_R$ ) to better maximize  
564 their rate of peptide elongation  $r_t$ . The elongation rate  $r_t$  will depend on how quickly the ribosomes can match  
565 codons with their correct amino-acyl tRNA, along with the subsequent steps of peptide bond formation and  
566 translocation. This ultimately depends on the cellular concentration of amino acids, which we treat as a single  
567 effective species,  $[AA]_{\text{eff}}$ . In our model, we determine the the rate of peptide elongation  $r_t$  and achievable growth  
568 rate as simply depending on the supply of amino acids (and, therefore, also amino-acyl tRNAs), through a parameter  
569  $r_{AA}$  in units of AA per second, and the rate of amino acid consumption by protein synthesis ( $r_t \times R \times f_a$ ). This is  
570 shown schematically in Figure 11(A) and derived in Appendix Derivation of Minimal Model for Nutrient-Mediated  
571 Growth Rate Control. Given our observation that protein synthesis and energy production are not limiting, we  
572 assume that other molecular players required by ribosomes such as elongation factors and GTP are available in  
573 sufficient abundance.

574 In Figure 11(B), we illustrate how the elongation rate will depend on the ribosomal copy number. Here, we  
575 have considered an arbitrarily chosen  $r_{AA} = 5 \times 10^6 \text{ AA} \cdot \text{s}^{-1} \cdot \mu\text{m}^{-3}$  and  $f_a = 1$  for a unit cell volume  $V = 1 \text{ fL}$ . At  
576 low ribosome copy numbers, the observed elongation rate is dependent primarily on  $[AA]_{\text{eff}}$  through  $r_{AA}$  [as  
577  $r_t^{\max} \times R \times f_a \ll r_{AA}$ , point (1) in Figure 11(B)]. As the ribosome copy number is increased such that the amino acid

(A)

## A MINIMAL MODEL FOR NUTRIENT-LIMITED GROWTH



**Figure 11. A minimal model of growth rate control under nutrient limitation.** (A) We consider a unit volume of cellular material composed of amino acids (colored spheres) provided at a supply rate  $r_{AA}$ . These amino acids are polymerized by a pool of ribosomes (brown blobs) at a rate  $r_t \times R \times f_a$ , where  $r_t$  is the elongation rate,  $R$  is the ribosome copy number in the unit volume, and  $f_a$  is the fraction of those ribosomes actively translating. (B) The observed elongation rate is plotted as a function of ribosomes. The three points correspond to three regimes of ribosome copy numbers and are shown schematically on the left-hand side. The region of the curve shown as dashed lines represents a non-physical copy number, but is shown for illustrative purposes. This curve was generated using an amino acid supply rate of  $5 \times 10^6 \text{ AA / s}$ , a maximal elongation rate of  $17.1 \text{ AA / s}$ ,  $f_a = 1$ , and a unit cell volume of  $V = 1 \text{ fL}$ . See Appendix Derivation of Minimal Model for Nutrient-Mediated Growth Rate Control for additional model details. (C) The cellular growth rate is plotted as a function of total cellular ribosome copy number for different cellular amino acid supply rates, with blue and green curves corresponding to low and high supply rates, respectively. As the ribosome copy number is increased, so too is the cell size and total protein abundance  $N_{\text{pep}}$ . We direct the reader to the Supplemental Information for discussion on the inference of the relationship between cell size, number of peptide bonds, and ribosome copy number.

**Figure 11–Figure supplement 1.** An interactive figure for exploration of the model parameter space.

578 supply rate and consumption rate are nearly equal [point (2) in **Figure 11(B)**], the observed elongation rate begins  
 579 to decrease sharply. When the ribosome copy number is increased even further, consumption at the maximum  
 580 elongation rate exceeds the supply rate, yielding a significantly reduced elongation rate [point (3) in **Figure 11(B)**].  
 581 While the elongation rate will always be dominated by the amino acid supply rate at sufficiently low ribosome  
 582 copy numbers, the elongation rate at larger ribosome abundances can be increased by tuning  $f_a$  such that not all  
 583 ribosomes are elongating, reducing the total consumption rate.

584 Optimal Ribosomal Content and Cell Size Depend on Nutrient Availability and Metabolic Capacity  
 585 To relate elongation rate to growth rate, we constrain the set of parameters based on our available proteomic  
 586 measurements; namely, we restrict the values of  $R$ ,  $N_{\text{pep}}$ , and cell size to those associated with the amalgamated  
 587 proteomic data (described in Appendix Estimation of Total Protein Content per Cell). We then consider how changes  
 588 in the nutrient conditions, through the parameter  $r_{AA}$ , influence the maximum growth rate as determined by  
 589 **Equation 3.** **Figure 11(C)** shows how the observed growth rate depends on the rate of amino acid supply  $r_{AA}$  as  
 590 a function of the cellular ribosome copy number. A feature immediately apparent is the presence of a maximal  
 591 growth rate whose dependence on  $R$  (and consequently, the cell size) increases with increasing  $r_{AA}$ . Importantly,  
 592 however, there is an optimum set of  $R$ ,  $N_{\text{pep}}$ , and  $V$  that are strictly dependent on the value of  $r_{AA}$ . Increasing the

593 ribosomal concentration beyond the cell's metabolic capacity has the adverse consequence of depleting the supply  
594 of amino acids and a concomitant decrease in the elongation rate  $r$ , [Figure 11(B)].

595 Also of note is the growth rate profiles shown for low amino acid supply rates [purple and blue lines in  
596 Figure 11(C)], representing growth in nutrient-poor media. In these conditions, there no longer exists a peak in  
597 growth, at least in the range of physiologically-relevant ribosome copy numbers. Instead, cells limit their pool of  
598 actively translating ribosomes by decreasing  $f_a$  (Dai et al., 2016), which would help maintain the pool of available  
599 amino acids  $[AA]_{\text{eff}}$  and increase the achievable elongation rate. This observation is in agreement with the central  
600 premise of the cellular resource allocation principle proposed by Scott et al. (2010); Klumpp et al. (2009); Klumpp  
601 and Hwa (2014) and Hui et al. (2015).

## 602 Discussion

603 Continued experimental and technological improvements have led to a treasure trove of quantitative biological  
604 data (Hui et al., 2015; Schmidt et al., 2016; Si et al., 2017; Gallagher et al., 2020; Peebo et al., 2015; Valgepea et al.,  
605 2013), and an ever advancing molecular view and mechanistic understanding of the constituents that support  
606 bacterial growth (Taheri-Araghi et al., 2015; Morgenstein et al., 2015; Si et al., 2019; Karr et al., 2012; Kostinski  
607 and Reuveni, 2020). In this work we have compiled what we believe to be the state-of-the-art knowledge on  
608 proteomic copy number across a broad range of growth conditions in *E. coli*. We have made this data accessible  
609 through a [GitHub repository](#), and an [interactive figure](#) that allows exploration of specific protein and protein  
610 complex copy numbers. Through a series of order-of-magnitude estimates that traverse key steps in the bacterial  
611 cell cycle, this proteomic data has been a resource to guide our understanding of two key questions: what biological  
612 processes limit the absolute speed limit of bacterial growth, and how do cells alter their molecular constituents  
613 as a function of changes in growth rate or nutrient availability? While not exhaustive, our series of estimates  
614 provide insight on the scales of macromolecular complex abundance across four classes of cellular processes – the  
615 transport of nutrients, the production of energy, the synthesis of the membrane and cell wall, and the numerous  
616 steps of the central dogma.

617 In general, the copy numbers of the complexes involved in these processes were in reasonable agreement  
618 with our order-of-magnitude estimates. Since many of these estimates represent soft lower-bound quantities, this  
619 suggests that cells do not express proteins grossly in excess of what is needed for a particular growth rate. Several  
620 exceptions, however, also highlight the dichotomy between a proteome that appears to "optimize" expression  
621 according to growth rate and one that must be able to quickly adapt to environments of different nutritional quality.  
622 Take, for example, the expression of carbon transporters. Shown in Figure 2(B), we find that cells always express a  
623 similar number of glucose transporters irrespective of growth condition. At the same time, it is interesting to note  
624 that many of the alternative carbon transporters are still expressed in low but non-zero numbers ( $\approx 10$ -100 copies  
625 per cell) across growth conditions. This may relate to the regulatory configuration for many of these operons,  
626 which require the presence of a metabolite signal in order for alternative carbon utilization operons to be induced  
627 (Monod, 1949; Laxhuber et al., 2020). Furthermore, upon induction, these transporters are expressed and present  
628 in abundances in close agreement with a simple estimate.

629 Of the processes illustrated in Figure 1, we arrive at a ribosome-centric view of cellular growth rate control.  
630 This is in some sense unsurprising given the long-held observation that *E. coli* and many other organisms vary  
631 their ribosomal abundance as a function of growth conditions and growth rate (Scott et al., 2010; Metzl-Raz et al.,  
632 2017). However, through our dialogue with the proteomic data, two additional key points emerge. The first relates  
633 to our question of what process sets the absolute speed limit of bacterial growth. While a cell can parallelize  
634 many of its processes simply by increasing the abundance of specific proteins or firing multiple rounds of DNA  
635 replication, this is not so for synthesis of ribosomes (Figure 9(A)). The translation time for each ribosome [ $\approx 7$  min,  
636 Dill et al. (2011)] places an inherent limit on the growth rate that can only be surpassed if the cell were to increase  
637 their polypeptide elongation rate, or if they could reduce the total protein and rRNA mass of the ribosome. The  
638 second point relates to the long-observed correlations between growth rate and cell size (Schaechter et al., 1958; Si  
639 et al., 2017), and between growth rate and ribosomal mass fraction. While both trends have sparked tremendous  
640 curiosity and driven substantial amounts of research in their own regards, these relationships are themselves  
641 intertwined. In particular, it is the need for cells to increase their absolute number of ribosomes under conditions  
642 of rapid growth that require cells to also grow in size. Further experiments are needed to test the validity of this

643 hypothesis. In particular, we believe that the change in growth rate in response to translation-inhibitory drugs  
644 (such as chloramphenicol) could be quantitatively predicted, given one had precision measurement of the relevant  
645 parameters, including the fraction of actively translating ribosomes  $f_a$  and changes in the metabolic capacity of the  
646 cell (i.e. the rate of amino acid supply) for a particular growth condition.

647 While the generation of new ribosomes plays a dominant role in growth rate control, there exist other physical  
648 limits to the function of cellular processes. One of the key motivations for considering energy production was  
649 the physical constraints on total volume and surface area as cells vary their size (*Harris and Theriot, 2018; Ojkic  
650 et al., 2019*). While *E. coli* get larger as it expresses more ribosomes, an additional constraint begins to arise in  
651 energy production due to a relative decrease in total surface area where ATP is predominantly produced (*Szenk  
652 et al., 2017*). Specifically, the cell interior requires an amount of energy that scales cubically with cell size, but the  
653 available surface area only grows quadratically (*Figure 5(A)*). While this threshold does not appear to be met for  
654 *E. coli* cells growing at 2 hr<sup>-1</sup> or less, it highlights an additional constraint on growth given the apparent need to  
655 increase in cell size to grow faster. This limit is relevant even to eukaryotic organisms, whose mitochondria exhibit  
656 convoluted membrane structures that nevertheless remain bacteria-sized organelles (*Guo et al., 2018*). In the  
657 context of bacterial growth and energy production more generally, we have limited our analysis to the aerobic  
658 growth conditions associated with the proteomic data and further consideration will be needed for anaerobic  
659 growth.

660 This work is by no means meant to be an exhaustive dissection of bacterial growth rate control, and there are  
661 many aspects of the bacterial proteome and growth that we neglected to consider. For example, other recent work  
662 (*Liebermeister et al., 2014; Hui et al., 2015; Schmidt et al., 2016*) has explored how the proteome is structured  
663 and how that structure depends on growth rate. In the work of *Hui et al. (2015)*, the authors coarse-grained the  
664 proteome into six discrete categories being related to either translation, catabolism, anabolism, and others related  
665 to signaling and core metabolism. The relative mass fraction of the proteome occupied by each sector could be  
666 modulated by external application of drugs or simply by changing the nutritional content of the medium. While  
667 we have explored how the quantities of individual complexes are related to cell growth, we acknowledge that  
668 higher-order interactions between groups of complexes or metabolic networks at a systems-level may reveal  
669 additional insights into how these growth-rate dependences are mechanistically achieved. Furthermore, while we  
670 anticipate the conclusions summarized here are applicable to a wide collection of bacteria with similar lifestyles as *E.  
671 coli*, other bacteria and archaea may have evolved other strategies that were not considered. Further experiments  
672 with the level of rigor now possible in *E. coli* will need to be performed in a variety of microbial organisms to learn  
673 more about how regulation of proteomic composition and growth rate control has evolved over the past 3.5 billion  
674 years.

## 675 Methods

### 676 Data Analysis and Availability

677 All proteomic measurements come from the experimental work of *Schmidt et al. (2016); Peebo et al. (2015);  
678 Valgepea et al. (2013)* (mass spectrometry) and *Li et al. (2014)* (ribosomal profiling). Data curation and analysis was  
679 done programmatically in Python, and compiled data and analysis files are accessible through a [GitHub repository]  
680 (DOI:XXX) associated with this paper as well as on the associated [paper website](#). An interactive figure that allows  
681 exploration of specific protein and protein complex copy numbers is available at [link].

### 682 Acknowledgements

683 We thank Matthias Heinemann, Alexander Schmidt, and Gene-Wei Li for additional input regarding their data. We  
684 also thank members of the Phillips, Theriot, Kondev, and Garcia labs for useful discussions. We thank Suzannah M.  
685 Beeler, Avi Flamholz, Soichi Hirokawa, and Manuel Razo-Mejia for reading and providing comments on drafts of this  
686 manuscript. R.P. is supported by La Fondation Pierre-Gilles de Gennes, the Rosen Center at Caltech, and the NIH  
687 1R35 GM118043 (MRA). J.A.T. is supported by the Howard Hughes Medical Institute, and NIH Grant R37-AI036929.  
688 N.M.B is a HHMI Fellow of The Jane Coffin Childs Memorial Fund.

<sup>689</sup> **Competing Interests**

<sup>690</sup> The authors declare no competing interests.

691 **Appendix for: Fundamental limits on the**  
692 **rate of bacterial cell division**

693 **Nathan M. Belliveau<sup>†, 1</sup>, Griffin Chure<sup>†, 2</sup>, Christina L. Hueschen<sup>3</sup>, Hernan G. Garcia<sup>4</sup>, Jane**  
694 **Kondev<sup>5</sup>, Daniel S. Fisher<sup>6</sup>, Julie A. Theriot<sup>1, 7, \*</sup>, Rob Phillips<sup>8, 9, \*</sup>**

695 <sup>1</sup>Department of Biology, University of Washington, Seattle, WA, USA; <sup>2</sup>Department of Applied Physics,  
696 California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, CA, USA; <sup>3</sup>Department of Chemical Engineering, Stanford  
697 University, Stanford, CA, USA; <sup>4</sup>Department of Molecular Cell Biology and Department of Physics,  
698 University of California Berkeley, Berkeley, CA, USA; <sup>5</sup>Department of Physics, Brandeis University,  
699 Waltham, MA, USA; <sup>6</sup>Department of Applied Physics, Stanford University, Stanford, CA, USA; <sup>7</sup>Allen  
700 Institute for Cell Science, Seattle, WA, USA; <sup>8</sup>Division of Biology and Biological Engineering, California  
701 Institute of Technology, Pasadena, CA, USA; <sup>9</sup>Department of Physics, California Institute of Technology,  
702 Pasadena, CA, USA; \*Co-corresponding authors. Address correspondence to phillips@pboc.caltech.edu  
703 and jtheriot@uw.edu; <sup>†</sup>These authors contributed equally to this work

<b>704</b>	<b>Contents</b>	
<b>705</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>706</b>	<b>Nutrient Transport</b>	<b>2</b>
707	Limits on Transporter Expression . . . . .	6
<b>708</b>	<b>Cell Envelope Biogenesis</b>	<b>6</b>
709	Lipid Synthesis . . . . .	6
710	Peptidoglycan Synthesis . . . . .	7
711	Limits on Cell Wall Biogenesis . . . . .	7
<b>712</b>	<b>Energy Production</b>	<b>7</b>
713	ATP Synthesis . . . . .	9
714	Generating the Proton Electrochemical Gradient . . . . .	9
715	Limits on Biosynthesis in a Crowded Membrane . . . . .	11
<b>716</b>	<b>Processes of the Central Dogma</b>	<b>11</b>
717	DNA Replication . . . . .	11
718	RNA Synthesis . . . . .	13
719	Protein Synthesis . . . . .	14
720	Maximum Growth Rate is Determined by the Ribosomal Mass Fraction . . . . .	16
721	rRNA Synthesis Presents a Potential Bottleneck During Rapid Growth . . . . .	18
722	Rapid Growth Requires <i>E. coli</i> to Increase Both Cell Size and Ribosomal Mass Fraction . . . . .	18
<b>723</b>	<b>A Minimal Model of Nutrient-Mediated Growth Rate Control</b>	<b>20</b>
724	Optimal Ribosomal Content and Cell Size Depend on Nutrient Availability and Metabolic Capacity . . . . .	21
<b>725</b>	<b>Discussion</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>726</b>	<b>Methods</b>	<b>23</b>
727	Data Analysis and Availability . . . . .	23
<b>728</b>	<b>Acknowledgements</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>729</b>	<b>Competing Interests</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>730</b>	<b>Additional Estimates of Fundamental Biological Processes</b>	<b>28</b>
731	Nutrient Transport . . . . .	28
732	Nitrogen . . . . .	28
733	Phosphorus . . . . .	28
734	Sulfur . . . . .	28
735	Additional Process of the Central Dogma . . . . .	29
736	dNTP synthesis . . . . .	29
737	mRNA and tRNA Synthesis . . . . .	29
738	tRNA Charging . . . . .	30
<b>739</b>	<b>Experimental Details Behind Proteomic Data</b>	<b>31</b>
740	Fluorescence based measurements . . . . .	31
741	Ribosomal profiling measurements . . . . .	32
742	Mass spectrometry measurements . . . . .	32
<b>743</b>	<b>Summary of Proteomic Data</b>	<b>32</b>
<b>744</b>	<b>Estimation of Cell Size and Surface Area</b>	<b>33</b>

745	<b>Estimation of Total Protein Content per Cell</b>	<b>34</b>
746	Estimating Volume and Number of Amino Acids from Ribosome Copy Number . . . . .	35
747	<b>Additional Considerations of Schmidt <i>et al.</i> Data Set</b>	<b>35</b>
748	Effect of cell volume on reported absolute protein abundances . . . . .	39
749	Relaxing assumption of constant protein concentration across growth conditions . . . . .	39
750	Comparison with total protein measurements from Basan <i>et al.</i> 2015. . . . .	39
751	<b>Calculation of Complex Abundance</b>	<b>40</b>
752	<b>Extending Estimates to a Continuum of Growth Rates</b>	<b>41</b>
753	Estimation of the total cell mass . . . . .	41
754	Complex Abundance Scaling With Cell Volume . . . . .	43
755	A Relation for Complex Abundance Scaling With Surface Area . . . . .	44
756	Number of Lipids . . . . .	44
757	Number of Murein Monomers . . . . .	44
758	Complex Abundance Scaling With Number of Origins, and rRNA Synthesis . . . . .	44
759	<b>Calculation of active ribosomal fraction.</b>	<b>45</b>
760	<b>Estimation of <math>\langle \#ori \rangle / \langle \#ter \rangle</math> and <math>\langle \#ori \rangle</math>.</b>	<b>45</b>
761	<b>Derivation of Minimal Model for Nutrient-Mediated Growth Rate Control</b>	<b>46</b>

762 **Additional Estimates of Fundamental Biological Processes**

763 In the main text of this work, we present estimates for a significant number of fundamental biological processes  
764 that are necessary for cell division. While we believe the estimates provided in the main text provide a succinct  
765 summary of the corresponding process, we left out additional estimates of related processes for brevity. In this  
766 section of the appendix, we present these additional estimates in full.

767 **Nutrient Transport**

768 In the main text, we make passing mention that while transport carbon often comes in the form of carbohydrates  
769 and sugar alcohols while other critical elements – such as nitrogen, sulfur, and phosphorus – are transported as  
770 inorganic ions. Below, we present estimates for the transport requirements of these materials.

771 **Nitrogen**

772 We must first address which elemental sources must require active transport, meaning that the cell cannot acquire  
773 appreciable amounts simply via diffusion across the membrane. The permeability of the lipid membrane to a large  
774 number of solutes has been extensively characterized over the past century. Large, polar molecular species (such  
775 as various sugar molecules, sulfate, and phosphate) have low permeabilities while small, non-polar compounds  
776 (such as oxygen, carbon dioxide, and ammonia) can readily diffuse across the membrane. Ammonia, a primary  
777 source of nitrogen in typical laboratory conditions, has a permeability on par with water ( $\sim 10^5$  nm/s, BNID:110824).  
778 In nitrogen-poor conditions, *E. coli* expresses a transporter (AmtB) which appears to aid in nitrogen assimilation,  
779 though the mechanism and kinetic details of transport are still a matter of debate (*van Heeswijk et al., 2013*;  
780 *Khademi et al., 2004*). Beyond ammonia, another plentiful source of nitrogen come in the form of glutamate,  
781 which has its own complex metabolism and scavenging pathways. However, nitrogen is plentiful in the growth  
782 conditions examined in this work, permitting us to neglect nitrogen transport as a potential rate limiting process in  
783 cell division in typical experimental conditions.

784 **Phosphorus**

785 Phosphorus is critical to the cellular energy economy in the form of high-energy phosphodiester bonds making  
786 up DNA, RNA, and the NTP energy pool as well as playing a critical role in the post-translational modification of  
787 proteins and defining the polar-heads of lipids. In total, phosphorus makes up  $\approx 3\%$  of the cellular dry mass which  
788 in typical experimental conditions is in the form of inorganic phosphate. The cell membrane has remarkably low  
789 permeability to this highly-charged and critical molecule, therefore requiring the expression of active transport  
790 systems. In *E. coli*, the proton electrochemical gradient across the inner membrane is leveraged to transport  
791 inorganic phosphate into the cell (*Rosenberg et al., 1977*). Proton-solute symporters are widespread in *E. coli*  
792 (*Ramos and Kaback, 1977; Booth et al., 1979*) and can have rapid transport rates of 50 to 100 molecules per second  
793 for sugars and other solutes (BNID: 103159; 111777). As a more extreme example, the proton transporters in  
794 the F<sub>1</sub>-F<sub>0</sub> ATP synthase, which use the proton electrochemical gradient for rotational motion, can shuttle protons  
795 across the membrane at a rate of  $\approx 1000$  per second (BNID: 104890; 103390). In *E. coli* the PitA phosphate  
796 transport system has been shown to be very tightly coupled with the proton electrochemical gradient with a 1:1  
797 proton:phosphate stoichiometric ratio (*Harris et al., 2001; Feist et al., 2007*). Taking the geometric mean of the  
798 aforementioned estimates gives a plausible rate of phosphate transport on the order of 300 per second. Illustrated  
799 in *Figure 2–Figure Supplement 1(A)*, we can estimate that  $\approx 200$  phosphate transporters are necessary to maintain  
800 an  $\approx 3\%$  dry mass with a 5000 s division time. This estimate is consistent with observation when we examine  
801 the observed copy numbers of PitA in proteomic data sets (plot in *Figure 2–Figure Supplement 1(A)*). While our  
802 estimate is very much in line with the observed numbers, we emphasize that this is likely a slight overestimate of the  
803 number of transporters needed as there are other phosphorous scavenging systems, such as the ATP-dependent  
804 phosphate transporter Pst system which we have neglected.

805 **Sulfur**

806 Similar to phosphate, sulfate is highly-charged and not particularly membrane permeable, requiring active transport.  
807 While there exists a H<sup>+</sup>/sulfate symporter in *E. coli*, it is in relatively low abundance and is not well characterized  
808 (*Zhang et al., 2014a*). Sulfate is predominantly acquired via the ATP-dependent ABC transporter CysUWA system

which also plays an important role in selenium transport (*Sekowska et al., 2000; Sirko et al., 1995*). While specific kinetic details of this transport system are not readily available, generic ATP transport systems in prokaryotes transport on the order of 1 to 10 molecules per second (BNID: 109035). Combining this generic transport rate, measurement of sulfur comprising 1% of dry mass, and a 5000 second division time yields an estimate of  $\approx 1000$  CysUWA complexes per cell (*Figure 2–Figure Supplement 1(B)*). Once again, this estimate is in notable agreement with proteomic data sets, suggesting that there are sufficient transporters present to acquire the necessary sulfur. In a similar spirit of our estimate of phosphorus transport, we emphasize that this is likely an overestimate of the number of necessary transporters as we have neglected other sulfur scavenging systems that are in lower abundance.

## Additional Process of the Central Dogma

In the main text, we consider the processes underlying the backbone of the central dogma, namely DNA replication, RNA transcription, and protein translation. In this section we turn our attention to additional processes related to the central dogma, primarily dNTP synthesis for DNA replication and amino-acyl tRNA synthesis for translation. Additionally, we explore in more detail the estimates shown in *Figure 7(A)* for the RNA polymerase requirements of mRNA and tRNA synthesis.

### dNTP synthesis

The four major dNTPs (dATP, dTTP, dCTP, and dGTP) serve as the fundamental units of the genetic code. Thus, to faithfully replicate the chromosome, the cell must be able to synthesize enough of these bases in the first place. All dNTPs are synthesized *de novo* in separate pathways, requiring different building blocks. However, a critical step present in all dNTP synthesis pathways is the conversion from ribonucleotide to deoxyribonucleotide via the removal of the 3' hydroxyl group of the ribose ring (*Rudd et al., 2016*). This reaction is mediated by a class of enzymes termed ribonucleotide reductases, of which *E. coli* possesses two aerobically active complexes (termed I and II) and a single anaerobically active enzyme. Due to their peculiar formation of a radical intermediate, these enzymes have received much biochemical, kinetic, and structural characterization. One such work (*Ge et al., 2003*) performed a detailed *in vitro* measurement of the steady-state kinetic rates of these complexes, revealing a turnover rate of  $\approx 10$  dNTP per second.

Since this reaction is central to the synthesis of all dNTPs, it is reasonable to consider the abundance of these complexes is a measure of the total dNTP production in *E. coli*. Illustrated schematically in *Figure 6 (A)*, we consider the fact that to replicate the cell's genome, on the order of  $\approx 10^7$  dNTPs must be synthesized. Assuming a production rate of 10 per second per ribonucleotide reductase complex and a cell division time of 5000 seconds, we arrive at an estimate of  $\approx 200$  complexes needed per cell. As shown in the bottom panel of *Figure Supplement 1 (A)*, this estimate agrees with the experimental measurements of these complexes abundances within  $\approx 1/2$  an order of magnitude. Extension of this estimate across a continuum of growth rate, including the fact that multiple chromosomes can be replicated at a given time, is shown as a grey transparent line in *Figure Supplement 1*. Similarly to our point estimate, this refinement agrees well with the data, accurately describing both the magnitude of the complex abundance and the dependence on growth rate.

Recent work has revealed that during replication, the ribonucleotide reductase complexes coalesce to form discrete foci colocalized with the DNA replisome complex (*Sánchez-Romero et al., 2011*). This is particularly pronounced in conditions where growth is slow, indicating that spatial organization and regulation of the activity of the complexes plays an important role.

### mRNA and tRNA Synthesis

In *Figure 7* of the main text, we present with limited explanation estimates for the number of RNA polymerases needed to synthesize enough mRNA and tRNA molecules. Here, we present a rationalization for these estimates.

To form a functional protein, all protein coding genes must first be transcribed from DNA to form an mRNA molecule. While each protein requires an mRNA blueprint, many copies of the protein can be synthesized from a single mRNA. Factors such as strength of the ribosomal binding site, mRNA stability, and rare codon usage frequency dictate the number of proteins that can be made from a single mRNA, with yields ranging from  $10^1$  to  $10^4$  (BNID: 104186; 100196; 106254). Computing the geometric mean of this range yields  $\approx 1000$  proteins synthesized

857 per mRNA, a value that agrees with experimental measurements of the number of proteins per cell ( $\approx 3 \times 10^6$ , BNID:  
858 100088) and total number of mRNA per cell ( $\approx 3 \times 10^3$ , BNID:100064).

859 This estimation captures the *steady-state* mRNA copy number, meaning that at any given time, there will exist  
860 approximately 3000 unique mRNA molecules. To determine the *total* number of mRNA that need to be synthesized  
861 over the cell's lifetime, we must consider degradation of the mRNA. In most bacteria, mRNAs are rather unstable  
862 with life times on the order of several minutes (BNID: 104324; 106253; 111927; 111998). For convenience, we  
863 assume that the typical mRNA in our cell of interest has a typical lifetime of  $\approx 300$  seconds. Using this value, we  
864 can determine the total mRNA production rate to maintain a steady-state copy number of 3000 mRNA per cell.  
865 While we direct the reader to the appendix for a more detailed discussion of mRNA transcriptional dynamics, we  
866 state here that the total mRNA production rate must be on the order of  $\approx 15$  mRNA per second. In *E. coli*, the  
867 average protein is  $\approx 300$  amino acids in length (BNID: 108986), meaning that the corresponding mRNA is  $\approx 900$   
868 nucleotides which we will further approximate as  $\approx 1000$  nucleotides to account for the non-protein coding regions  
869 on the 5' and 3' ends. This means that the cell must have enough RNA polymerase molecules about to sustain a  
870 transcription rate of  $\approx 1.5 \times 10^4$  nucleotides per second. Knowing that a single RNA polymerase polymerizes RNA  
871 at a clip of 40 nucleotides per second, we arrive at a comfortable estimate of  $\approx 250$  RNA polymerase complexes  
872 needed to satisfy the mRNA demands of the cell. It is worth noting that this number is approximately half of that  
873 required to synthesize enough rRNA, as we saw in the previous section. We find this to be a striking result as these  
874 250 RNA polymerase molecules are responsible for the transcription of the  $\approx 4000$  protein coding genes that are  
875 not ribosome associated.

876 We now turn our attention to the synthesis of tRNA. Unlike mRNA or rRNA, each individual tRNA is remarkably  
877 short, ranging from 70 to 95 nucleotides each (BNID: 109645; 102340). What they lack in length, they make up  
878 for in abundance, with reported values ranging from  $\approx 5 \times 10^4$  (BNID: 105280) to  $\approx 5 \times 10^5$  (BNID: 108611). To test  
879 tRNA synthesis as a possible growth-rate limiting stage, we will err towards a higher abundance of  $\approx 5 \times 10^5$  per cell.  
880 Combining the abundance and tRNA length measurements, we make the estimate that  $\approx 5 \times 10^7$  nucleotides are  
881 sequestered in tRNA per cell. Unlike mRNA, tRNA is remarkably stable with typical lifetimes *in vivo* on the order of  $\approx$   
882 48 hours (*Abelson et al., 1974; Svenningsen et al., 2017*) – well beyond the timescale of division. Once again using  
883 our rule-of-thumb for the rate of transcription to be 40 nucleotides per second and assuming a division time of  $\approx$   
884 5000 seconds, we arrive at an estimate of  $\approx 200$  RNA polymerases to synthesize enough tRNA. This requirement  
885 pales in comparison to the number of polymerases needed to generate the rRNA and mRNA pools and can be  
886 neglected as a significant transcriptional burden.

## 887 tRNA Charging

888 In the previous subsection, we focused solely on estimating the number of RNA polymerases needed for the  
889 generation of the tRNA molecule itself. We now explore the protein complex requirements for ligation of the  
890 appropriate amino acid to each tRNA. We begin by again using an estimate of  $\approx 3 \times 10^6$  proteins per cell at a 5000 s  
891 division time (BNID: 115702) and a typical protein length of  $\approx 300$  amino acids (BNID: 100017), we can estimate  
892 that a total of  $\approx 10^9$  amino acids are stitched together by peptide bonds.

893 How many tRNAs are needed to facilitate this remarkable number of amino acid delivery events to the translating  
894 ribosomes? It is important to note that tRNAs are recycled after they've passed through the ribosome and can be  
895 recharged with a new amino acid, ready for another round of peptide bond formation. While some *in vitro* data  
896 exists on the turnover of tRNA in *E. coli* for different amino acids, we can make a reasonable estimate by comparing  
897 the number of amino acids to be polymerized to cell division time. Using our stopwatch of 5000 s and  $10^9$  amino  
898 acids, we arrive at a requirement of  $\approx 2 \times 10^5$  tRNA molecules to be consumed by the ribosome per second.

899 There are many processes which go into synthesizing a tRNA and ligating it with the appropriate amino acids.  
900 As we discussed previously, there appear to be more than enough RNA polymerases per cell to synthesize the  
901 needed pool of tRNAs. Without considering the many ways in which amino acids can be scavenged or synthesized  
902 *de novo*, we can explore ligation the as a potential rate limiting step. The enzymes which link the correct amino acid  
903 to the tRNA, known as tRNA synthetases or tRNA ligases, are incredible in their proofreading of substrates with the  
904 incorrect amino acid being ligated once out of every  $10^4$  to  $10^5$  events (BNID: 103469). This is due in part to the  
905 consumption of energy as well as a multi-step pathway to ligation. While the rate at which tRNA is ligated is highly  
906 dependent on the identity of the amino acid, it is reasonable to state that the typical tRNA synthetase has charging

**Table 1.** Overview of proteomic data sets.

Author	Method	Reported Quantity
Taniguchi <i>et al.</i> (2010)	YFP-fusion, cell fluorescence	fg/copies per cell
Valgepea <i>et al.</i> (2012)	mass spectrometry	fg/copies per cell
Peebo <i>et al.</i> (2014)	mass spectrometry	fg/copies per fl
Li <i>et al.</i> (2014)	ribosomal profiling	fg/copies per cell <sup>a</sup>
Soufi <i>et al.</i> (2015)	mass spectrometry	fg/copies per cell
Schmidt <i>et al.</i> (2016)	mass spectrometry	fg/copies per cell <sup>b</sup>

a. The reported values assume that the proteins are long-lived compared to the generation time but are unable to account for post-translational modifications that may alter absolute protein abundances.

b. This mass spectrometry approach differs substantially from the others since in addition to the relative proteome-wide abundance measurements, the authors performed absolute quantification of 41 proteins across all growth conditions (see section on Additional Considerations of Schmidt *et al.* Data Set for more details on this).

907 rate of  $\approx$  20 AA per tRNA synthetase per second (BNID: 105279).

908 We can make an assumption that amino-acyl tRNAs are in steady-state where they are produced at the same  
909 rate they are consumed, meaning that  $2 \times 10^5$  tRNAs must be charged per second. Combining these estimates  
910 together, as shown schematically in **Figure 8–Figure Supplement 1**, yields an estimate of  $\sim 10^4$  tRNA synthetases  
911 per cell with a division time of 5000 s. This point estimate is in very close agreement with the observed number  
912 of synthetases (the sum of all 20 tRNA synthetases in *E. coli*). This estimation strategy seems to adequately  
913 describe the observed growth rate dependence of the tRNA synthetase copy number (shown as the grey line in  
914 **Figure 8–Figure Supplement 1**, suggesting that the copy number scales with the cell volume).

915 In total, the estimated and observed  $\sim 10^4$  tRNA synthetases occupy only a meager fraction of the total cell  
916 proteome, around 0.5% by abundance. It is reasonable to assume that if tRNA charging was a rate limiting  
917 process, cells would be able to increase their growth rate by devoting more cellular resources to making more tRNA  
918 synthetases. As the synthesis of tRNAs and the corresponding charging can be highly parallelized, we can argue that  
919 tRNA charging is not a rate limiting step in cell division, at least for the growth conditions explored in this work.

## 920 Experimental Details Behind Proteomic Data

921 Here we provide a brief summary of the experiments behind each proteomic data set considered. The purpose of  
922 this section is to identify how the authors arrived at absolute protein abundances. In the following section (see  
923 section on Summary of Proteomic Data) we will then provide a summary of the protein abundance measurements.  
924 Table 1 provides an overview of the publications we considered. These are predominately mass spectrometry-based,  
925 with the exception of the work from Li *et al.* (2014) which used ribosomal profiling, and the fluorescence-based  
926 counting done in Taniguchi *et al.* (2010). After having compiled and comparing these measurements, we noted  
927 substantial deviations in the measurements from Taniguchi *et al.* (2010) and Soufi *et al.* (2015) (shown in the  
928 following section), and decided to only use the data from Taniguchi *et al.* (2010); Li *et al.* (2014); Valgepea *et al.*  
929 (2013); Peebo *et al.* (2015) in the main text. For completeness, we include these additional datasets in our discussion  
930 of the experimental data.

## 931 Fluorescence based measurements

932 In the work of Taniguchi *et al.* (2010), the authors used a chromosomal YFP fusion library where individual strains  
933 have a specific gene tagged with a YFP-coding sequence. 1018 of their 1400 attempted strains were used in the work.  
934 A fluorescence microscope was used to collect cellular YFP intensities across all these strains. Through automated  
935 image analysis, the authors normalized intensity measurements by cell size to account for the change in size and  
936 expression variability across the cell cycle. Following correction of YFP intensities for cellular autofluorescence,  
937 final absolute protein levels were determined by a calibration curve with single-molecule fluorescence intensities.  
938 This calibration experiment was performed separately using a purified YFP solution.

939 **Ribosomal profiling measurements**

940 The work of *Li et al. (2014)* takes a sequencing based approach to estimate protein abundance. Ribosomal  
941 profiling, which refers to the deep sequencing of ribosome-protected mRNA fragments, can provide a quantitative  
942 measurement of the protein synthesis rate. As long as the protein life-time is long relative to the cell doubling time,  
943 it is possible to estimate absolute protein copy numbers. The absolute protein synthesis rate has units of proteins  
944 per generation, and for stable proteins will also correspond to the protein copy number per cell.

945 In the experiments, ribosome-protected mRNA is extracted from cell lysate and selected on a denaturing  
946 polyacrylamide gel for deep sequencing (15–45 nt long fragments collected and sequenced by using an Illumina  
947 HiSeq 2000 in *Li et al. (2014)*). Counts of ribosome footprints from the sequencing data were then corrected  
948 empirically for position-dependent biases in ribosomal density across each gene, as well as dependencies on  
949 specific sequences including the Shine-Dalgarno sequence. These data-corrected ribosome densities represent  
950 relative protein synthesis rates. Absolute protein synthesis rates are obtained by multiplying the relative rates by  
951 the total cellular protein per cell. The total protein per unit volume was determined with the Lowry method to  
952 quantify total protein, calibrated against bovine serum albumin (BSA). By counting colony-forming units following  
953 serial dilution of their cell cultures, they then calculated the total protein per cell.

954 **Mass spectrometry measurements**


955 Perhaps not surprisingly, the data is predominantly mass spectrometry based. This is largely due to tremendous  
956 improvements in the sensitivity of mass spectrometers, as well as improvements in sample preparation and  
957 data analysis pipelines. It is now a relatively routine task to extract protein from a cell and quantify the majority  
958 of proteins present by shotgun proteomics. In general, this involves lysing cells, enzymatically digesting the  
959 proteins into short peptide fragments, and then introducing them into the mass spectrometer (e.g. with liquid  
960 chromatography and electrospray ionization), which itself can have multiple rounds of detection and further  
961 fragmentation of the peptides.

962 Most quantitative experiments rely on labeling protein with stable isotopes, which allow multiple samples  
963 to be measured together by the mass spectrometer. By measuring samples of known total protein abundance  
964 simultaneously (i.e. one sample of interest, and one reference), it is possible to determine relative protein  
965 abundances. Absolute protein abundances can be estimated following the same approach used above for  
966 ribosomal profiling, which is to multiply each relative abundance measurement by the total cellular protein per  
967 cell. This is the approach taken by *Valgepea et al. (2013)*; *Peebo et al. (2015)* and *Soufi et al. (2015)*, with relative  
968 protein abundances determined based on the relative peptide intensities (label free quantification 'LFQ' intensities).  
969 For the data of *Valgepea et al. (2013)*, total protein per cell was determined by measuring total protein by the  
970 Lowry method, and counting colony-forming units following serial dilution. For the data from *Peebo et al. (2015)*,  
971 the authors did not determine cell quantities and instead report the cellular protein abundances in protein per  
972 unit volume by assuming a mass density of 1.1 g/ml, with a 30% dry mass fraction.

973 An alternative way to arrive at absolute protein abundances is to dope in synthetic peptide fragments of known  
974 abundance. These can serve as a direct way to calibrate mass spectrometry signal intensities to absolute mass.  
975 This is the approach taken by *Schmidt et al. (2016)*. In addition to a set of shotgun proteomic measurements to  
976 determine proteome-wide relative abundances, the authors also performed absolute quantification of 41 proteins  
977 covering over four orders of magnitude in cellular abundance. Here, a synthetic peptide was generated for each of  
978 the proteins, doped into each protein sample, and used these to determine absolute protein abundances of the 41  
979 proteins. These absolute measurements, determined for every growth condition, were then used as a calibration  
980 curve to convert proteomic-wide relative abundances into absolute protein abundance per cell. A more extensive  
981 discussion of the *Schmidt et al. (2016)* data set can be found in Section Additional Considerations of Schmidt et al.  
982 Data Set.

983 **Summary of Proteomic Data**

984 In the work of the main text we only used the data from *Valgepea et al. (2013)*; *Li et al. (2014)*; *Peebo et al. (2015)*;  
985 *Schmidt et al. (2016)*. As shown in *Figure 12(A)*, the reported total protein abundances in the work of *Taniguchi*  
986 *et al. (2010)* and *Soufi et al. (2015)* differed quite substantially from the other work. For the work of *Taniguchi et al.*



**Figure 12. Summary of the growth-rate dependent total protein abundance for each data set.** (A) Total protein abundance per cell as originally reported in the data sets of *Taniguchi et al. (2010)*; *Valgepea et al. (2013)*; *Li et al. (2014)*; *Soufi et al. (2015)*; *Peebo et al. (2015)*; *Schmidt et al. (2016)*. Note that the data from *Peebo et al. (2015)* only reported protein abundances per unit volume and total protein per cell was found by multiplying these by the growth-rate dependent cell size as determined by *Si et al. (2017)*. (B) Adjusted total protein abundances across the proteomic data sets are summarized. Protein abundances were adjusted so that all data shared a common set of growth-rate dependent total protein per cell and cellular protein concentration following the cell size expectations of *Si et al. (2017)* (see section on Estimation of Cell Size and Surface Area for further details).


987 (2010) this is in part due to a lower coverage in total proteomic mass quantified, though we also noticed that most  
988 proteins appear undercounted when compared to the other data.

989 *Figure 12(B)* summarizes the total protein mass for each data set used in our final compiled data set. Our  
990 inclination initially was to leave reported copy numbers untouched, but a notable discrepancy between the scaling  
991 of the total protein per cell between *Schmidt et al. (2016)* and the other data sets forced us to dig deeper into  
992 those measurements (compare *Schmidt et al. (2016)* and *Li et al. (2014)* data in *Figure 12(A)*). The particular trend  
993 in *Schmidt et al. (2016)* appears to be due to assumptions made about cell size and we provide a more extensive  
994 discussion and analysis of their data in Additional Considerations of Schmidt et al. Data Set. As a compromise, and  
995 in an effort to treat all data equally, we instead applied a correction factor to all protein abundance values based  
996 on a data-driven estimate of total protein per cell. Here we used cell size measurements from *Si et al. (2017, 2019)*,  
997 and an estimate of total protein content through expected dry mass. Total protein per cell was then determined  
998 using available data on total DNA, RNA, and protein from *Basan et al. (2015)*; *Dai et al. (2016)*, which account for  
999 the majority of dry mass in the cell. We describe these details further in sections on Estimation of Cell Size and  
1000 Surface Area and Estimation of Total Protein Content per Cell that follows.

1001 Lastly, in *Figure 13* we show the total proteomic coverage and overlap of proteins quantified across each data  
1002 set. Here we have used an UpSet diagram (*Lex et al., 2014*) to compare the data. Overall, the overlap in quantified  
1003 proteins is quite high, with 1157 proteins quantified across all data sets. The sequencing based approach of *Li*  
1004 *et al. (2014)* has substantially higher coverage compared to the mass spectrometry data sets (3394 genes versus  
1005 the 2041 genes quantified in the work of *Schmidt et al. (2016)*). However, in terms of total protein mass, the data  
1006 from *Li et al. (2014)*; *Schmidt et al. (2016)*; *Peebo et al. (2015)* each quantify roughly equivalent total protein mass.  
1007 An exception to this is in the data from *Valgepea et al. (2013)*, where we find that the total protein quantified in  
1008 *Valgepea et al. (2013)* is 90-95 % of the total protein mass (when using the data from *Schmidt et al. (2016)* as a  
1009 reference).

## 1010 Estimation of Cell Size and Surface Area

1011 Since most of the proteomic data sets lack cell size measurements, we chose instead to use a common estimate of  
1012 size for any analysis requiring cell size or surface area. Since each of the data sets used either K-12 MG1655 or  
1013 its derivative, BW25113 (from the lab of Barry L. Wanner; the parent strain of the Keio collection (*Datsenko and*  
1014 *Wanner, 2000; Baba et al., 2006*)), below we fit the MG1655 cell size data from the supplemental material of *Si*



**Figure 13. Comparison of proteomic coverage across different data sets.** An UpSet diagram (*Lex et al., 2014*) summarizes the total number of protein coding genes whose protein abundance was reported in the data sets of *Valgepea et al. (2013)*; *Li et al. (2014)*; *Schmidt et al. (2016)*; *Peebo et al. (2015)*. Bar plot on bottom left indicates the total number of genes reported in each individual data. The main bar plot summarizes the number of unique proteins identified across overlapping subsets of the data. For example, in the first column only the data from *Li et al. (2014)* is considered (indicated by solid blue circle) and 1288 proteins are identified as exclusive to the data set. In the second column, the intersection of all four data sets is considered, with 1157 proteins quantified across them. This follows for each additional column in the plot, with the subset under consideration denoted by the solid blue circles.

1015 *et al. (2017, 2019)* using the `optimize.curve_fit` function from the Scipy python package (*Virtanen et al., 2020*). A  
1016 quick comment on nomenclature: throughout the text, we usually refer to cell size, in units of  $\mu\text{m}^3$ ; however, on  
1017 occasion we will mention size as a volume in units of fL.

1018 The average size measurements from each of their experiments are shown in **Figure 14**, with cell length and  
1019 width shown in (A) and (B), respectively. The length data was well described by the exponential function  $0.5 e^{1.09 \cdot \lambda} +$   
1020  $1.76 \mu\text{m}$ , while the width data was well described by  $0.64 e^{0.24 \cdot \lambda} \mu\text{m}$ . In order to estimate cell size we take the cell as  
1021 a cylinder with two hemispherical ends (*Si et al., 2017; Basan et al., 2015*). Specifically, cell size is estimated from,

$$V = \pi \cdot r^2 \cdot (l - 2r/3), \quad (5)$$

1022 where  $r$  is half the cell width. A best fit to the data is described by  $0.533 e^{1.037 \cdot \lambda} \mu\text{m}^3$ . Calculation of the cell surface  
1023 area is given by,


$$S = \eta \cdot \pi \left( \frac{\eta \cdot \pi}{4} - \frac{\pi}{12} \right)^{-2/3} V^{2/3}, \quad (6)$$

1024 where  $\eta$  is the aspect ratio ( $\eta = l/w$ ) (*Ojkic et al., 2019*).

## 1025 Estimation of Total Protein Content per Cell

1026 In order to estimate total protein per cell for a particular growth rate, we begin by estimating the cell size from the  
1027 fit shown in **Figure 14(C)** (cell size =  $0.533 e^{1.037 \cdot \lambda} \mu\text{m}^3$ , as noted in the previous section). We then estimate the total  
1028 protein content from the total dry mass of the cell. Here we begin by noting that for almost the entire range of  
1029 growth rates considered here, protein, DNA, and RNA were reported to account for at least 90 % of the dry mass  
1030 (*Basan et al. (2015)*). The authors also found that the total dry mass concentration was roughly constant across  
1031 growth conditions. Under such a scenario, we can calculate the total dry mass concentration for protein, DNA, and  
1032 RNA, which is given by  $1.1 \text{ g/ml} \times 30 \% \times 90 \% \text{ or about } [M_p] = 300 \text{ fg per fL}$ . Multiplying this by our prediction of  
1033 cell size gives the total dry mass per cell.

1034 However, even if dry mass concentration is relatively constant across growth conditions, it is not obvious how  
1035 protein concentration might vary due to the substantial increase in rRNA at faster growth rates (*Dai et al. (2016)*).  
1036 The increase in rRNA increases from the linear increase in ribosomal content with faster growth rate (*Scott et al.*



**Figure 14. Summary of size measurements from Si et al. 2017, 2019.** Cell lengths and widths were measured from cell contours obtained from phase contrast images, and refer to the long and short axis respectively. (A) Cell lengths and (B) cell widths show the mean measurements reported (they report 140-300 images and 5,000-30,000 for each set of samples; which likely means about 1,000-5,000 measurements per mean value reported here since they considered about 6 conditions at a time). Fits were made to the MG1655 strain data; length:  $0.5 e^{1.09 \cdot \lambda} + 1.76 \mu\text{m}$ , width:  $0.64 e^{0.24 \cdot \lambda} \mu\text{m}$ . (C) Cell size was calculated as cylinders with two hemispherical ends (Equation 5). The MG1655 strain data gave a best fit of  $0.533 e^{1.037 \cdot \lambda} \mu\text{m}^3$ .

1037 (2010)), since it makes up about about 2/3 or the ribosomal mass. To proceed we therefore relied on experimental  
 1038 measurements of total DNA content per cell from Basan et al. (2015), and RNA to protein ratios that were measured  
 1039 in Dai et al. (and cover the entire range of growth conditions considered here). These are reproduced in Figure 15(A)  
 1040 and (B), respectively.

1041 Assuming that the protein, DNA, and RNA account for 90 % of the total dry mass, the protein mass can then  
 1042 determined by first subtracting the experimentally measured DNA mass, and then using the experimental estimate  
 1043 of the RNA to protein ratio. The total protein per cell is will be related to the summed RNA and protein mass by,

$$M_P = \frac{[M_P + M_{RNA}]}{1 + (RP_{ratio})}. \quad (7)$$

1044 ( $RP_{ratio}$  refers to the RNA to protein ratio as measured by Dai et al.. In Figure 15(C) we plot the estimated cellular  
 1045 concentrations for protein, DNA, and RNA from these calculations, and in Figure 15(D) we plot their total expected  
 1046 mass per cell. This later quantity is the growth rate-dependent total protein mass that was used to estimate total  
 1047 protein abundance across all data sets (and summarized in Figure 12(B)).


#### 1048 Estimating Volume and Number of Amino Acids from Ribosome Copy Number

1049 Towards the end of the main text, we examine a coarse-grained model of nutrient-limited growth. A key point  
 1050 in our analysis was to consider how elongation rate  $r_i$  and growth rate  $\lambda$  vary with respect to the experimentally  
 1051 observed changes in cell size, total number of peptide bonds per cell  $N_{pep}$ , and ribosomal content. In order to  
 1052 restrict parameters to those observed experimentally, but otherwise allow us to explore the model, we performed  
 1053 a phenomenological fit of  $N_{pep}$  and  $V$  as a function of the measured ribosomal copy number  $R$ . As has been  
 1054 described in the preceding sections of this supplement, we estimate cell volume for each growth condition using  
 1055 the size measurements from Si et al. (2017, 2019), and  $N_{pep}$  is approximated by taking the total protein mass and  
 1056 dividing this number by the average mass of an amino acid, 110 Da (BNID: 104877).


1057 Given the exponential scaling of  $V$  and  $N_{pep}$  with growth rate, we performed a linear regression of the log  
 1058 transform of these parameters as a function of the log transform of the ribosome copy number. Using optimization  
 1059 by minimization, we estimated the best-fit values of the intercept and slope for each regression. Figure 16 shows  
 1060 the result of each regression as a dashed line.

#### 1061 Additional Considerations of Schmidt et al. Data Set

1062 While the data set from Schmidt et al. (2016) remains a heroic effort that our labs continue to return to as a resource,  
 1063 there were steps taken in their calculation of protein copy number that we felt needed further consideration. In



**Figure 15. Empirical estimate of cellular protein, DNA, and RNA as a function of growth rate.** (A) Measured DNA mass per cell as a function of growth rate, reproduced from Basan *et al.* 2015. The data was fit to an exponential curve (DNA mass in fg per cell is given by  $0.42 e^{2.23 \cdot \lambda} + 7.2$  fg per cell, where  $\lambda$  is the growth rate in hr<sup>-1</sup>). (B) RNA to protein measurements as a function of growth rate. The data was fit to two lines (shown in black) due to the change in slope at slower growth rates *Neidhardt et al.* (1991); *Dai et al.* (2016). For growth rates below 0.7 hr<sup>-1</sup>, the RNA/protein ratio is  $0.18 \cdot \lambda + 0.093$ , while for growth rates faster than 0.7 hr<sup>-1</sup> the RNA/protein ratio is given by  $0.25 \cdot \lambda + 0.035$ . For (A) and (B) cells are grown under varying levels of nutrient limitation, with cells grown in minimal media with different carbon sources for the slowest growth conditions, and rich-defined media for fast growth rates. (C) Estimation of cellular protein, DNA, and RNA concentration. (D) Total cellular mass estimated for protein, DNA, and RNA using the cell size calculated in Estimation of Cell Size and Surface Area. Symbols (diamond: DNA, square: RNA, circle: protein) show estimated values of mass concentration and mass per cell for the specific growth rates in *Schmidt et al.* (2016).




**Figure 16. Phenomenological regression of cell volume and number of amino acids per cell as a function of the ribosome copy number.** Colored points correspond to the measured value (or calculated value in the case of the cell volume) with colors denoting different data sets. The dashed black line shows the result of the fit, with the functional form of the equation given in the legend with  $R$  representing the ribosome copy number.


particular, the authors made an assumption of constant cellular protein concentration across all growth conditions and used measurements of cell volume that appear inconsistent with an expected exponential scaling of cell size with growth rate that is well-documented in *E. coli* (*Schaechter et al. (1958); Taheri-Araghi et al. (2015); Si et al. (2017)*).

We begin by looking at their cell volume measurements, which are shown in blue in Figure *Figure 17*. As a comparison, we also plot cell sizes reported in three other recent papers: measurements from Taheri-Araghi *et al.* and Si *et al.* come from the lab of Suckjoon Jun, while those from Basan *et al.* come from the lab of Terence Hwa. Each set of measurements used microscopy and cell segmentation to determine the length and width, and then calculated cell size by treating the cell as a cylinder with two hemispherical ends, as we considered in the previous section. While there is notable discrepancy between the two research groups, which are both using strain NCM3722, Basan *et al.* found that this came specifically from uncertainty in determining the cell width. This is prone to inaccuracy given the small cell size and optical resolution limits (further described in their supplemental text). Perhaps the more concerning point is that while each of these alternative measurements show an exponential increase in cell size at faster growth rates, the measurements used by Schmidt *et al.* appear to plateau. This resulted in an analogous trend in their final reported total cellular protein per cell as shown in *Figure 18* (purple data points), and is in disagreement with other measurements of total protein at these growth rates (*Basan et al., 2015*).

Since it is not obvious how measurements of cell size influenced their reported protein abundances, in the following subsections we begin by considering how the authors determined total protein mass per cell. We then consider three different approaches to estimate the growth-rate dependent total protein mass and compare these estimates with those reported by Schmidt *et al. (2016)*. Those results are summarized in *Figure 17(B)*, with the original values from both Schmidt *et al. (2016)* and Li *et al. (2014)* shown in *Figure 17(A)* for reference. For most growth conditions, we find reasonable agreement between our estimates and the reported total protein per cell. However, for the fastest growth conditions, with glycerol + supplemented amino acids, and LB media, all estimates are substantially higher than those originally reported. This is the main reason why we chose to readjust protein abundance as shown in *Figure 12(B)* (with the calculation described in section Estimation of Total Protein Content per Cell).



**Figure 17. Measurements of cell size as a function of growth rate.** (A) Plot of the reported cell sizes from several recent papers. The data in blue come from Volkmer and Heinemann, 2011 (*Volkmer and Heinemann (2011)*) and were used in the work of Schmidt *et al.*. Data from the lab of Terence Hwa are shown in purple (*Basan et al. (2015)*), while the two data sets shown in green and light red come from the lab of Suckjoon Jun (*Taheri-Araghi et al. (2015); Si et al. (2017)*). (B) Same as in (A) but with the data plotted on a logarithmic y-axis to highlight the exponential scaling that is expected for *E. coli*.



**Figure 18. Alternative estimates of total cellular protein for the growth conditions considered in Schmidt *et al.*** (A) The original protein mass from Schmidt *et al.* and Li *et al.* are shown in purple and blue, respectively. (B) Three alternative estimates of total protein per cell. 1. light red: Rescaling of total protein mass assuming a growth rate independent protein concentration and cell volumes estimated from Si *et al.* 2017. 2. light green: Rescaling of total protein mass using estimates of growth rate-dependent protein concentrations and cell volumes estimated from Si *et al.* 2017. Total protein per cell is calculated by assuming a 1.1 g/ml cellular mass density, 30% dry mass, with 90% of the dry mass corresponding to DNA, RNA, and protein (*Basan et al., 2015*). See Estimation of Total Protein Content per Cell for details on calculation. 3. light purple: Rescaling of total protein mass using the experimental measurements from Basan *et al.* 2015.

1091 **Effect of cell volume on reported absolute protein abundances**

1092 As noted in Experimental Details Behind Proteomic Data, the authors from the work in *Schmidt et al. (2016)*  
1093 calculated proteome-wide protein abundances by first determining absolute abundances of 41 pre-selected  
1094 proteins, which relied on adding synthetic heavy reference peptides into their protein samples at known abundance.  
1095 This absolute quantitation was performed in replicate for each growth condition. Separately, the authors also  
1096 performed a more conventional mass spectrometry measurement for samples from each growth condition,  
1097 which attempted to maximize the number of quantified proteins but only provided relative abundances based  
1098 on peptide intensities. Finally, using their 41 proteins with absolute abundances already determined, they then  
1099 created calibration curves with which to relate their relative intensity to absolute protein abundance for each  
1100 growth condition. This allowed them to estimate absolute protein abundance for all proteins detected in their  
1101 proteome-wide data set. Combined with their flow cytometry cell counts, they were then able to determine  
1102 absolute abundance of each protein detected on a per cell basis.

1103 While this approach provided absolute abundances, another necessary step to arrive at total cellular protein  
1104 was to account for any protein loss during their various protein extraction steps. Here the authors attempted  
1105 to determine total protein separately using a BCA protein assay. In personal communications, it was noted that  
1106 determining reasonable total protein abundances by BCA across their array of growth conditions was particularly  
1107 troublesome. Instead, they noted confidence in their total protein measurements for cells grown in M9 minimal  
1108 media + glucose and used this as a reference point with which to estimate the total protein for all other growth  
1109 conditions.

1110 For cells grown in M9 minimal media + glucose an average total mass of  $M_p = 240$  fg per cell was measured.  
1111 Using their reported cell volume, reported as  $V_{orig} = 2.84$  fl, a cellular protein concentration of  $[M_p]_{orig} = M_p/V_{orig} =$   
1112  $85$  fg/fl. Now, taking the assumption that cellular protein concentration is relatively independent of growth rate,  
1113 they could then estimate the total protein mass for all other growth conditions from,

$$M_{p\_i} = [M_p]_{orig} \cdot V_i \quad (8)$$

1114 where  $M_{p_i}$  represents the total protein mass per cell and  $V_i$  is the cell volume for each growth condition  $i$  as  
1115 measured in Volkmer and Heinemann, 2011. Here the thinking is that the values of  $M_{p_i}$  reflects the total cellular  
1116 protein for growth condition  $i$ , where any discrepancy from their absolute protein abundance is assumed to be due  
1117 to protein loss during sample preparation. The protein abundances from their absolute abundance measurements  
1118 noted above were therefore scaled to their estimates and are shown in Figure *Figure 18* (purple data points).

1119 If we instead consider the cell volumes predicted in the work of Si *et al.*, we again need to take growth in M9  
1120 minimal media + glucose as a reference with known total mass, but we can follow a similar approach to estimate  
1121 total protein mass for all other growth conditions. Letting  $V_{Si\_glu} = 0.6$  fl be the predicted cell volume, the cellular  
1122 protein concentration becomes  $[M_p]_{Si} = M_p/V_{Si\_glu} = 400$  fg/fl. The new total protein mass per cell can then be  
1123 calculated from,

$$M'_{p\_i} = [M_p]_{Si} \cdot V_{Si\_i} \quad (9)$$


1124 where  $M'_{p_i}$  is the new protein mass prediction, and  $V_{Si\_i}$  refers to the new volume prediction for each condition  $i$ ,  
1125 These are shown as red data points in Figure *Figure 18(B)*.

1126 **Relaxing assumption of constant protein concentration across growth conditions**

1127 We next relax the assumption that cellular protein concentration is constant and instead, attempt to estimate  
1128 it using experimental data. Here we use the estimation of total protein mass per cell detailed in Estimation of  
1129 Total Protein Content per Cell for all data points in the *Schmidt et al. (2016)* data set. The green data points in  
1130 *Figure 18(B)* show this prediction, and this represents the approach used to estimate total protein per cell for all  
1131 data sets.

1132 **Comparison with total protein measurements from Basan *et al.* 2015.**

1133 One of the challenges in our estimates in the preceding sections is the need to estimate protein concentration and  
1134 cell volumes. These are inherently difficult to measure accurately due to the small size of *E. coli*. Indeed, for all



**Figure 19. Total cellular protein reported in Basan *et al.* 2015.** Measured protein mass as a function of growth rate as reproduced from Basan *et al.* 2015, with cells grown under different levels of nutrient limitation. The data was fit to an exponential curve where protein mass in fg per cell is given by  $14.65 e^{2.180 \cdot \lambda} + 172$  fg per cell, where  $\lambda$  is the growth rate in hr $^{-1}$ .

the additional measurements of cell volume included in Figure *Figure 17*, no measurements were performed for cells growing at rates below 0.5 hr $^{-1}$ . It therefore remains to be determined whether our extrapolated cell volume estimates are appropriate, with the possibility that the logarithmic scaling of cell size might break down for slower growth.

In our last approach we therefore attempt to estimate total protein using experimental data that required no estimates of concentration or cell volume. Specifically, in the work of Basan *et al.*, the authors measured total protein per cell for a broad range of growth rates (reproduced in Figure *Figure 19*). These were determined by first measuring bulk protein from cell lysate, measured by the colorimetric Biuret method (*You et al. (2013)*), and then abundance per cell was calculated from cell counts from either plating cells or a Coulter counter. While it is unclear why Schmidt *et al.* was unable to take a similar approach, the results from Basan *et al* appear more consistent with our expectation that cell mass will increase exponentially with faster growth rates. In addition, although they do not consider growth rates below about 0.5 hr $^{-1}$ , it is interesting to note that the protein mass per cell appears to plateau to a minimum value at slow growth. In contrast, our estimates using cell volume so far have predicted that total protein mass should continue to decrease slightly for slower growing cells. By fitting this data to an exponential function dependent on growth rate, we could then estimate the total protein per cell for each growth condition considered by Schmidt *et al.* (2016). These are plotted as red data points in *Figure 18(B)*.

### Calculation of Complex Abundance

All protein data quantified the abundance of individual proteins per cell. However, this work requires estimates on the abundance of individual protein *complexes*, rather than the copy number of individual proteins. In our analysis of the protein copy number data, it became clear that the reported copy numbers do not always align with those based on reported stoichiometry. As one example of this, the F-O subunit of ATP synthase consists of three protein subunits with a stoichiometry of [AtpB][AtpF]<sub>2</sub>[AtpE]<sub>10</sub> (also referred to as subunits a, b, and c, respectively). In the experimental data of Schmidt *et al.* (2016), the values deviate from this quite substantially, with approximately 1000 AtpB, 9000 AtpF, and 300 AtpE reported per cell (minimal media + glucose growth condition). This highlights the technical challenges that still remain in our ability to quantify cellular composition, particularly for membrane-bound proteins like the ATP synthase complex considered here. In this section, we outline the approach we used to annotate proteins as part of each macromolecular complex and how we used averaging across the individual protein measurements to estimate an absolute complex abundances per cell.

Protein complexes, and proteins individually, often have a variety of names, both longform and shorthand. As individual proteins can have a variety of different synonyms, we sought to ensure that each protein annotated in the data sets used the same synonym. To do use, we relied heavily on the EcoCyc Genomic Database (*Keseler*

1166 **et al., 2017**). Each protein in available data sets included an annotation of one of the gene name synonyms as  
1167 well as an accession ID – either a UniProt or Blattner "b-number". We programmatically matched up individual  
1168 accession IDs between the proteins in different data sets. In cases where accession IDs matched but the gene  
1169 names were different, we manually verified that the gene product was the same between the datasets and chose a  
1170 single synonym. All code used in the data cleaning and unification procedures can be found on the associated  
1171 [GitHub repository] (DOI:XXX) associated with this paper as well as on the associated [paper website](#).

1172 With each protein conforming to a single identification scheme, we then needed to identify the molecular  
1173 complexes each protein was a member of. Additionally, we needed to identify how many copies of each protein  
1174 were present in each complex (i.e. the subunit copy number) and compute the estimated abundance complex that  
1175 accounted for fluctuations in subunit stoichiometry. To map proteins to complexes, we accessed the EcoCyc *E.*  
1176 *coli* database **Keseler et al. (2017)** using PathwayTools version 23.0 **Karp et al. (2019)**. With a license for PathWay  
1177 Tools, we mapped each unique protein to its annotated complexes via the BioCyc Python package. As we mapped  
1178 each protein with *all* of its complex annotations, there was redundancy in the dataset. For example, ribosomal  
1179 protein L20 (RplT) is annotated to be a component of the 50S ribosome (EcoCyc complex CPLX-03962) as well as a  
1180 component of the mature 70S ribosome (EcoCyc complex CPLX-03964).

1181 In addition to the annotated complex, we collected information on the stoichiometry of each macromolecular  
1182 complex. For a complex with  $N_{\text{subunits}}$  protein species, for each protein subunit  $i$  we first calculate the number of  
1183 complexes that *could* be formed given the measured protein copy numbers per cell,

$$N_{\text{complex}}(\text{subunit } i) = \frac{P_{\text{subunit } i}^{(\text{measured})}}{m_{\text{subunit } i}}. \quad (10)$$

1184 Here,  $P_{\text{subunit } i}^{(\text{measured})}$  refers to the measured protein copy number of species  $i$ , and  $m$  refers to the number of monomers  
1185 present for that protein in the complex. For example, the 70S mature ribosome complex has 55 protein components,  
1186 all of which are present in a single copy except L4 (RplL), which is present in 4 copies ( $m = 4$ ). For each ribosomal  
1187 protein, we then calculate the maximum number of complexes that could be formed using **Equation 10**. This  
1188 example, along with example from 5 other macromolecular complexes, can be seen in **Figure 20**.

1189 It is important to note that measurement noise, efficiency of protein extraction, and differences in protein  
1190 stability will mean that the precise value of each calculation will be different for each component of a given complex.  
1191 Thus, to report the total complex abundance, we use the arithmetic mean of across all subunits in the complex,

$$\langle N_{\text{complex}} \rangle = \frac{1}{N_{\text{subunits}}} \sum_i^{N_{\text{subunits}}} \frac{P_i^{(\text{measured})}}{m_{\text{subunit } i}}. \quad (11)$$


1192 in **Figure 20**, we show this mean value as a grey line for a variety of different complexes. Additionally, we have built  
1193 an interactive figure accessible on the [paper website](#) where the validity of this approach can be examined for any  
1194 complex with more than two subunits (thus, excluding monomers and dimers).

## 1195 Extending Estimates to a Continuum of Growth Rates

1196 In the main text, we considered a standard stopwatch of 5000 s to estimate the abundance of the various protein  
1197 complexes considered. In addition to point estimates, we also showed the estimate as a function of growth rate as  
1198 transparent grey curves. In this section, we elaborate on this continuum estimate, giving examples of estimates  
1199 that scale with either cell volume, cell surface area, or number of origins of replication.

## 1200 Estimation of the total cell mass

1201 For many of the processes estimated in the main text we relied on a cellular dry mass of  $\approx 300$  fg from which we  
1202 computed elemental and protein fractions using knowledge of fractional composition of the dry mass. At modest  
1203 growth rates, such as the 5000 s doubling time used in the main text, this is a reasonable number to use as the  
1204 typical cell mass is  $\approx 1$  pg and *E. coli* cells can approximated as 70% water by volume. However, as we have shown  
1205 in the preceding sections, the cell size is highly dependent on the growth rate. This means that a dry mass of 300 fg  
1206 cannot be used reliably across all growth rates.



**Figure 20. Calculation of the mean complex abundance from measurements of single subunits.** Six of the largest complexes (by number of subunits) in *E. coli*. Points correspond to the maximum number of complexes that can be formed given measurement of that individual protein. Solid grey line corresponds to the arithmetic mean across all subunits. These data correspond to measurements from Schmidt *et al.* (2016) in a glucose-supplemented minimal growth medium.

1207 Rather, using the phenomenological description of cell volume scaling exponentially with growth rate, and  
 1208 using a rule-of-thumb of a cell buoyant density of  $\approx 1.1 \text{ pg} / \text{fL}$  (BNID: 103875), we can calculate the cell dry mass  
 1209 across a range of physiological growth rates as

$$m_{\text{cell}} \approx \rho V(\lambda) \approx \rho a e^{\lambda * b} \quad (12)$$

1210 where  $a$  and  $b$  are constants with units of  $\mu\text{m}^3$  and hr, respectively. The value of these constants can be estimated  
 1211 from the careful volume measurements performed by *Si et al. (2017,?)*, as considered in Appendix Estimation of  
 1212 Cell Size and Surface Area earlier.

### 1213 Complex Abundance Scaling With Cell Volume

1214 Several of the estimates performed in the main text are implicitly dependent on the cell volume. This includes  
 1215 processes such as ATP utilization and, most prominently, the transport of nutrients, whose demand will be  
 1216 proportional to the volume of the cell. Of the latter, we estimated the number of transporters that would be  
 1217 needed to shuttle enough carbon, phosphorus, and sulfur across the membrane to build new cell mass. To do so,  
 1218 we used elemental composition measurements combined with a 300 fg cell dry mass to make the point estimate.  
 1219 As we now have a means to estimate the total cell mass as a function of volume, we can generalize these estimates  
 1220 across growth rates.

1221 Rather than discussing the particular details of each transport system, we will derive this scaling expression in  
 1222 very general terms. Consider that we wish to estimate the number of transporters for some substance  $X$ , which  
 1223 has been measured to be made up some fraction of the dry mass,  $\theta_X$ . If we assume that, irrespective of growth  
 1224 rate, the cell dry mass is relatively constant (*Basan et al., 2015*) and  $\approx 30\%$  of the total cell mass, we can state that  
 1225 the total mass of substance  $X$  as a function of growth rate is

$$m_X \approx 0.3 \times \rho V(\lambda) \theta_X, \quad (13)$$

1226 where we have used  $\rho V(\lambda)$  as an estimate of the total cell mass, defined in *Equation 12*. To convert this to the  
 1227 number of units  $N_X$  of substance  $X$  in the cell, we can use the formula weight  $w_X$  of a single unit of  $X$  in conjunction  
 1228 with *Equation 13*,

$$N_X \approx \frac{m_X}{w_X}. \quad (14)$$

1229 To estimate the number of transporters needed, we make the approximation that loss of units of  $X$  via diffusion  
 1230 through porins or due to the permeability of the membrane is negligible and that a single transporter complex  
 1231 can transport substance  $X$  at a rate  $r_X$ . As this rate  $r_X$  is in units of  $X$  per time per transporter, we must provide  
 1232 a time window over which the transport process can occur. This is related to the cell doubling time  $\tau$ , which can  
 1233 be calculated from the the growth rate  $\lambda$  as  $\tau = \log(2)/\lambda$ . Putting everything together, we arrive at a generalized  
 1234 transport scaling relation of

$$N_{\text{transporters}}(\lambda) = \frac{0.3 \times \rho V(\lambda) \theta_X}{w_X r_X \tau}. \quad (15)$$

1235 This function is used to draw the continuum estimates for the number of transporters seen in Figures 2 and  
 1236 3 as transparent grey curves. Occasionally, this continuum scaling relationship will not precisely agree with the  
 1237 point estimate outlined in the main text. This is due to the choice of  $\approx 300 \text{ fg}$  total dry mass per cell for the point  
 1238 estimate, whereas we considered more precise values of cell mass in the continuum estimate. We note, however,  
 1239 that both this scaling relation and the point estimates are meant to describe the order-of-magnitude observed,  
 1240 and not the predict the exact values of the abundances.

1241 *Equation 15* is a very general relation for processes where the cell volume is the "natural variable" of the  
 1242 problem. This means that, as the cell increases in volume, the requirements for substance  $X$  also scale with  
 1243 volume rather than scaling with surface area, for example. So long as the rate of the process, the fraction of the  
 1244 dry mass attributable to the substance, and the formula mass of the substance is known, *Equation 15* can be used  
 1245 to compute the number of complexes needed. For example, to compute the number of ATP synthases per cell,  
 1246 *Equation 15* can be slightly modified to the form

$$N_{\text{ATP synthases}}(\lambda) = \frac{0.3 \times \rho V(\lambda) \theta_{\text{protein}} N_{\text{ATP}}}{w_{AA} r_{\text{ATP}} \tau}, \quad (16)$$

1247 where we have included the term  $N_{ATP}$  to account for the number of ATP equivalents needed per amino acid for  
 1248 translation ( $\approx 4$ , BNID: 114971), and  $w_{AA}$  is the average mass of an amino acid. The grey curves in Figure 4 of the  
 1249 main text were made using this type of expression.

## 1250 A Relation for Complex Abundance Scaling With Surface Area

1251 In our estimation for the number of complexes needed for lipid synthesis and peptidoglycan maturation, we used  
 1252 a particular estimate for the cell surface area ( $\approx 5 \mu\text{m}$ , BNID: 101792) and the fraction of dry mass attributable to  
 1253 peptidoglycan ( $\approx 3\%$ , BNID: 101936). Both of these values come from glucose-fed *E. coli* in balanced growth. As we  
 1254 are interested in describing the scaling as a function of the growth rate, we must also consider how these values  
 1255 scale with cell surface area, which is the natural variable for these types of processes. In the coming paragraphs,  
 1256 we highlight how we incorporate a condition-dependent surface area into our calculation of the number of lipids  
 1257 and murein monomers that need to be synthesized and crosslinked, respectively.

### 1258 Number of Lipids

1259 To compute the number of lipids as a function of growth rate, we make the assumption that some features, such as  
 1260 the surface area of a single lipid ( $A_{lipid} \approx 0.5 \text{ nm}^2$ , BNID: 106993) and the total fraction of the membrane composed  
 1261 of lipids ( $\approx 40\%$ , BNID: 100078) are independent of the growth rate. Using these approximations combined with  
 1262 **Equation 6**, and recognizing that each membrane is composed of two leaflets, we can compute the number of  
 1263 lipids as a function of growth rate as

$$N_{lipids}(\lambda) \approx \frac{4 \text{ leaflets} \times 0.4 \times \eta\pi \left( \frac{\eta\pi}{4} - \frac{\pi}{12} \right)^{-2/3} V(\lambda)^{2/3}}{A_{lipid}} \quad (17)$$

1264 where  $\eta$  is the length-to-width aspect ratio and  $V$  is the cell volume.

### 1265 Number of Murein Monomers

1266 In calculation of the number of transpeptidases needed for maturation of the peptidoglycan, we used an empirical  
 1267 measurement that  $\approx 3\%$  of the dry mass is attributable to peptidoglycan and that a single murien monomer is  
 1268  $m_{murein} \approx 1000 \text{ Da}$ . While the latter is independent of growth rate, the former is not. As the peptidoglycan exists as  
 1269 a thin shell with a width of  $w \approx 10 \text{ nm}$  encapsulating the cell, one would expect the number of murein monomers  
 1270 scales with the surface area of this shell. In a similar spirit to our calculation of the number of lipids, the total  
 1271 number of murein monomers as a function of growth rate can be calculated as

$$N_{murein \text{ monomers}}(\lambda) \approx \frac{\rho_{pg} w \eta \pi \left( \frac{\eta\pi}{4} - \frac{\pi}{12} \right)^{-2/3} V(\lambda)^{2/3}}{m_{murein}}, \quad (18)$$

1272 where  $\rho_{pg}$  is the density of peptidoglycan.

## 1273 Complex Abundance Scaling With Number of Origins, and rRNA Synthesis

1274 While the majority of our estimates hinge on the total cell volume or surface area, processes related to the central  
 1275 dogma, namely DNA replication and synthesis of rRNA, depend on the number of chromosomes present in the  
 1276 cell. As discussed in the main text, the ability of *E. coli* to parallelize the replication of its chromosome by having  
 1277 multiple active origins of replication is critical to synthesize enough rRNA, especially at fast growth rates. Derived in  
 1278 *Si et al. (2017)* and reproduced in the main text and Appendix Estimation of  $\langle \#ori \rangle / \langle \#ter \rangle$  and  $\langle \#ori \rangle$  below, the  
 1279 average number of origins of replication at a given growth rate can be calculated as

$$\langle \#ori \rangle \approx 2^{t_{cyc}\lambda / \ln 2} \quad (19)$$

1280 where  $t_{cyc}$  is the total time of replication and division. We can make the approximation that  $t_{cyc} \approx 70 \text{ min}$ , which is  
 1281 the time from the initiation of chromosomal replication until division. This time corresponds to the sum of the  
 1282 so-called C and D periods of the cell cycle, which correspond to the time it takes to replicate the entire chromosome  
 1283 (C period) and the time from completion to eventual division (D period) *Helmstetter and Cooper (1968)*.

1284 In the case of rRNA synthesis, the majority of the rRNA operons are surrounding the origin of replication. Thus,  
1285 at a given growth rate  $\lambda$ , the average dosage of rRNA operons per cell  $D_{\text{rRNA}}$  is

$$D_{\text{rRNA}}(\lambda) \approx N_{\text{rRNA operons}} \times 2^{t_{\text{cyc}}\lambda/\ln 2}. \quad (20)$$

1286 This makes the approximation that *all* rRNA operons are localized around the origin. In reality, the operons are  
1287 some distance away from the origin, making **Equation 20** an approximation (*Dennis et al., 2004*).

1288 In the main text, we stated that at a growth rate of  $0.5 \text{ hr}^{-1}$ , there is  $\approx 1$  chromosome per cell. While a fair  
1289 approximation, **Equation 19** illustrates that is not precisely true, even at slow growth rates. In estimating the  
1290 number of RNA polymerases as a function of growth rate, we consider that regardless of the number of rRNA  
1291 operons, they are all sufficiently loaded with RNA polymerase such that each operon produces one rRNA per  
1292 second. Thus, the total number of RNA polymerase as a function of the growth rate can be calculated as

$$N_{\text{RNA polymerase}}(\lambda) \approx L_{\text{operon}} D_{\text{rRNA}} \rho_{\text{RNA polymerase}}, \quad (21)$$

1293 where  $L_{\text{operon}}$  is the total length of an rRNA operon ( $\approx 4500 \text{ bp}$ ) and  $\rho_{\text{RNA polymerase}}$  is packing density of RNA  
1294 polymerase on a given operon, taken to be 1 RNA polymerase per 80 nucleotides.

### 1295 Calculation of active ribosomal fraction.


1296 In the main text we used the active ribosomal fraction  $f_a$  that was reported in the work of *Dai et al. (2016)* to  
1297 estimate the active ribosomal mass fraction  $\Phi_R \times f_a$  across growth conditions. We lacked any specific model to  
1298 consider how  $f_a$  should vary with growth rate, and instead find that the data is well-approximated by fitting to an  
1299 exponential curve ( $f_a = -0.889 e^{4.6\lambda} + 0.922$ ; dashed line in inset of **Figure 9(C)**). We use this function to estimate  $f_a$   
1300 for each of the data points shown in **Figure 9(C)**.

### 1301 Estimation of $\langle \# \text{ori} \rangle / \langle \# \text{ter} \rangle$ and $\langle \# \text{ori} \rangle$ .

1302 *E. coli* shows robust scaling of cell size with the average number of origins per cell,  $\langle \# \text{ori} \rangle$  (*Si et al., 2017*). Since  
1303 protein makes up a majority of the cell's dry mass, the change in cell size is also a reflection of the changes in  
1304 proteomic composition and total abundance across growth conditions. Given the potential constraints on rRNA  
1305 synthesis and changes in ribosomal copy number with  $\langle \# \text{ori} \rangle$ , it becomes important to also consider how protein  
1306 copy numbers vary with the state of chromosomal replication. This is particularly true when trying to make sense of  
1307 the changes in ribosomal fraction and growth-rate dependent changes in proteomic composition at a mechanistic  
1308 level. As considered in the main text, it is becoming increasingly apparent that regulation through the secondary  
1309 messengers (p)ppGpp may act to limit DNA replication and also reduce ribosomal activity in poorer nutrient  
1310 conditions. In this context, both  $\langle \# \text{ori} \rangle$ , as well as the  $\langle \# \text{ori} \rangle / \langle \# \text{ter} \rangle$  ratio become important parameters to consider  
1311 and keep track of. An increase in  $\langle \# \text{ori} \rangle / \langle \# \text{ter} \rangle$  ratio in particular, causes a relatively higher gene dosage in rRNA  
1312 and r-protein genes due to skew in genes near the origin, where the majority of these are located

1313 In the main text we estimated the change in  $\langle \# \text{ori} \rangle$  with growth rate using the nutrient-limited wild-type cell  
1314 data from *Si et al. (2017)*. We consider their measurements of DNA replication time ( $t_C$ , 'C' period of cell division),  
1315 total cell cycle time ( $t_{\text{cyc}}$ , 'C' + 'D' period of cell division), and doubling time  $\tau$  from wild-type *E. coli* growing across  
1316 a range of growth conditions. Here we show how we estimate this parameter, as well as the  $\langle \# \text{ori} \rangle / \langle \# \text{ter} \rangle$  ratio  
1317 from their data. We begin by considering  $\langle \# \text{ori} \rangle$ . If the cell cycle time takes longer than the time of cell division, the  
1318 cell will need to initiate DNA replication more often than its rate of division,  $2^{\lambda t} = 2^{\ln(2)\cdot t/\tau}$  to maintain steady state  
1319 growth. Cells will need to do this in proportion to the ratio  $\lambda_{\text{cyc}}/\lambda = t_{\text{cyc}}/\tau$ , and the number of origins per cell (on  
1320 average) is then given by  $2^{t_{\text{cyc}}/\tau}$ . The average number of termini will in contrast depend on the lag time between  
1321 DNA replication and cell division,  $t_D$ , with  $\langle \# \text{ori} \rangle / \langle \# \text{ter} \rangle$  ratio =  $2^{t_{\text{cyc}}/\tau - t_D/\tau} = 2^{t_C/\tau}$ .

1322 In Figure 21(A) and (B) we plot the measured  $t_C$  and  $t_{\text{cyc}}$  values versus the doubling time from *Si et al. (2017)*.  
1323 The authors estimated  $t_C$  by marker frequency analysis using qPCR, while  $t_{\text{cyc}} = t_C + t_D$  were inferred from  $t_C$  and  
1324  $\tau$ . In the plots we see that both  $t_C$  and  $t_{\text{cyc}}$  reach a minimum at around 40 and 75 minutes, respectively. For a C  
1325 period of 40 minutes, this would correspond to a maximum rate of elongation of about 1,000 bp/sec. Since we  
1326 lacked a specific model to describe how each of these parameters vary with growth condition, we assumed that  
1327 they were linearly dependent on the doubling time. For each parameter,  $t_C$  and  $t_{\text{cyc}}$ , we split them up into two



**Figure 21. Estimation of  $\langle \#ori \rangle / \langle \#ter \rangle$  and  $\langle \#ori \rangle$  using data from Si et al. (2017).** (A) and (B) plot the reported  $t_C$  and  $t_{cyc}$  as a function of cell doubling time  $\tau$ , respectively. The dashed lines show a piecewise fit to the data. For short doubling times (rich media),  $t_C$  and  $t_{cyc}$  are assumed constant ( $t_C = 42$  minutes,  $t_{cyc} = 73$  minutes). At the transition, taken to occur at 40 minutes, the dashed line corresponds to an assumed proportional increase in each parameter as a function of the doubling time ( $t_C = 0.46 \tau + 23.3$  minutes,  $t_{cyc} = 0.50 \tau + 52.7$  minutes). (C) and (D) plot the same data as in (A) and (B), but as a function of growth rate, given by  $\lambda = \ln(2)/\tau$ .

domains corresponding to poorer nutrient conditions and rich nutrient conditions (cut off at  $\tau \approx 40$  minutes where chromosomal replication becomes nearly constant). The fit lines are shown as solid black lines. In Figure 21(C) and (D) we also show  $t_C$  and  $t_{cyc}$  as a function of growth rate  $\lambda$  along with our piecewise linear fits, which match the plots in the main text.

### Derivation of Minimal Model for Nutrient-Mediated Growth Rate Control

Here we provide a derivation of the minimal model for growth rate control under nutrient-limited growth. By growth rate control, we are specifically referring to the ability of bacteria to modulate their proteome ( $N_{\text{pep}}$ ,  $R$ ,  $\Phi_R$ ) and cell size as nutrient conditions change, with slower growing cells generally being smaller in size (Ojkic et al., 2019). This capability provides bacteria with a particular benefit when nutrients are more scarce since it will mean there is a smaller net demand on carbon, phosphorus, sulfur, and nitrogen. The specific goal of developing this model is to help us better explore the overall constraints on growth that follow from 1) our observation that many of the cellular processes we've considered require increased protein abundance at faster growth rates, and 2) a strict limit on growth rate that is governed by the ribosomal synthesis rate and ribosomal mass fraction  $\Phi_R$ .

In Figure 11(A) of the main text we provide a schematic of the model, where we consider growth as simply governed by the rate of protein synthesis ( $r_t \times R \times f_a$ ). In order to grow rapidly, at least to the extent possible, these three parameters need to be maximized (with  $r_t \leq 17$  amino acids per second, and  $f_a \leq 1$  reported in the work of Dai et al. (2016)). The elongation rate  $r_t$  will depend on how quickly ribosomes can match codons with their correct amino-acyl tRNA, along with the subsequent steps of peptide bond formation and translocation. This ultimately depends on the cellular concentration amino acids, which we treat as a single effective species,  $[AA]_{\text{eff}}$ .

In our model, we need to determine the rate of peptide elongation  $r_t$ , which we consider as simply depending on the supply of amino acids (and, therefore, also amino-acyl tRNAs) through a parameter  $r_{AA}$  in units of AA per second, and the rate of amino acid consumption by protein synthesis ( $r_t \times R \times f_a$ ). The balance between these two rates will determine the effective amino acid concentration in the cell  $[AA]_{\text{eff}}$ . An important premise for this formulation

1351 is growing evidence that cells are able to modulate their biosynthesis activity according to nutrient availability  
 1352 (i.e. extent of chromosomal replication, transcriptional, and translation activity) through secondary-messenger  
 1353 molecules like (p)ppGpp (*Hauryliuk et al., 2015; Zhu and Dai, 2019; Kraemer et al., 2019; Fernández-Coll et al., 2020; Büke et al., 2020*). Given our observation that protein synthesis and energy production are not limiting,  
 1355 we assume that other molecular players required by ribosomes like elongation factors and GTP are available in  
 1356 sufficient abundance. In addition, experimentally, the relative number of tRNA and elongation factor EF-Tu per  
 1357 ribosome have been found to increase in poorer nutrient conditions *Pedersen (1978); Dong et al. (1996); Klumpp*  
 1358 *et al. (2013)*.

1359 We begin by considering a coarse-grained description of peptide elongation, which includes 1) the time required  
 1360 to find and bind each correct amino-acyl tRNA, and 2) the remaining steps in peptide elongation that will not  
 1361 depend on the amino acid availability. These time scales will be related to the inverse of the elongation rate  $r_t$ ,

$$\frac{1}{r_t} = \frac{1}{k_{on}\alpha[AA]_{eff}} + \frac{1}{r_t^{\max}}. \quad (22)$$

1362 where we have assumed that the rate of binding by amino-acyl tRNA  $k_{on}$  is proportional to  $[AA]_{eff}$  by a constant  
 1363  $\alpha$ .  $r_t^{\max}$  refers to the maximum elongation rate. This leads to a Michaelis-Menten dependence of the elongation  
 1364 rate  $r_t$  on the effective amino acid concentration  $[AA]_{eff}$  (*Klumpp et al., 2013; Dai et al., 2016*). We can re-write this  
 1365 more succinctly in terms of an effective dissociation constant,

$$K_D = \frac{r_t^{\max}}{\alpha k_{on}}, \quad (23)$$

1366 where the elongation rate  $r_t$  is now given by

$$r_t = \frac{r_t^{\max}}{1 + K_D/[AA]_{eff}}. \quad (24)$$

1367 The rate of amino acid supply  $r_{AA}$  will vary with changing nutrient conditions and the cell can maintain  $[AA]_{eff}$  by  
 1368 tuning the rate of amino acid consumption,  $r_t \times R \times f_a$ . Thus,  $[AA]_{eff}$  is determined by the difference in the rate of  
 1369 amino acid synthesis (or import, for rich media) and/or tRNA charging,  $r_{AA}$ , and the rate of consumption,  $r_t \times R \times f_a$ .  
 1370 Over an arbitrary length of time  $t$  of cellular growth, the cell will grow in volume, requiring us to consider these  
 1371 rates in terms of concentration rather than absolute numbers, with  $[AA]_{eff}$  given by,

$$\int_0^t \frac{d[AA]_{eff}}{dt} dt = \int_0^t ([r_{AA}] - [r_t \times R \times f_a]) dt. \quad (25)$$

1372 This considers the net change in amino acid concentration over a time from 0 to  $t$ , with the square brackets  
 1373 indicating concentrations per unit time. Integrating **Equation 25** yields.

$$[AA]_{eff} = t([r_{AA}] - [r_t \times R \times f_a]). \quad (26)$$

1374 Alternatively, to connect to the experimental data in terms of absolute ribosome copy number  $R$  we can  
 1375 consider a unit volume  $V$ ,

$$[AA]_{eff} = \frac{t(r_{AA} - r_t \times R \times f_a)}{V \times N_A}, \quad (27)$$

1376 where  $r_{AA}$  is in units of AA per unit time and  $r_t$  is in units of AA per unit time per ribosome.  $N_A$  refers to Avogadro's  
 1377 number and is needed to convert between concentration and absolute numbers per cell. With an expression for  
 1378  $[AA]_{eff}$  in hand, we can now solve **Equation 24** for  $r_t$ , which is a quadratic function with a physically-meaningful root  
 1379 of

$$r_t = \frac{t(r_{AA} + r_t^{\max} R f_a) + K_D V N_A - \sqrt{(r_{AA} + r_t^{\max} R f_a + K_D V N_A)^2 - 4(R f_a t)(r_t^{\max} r_{AA} t)}}{2R f_a t}. \quad (28)$$

1380 This is the key equation that allows us to calculate growth rate for any combination of  $N_{pep}$ ,  $R$ ,  $f_a$ , and cell size  $V$   
 1381 as a function of amino acid supply  $r_{AA}$  (**Equation 3** of the main text). We refer the reader to A Minimal Model of  
 1382 Nutrient-Mediated Growth Rate Control of the main text for our exploration of this model in the context of the  
 1383 proteomic data.

1384 We end this section by noting several distinctions of this formulation with previous work. The first, as noted  
1385 in the main text, relates to the now seminal work of *Scott et al. (2010)*, which provides a treatment of resource  
1386 allocation that partitions of the proteome into sectors – including one for ribosome-associated proteins and one  
1387 for metabolic proteins. As cells grow faster, there is a notable change in the mass fraction of these sectors, with  
1388 an increase in ribosomal content that is predominantly achieved at the expense of a decrease in the metabolic  
1389 sector. By including an additional constraint through the phenomenological parameter  $\nu$ , which characterizes the  
1390 quality of the growth medium *Scott et al. (2010); Klumpp et al. (2013); Klumpp and Hwa (2014)*, the authors derive  
1391 a model of growth rate, dependent on optimal resource allocation. Here we have developed a model that considers  
1392 the effect of changes in absolute protein abundance and ribosomal content, and consider how these influence the  
1393 achievable growth rate. In addition, by accounting for the metabolic supply of amino acids directly through their  
1394 availability in the cell (i.e.  $[AA]_{\text{eff}}$ ), we are able to consider how the balance between translation-specific metabolic  
1395 capacity and translational capacity influences both the elongation rate  $r_e$  and growth rate  $\lambda$ .

1396 The second and last point we note is that the recent works from *Dai et al. (2016)* and *Klumpp et al. (2013)* also  
1397 employ a similar coarse-graining of translation elongation as we've considered above. Here, however, a notable  
1398 distinction is that the authors consider the entire ternary complex (i.e. the complex of amino-acyl tRNA, EF-Tu,  
1399 and GTP) as rate limiting. Further, through an assumed proportionality between ternary complex and ribosome  
1400 abundance, they arrive at a formulation of elongation rate  $r_e$  that exhibits a Michaelis-Mention dependence on the  
1401 ribosomal fraction  $\Phi_R$ . They demonstrate that all their measurements of elongation rate, even upon addition of  
1402 sublethal doses of chloramphenicol (which cause an increase in both  $r_e$  and  $\Phi_R$ ), can be collapsed onto a single  
1403 curve described by this Michaelis-Mention dependence. There is always a benefit to increase their ribosomal  
1404 fraction  $\Phi_R$  on growth rate when nutrient conditions allow (see Maximum Growth Rate is Determined by the  
1405 Ribosomal Mass Fraction), and this trend in the data in part follows from the tendency for cells to increase  $\Phi_R$   
1406 and better maximize  $r_e$  as nutrient conditions improve. In addition, it does not account for the decrease in the  
1407 fraction of actively translating ribosome  $f_a$  that was strikingly apparent at slow growth rates or in sublethal doses of  
1408 chloramphenicol in the work of *Dai et al. (2016)*. Through **Equation 28** we also account for changes in the fraction  
1409 of actively translating ribosomes. Ultimately, we find that cells are able to maximize both  $\Phi_R$ ,  $r_e$ , and their growth  
1410 rate only to the extent allowed by the nutrient conditions (i.e. via  $r_{AA}$ ) and through the maintenance of the cellular  
1411 pool of amino acids  $[AA]_{\text{eff}}$ , amino-acyl tRNA, GTP, as well as the synthesis of other key molecular constituents like  
1412 EF-Tu.

1413 **References**

- 1414 Abelson, H., Johnson, L., Penman, S., and Green, H. (1974). Changes in RNA in relation to growth of the fibroblast: II. The lifetime  
1415 of mRNA, rRNA, and tRNA in resting and growing cells. *Cell*, 1(4):161–165.
- 1416 Aidelberg, G., Towbin, B. D., Rothschild, D., Dekel, E., Bren, A., and Alon, U. (2014). Hierarchy of non-glucose sugars in *Escherichia*  
1417 *coli*. *BMC Systems Biology*, 8(1):133.
- 1418 Antonenko, Y. N., Pohl, P., and Denisov, G. A. (1997). Permeation of ammonia across bilayer lipid membranes studied by  
1419 ammonium ion selective microelectrodes. *Biophysical Journal*, 72(5):2187–2195.
- 1420 Ashburner, M., Ball, C. A., Blake, J. A., Botstein, D., Butler, H., Cherry, J. M., Davis, A. P., Dolinski, K., Dwight, S. S., Eppig, J. T., Harris,  
1421 M. A., Hill, D. P., Issel-Tarver, L., Kasarskis, A., Lewis, S., Mateescu, J. C., Richardson, J. E., Ringwald, M., Rubin, G. M., and Sherlock, G.  
1422 (2000). Gene Ontology: tool for the unification of biology. *Nature Genetics*, 25(1):25–29.
- 1423 Ason, B., Bertram, J. G., Hingorani, M. M., Beechem, J. M., O'Donnell, M., Goodman, M. F., and Bloom, L. B. (2000). A Model  
1424 for *Escherichia coli* DNA Polymerase III Holoenzyme Assembly at Primer/Template Ends: DNA Triggers A Change In Binding  
1425 Specificity of the  $\gamma$  Complex Clamp Loader. *Journal of Biological Chemistry*, 275(4):3006–3015.
- 1426 Assentoft, M., Kaptan, S., Schneider, H.-P., Deitmer, J. W., de Groot, B. L., and MacAulay, N. (2016). Aquaporin 4 as a  $\text{NH}_3$  Channel.  
1427 *Journal of Biological Chemistry*, 291(36):19184–19195.
- 1428 Baba, T., Ara, T., Hasegawa, M., Takai, Y., Okumura, Y., Baba, M., Datsenko, K. A., Tomita, M., Wanner, B. L., and Mori, H. (2006).  
1429 Construction of *Escherichia coli*K-12 in-frame, single-gene knockout mutants: the Keio collection. *Molecular Systems Biology*,  
1430 2(1):2460.
- 1431 Basan, M., Zhu, M., Dai, X., Warren, M., Sévin, D., Wang, Y.-P., and Hwa, T. (2015). Inflating bacterial cells by increased protein  
1432 synthesis. *Molecular Systems Biology*, 11(10):836.
- 1433 Bauer, S. and Ziv, E. (1976). Dense growth of aerobic bacteria in a bench-scale fermentor. *Biotechnology and Bioengineering*,  
1434 18(1):81–94. \_eprint: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1002/bit.260180107>.
- 1435 Belliveau, N. M., Barnes, S. L., Ireland, W. T., Jones, D. L., Sweredoski, M. J., Moradian, A., Hess, S., Kinney, J. B., and Phillips, R.  
1436 (2018). Systematic approach for dissecting the molecular mechanisms of transcriptional regulation in bacteria. *Proceedings of  
1437 the National Academy of Sciences*, 115(21):E4796–E4805.
- 1438 Booth, I. R., Mitchell, W. J., and Hamilton, W. A. (1979). Quantitative analysis of proton-linked transport systems. The lactose  
1439 permease of *Escherichia coli*. *Biochemical Journal*, 182(3):687–696.
- 1440 Bremer, H. and Dennis, P. P. (2008). Modulation of Chemical Composition and Other Parameters of the Cell at Different Exponential  
1441 Growth Rates. *EcoSal Plus*, 3(1).
- 1442 Browning, D. F. and Busby, S. J. W. (2016). Local and global regulation of transcription initiation in bacteria. *Nature Reviews  
1443 Microbiology*, 14(10):638–650.
- 1444 Büke, F., Grilli, J., Lagomarsino, M. C., Bokinsky, G., and Tans, S. (2020). ppGpp is a bacterial cell size regulator. *bioRxiv*,  
1445 266:2020.06.16.154187.
- 1446 Catherwood, A. C., Lloyd, A. J., Tod, J. A., Chauhan, S., Slade, S. E., Walkowiak, G. P., Galley, N. F., Punekar, A. S., Smart, K., Rea, D.,  
1447 Evans, N. D., Chappell, M. J., Roper, D. I., and Dowson, C. G. (2020). Substrate and Stereochemical Control of Peptidoglycan  
1448 Cross-Linking by Transpeptidation by *Escherichia coli* PBP1B. *Journal of the American Chemical Society*, 142(11):5034–5048.
- 1449 Cox, G. B., Newton, N. A., Gibson, F., Snoswell, A. M., and Hamilton, J. A. (1970). The function of ubiquinone in *Escherichia coli*.  
1450 *Biochemical Journal*, 117(3):551–562.
- 1451 Dai, X., Zhu, M., Warren, M., Balakrishnan, R., Okano, H., Williamson, J. R., Fredrick, K., and Hwa, T. (2018). Slowdown of Translational  
1452 Elongation in *Escherichia coli* under Hyperosmotic Stress. - PubMed - NCBI. *mBio*, 9(1):281.
- 1453 Dai, X., Zhu, M., Warren, M., Balakrishnan, R., Patsalo, V., Okano, H., Williamson, J. R., Fredrick, K., Wang, Y.-P., and Hwa, T.  
1454 (2016). Reduction of translating ribosomes enables *Escherichia coli* to maintain elongation rates during slow growth. *Nature  
1455 Microbiology*, 2(2):16231.
- 1456 Datsenko, K. A. and Wanner, B. L. (2000). One-step inactivation of chromosomal genes in *Escherichia coli* K-12 using PCR products.  
1457 *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 97(12):6640–6645.
- 1458 Dennis, P. P., Ehrenberg, M., and Bremer, H. (2004). Control of rRNA Synthesis in *Escherichia coli*: a Systems Biology Approach.  
1459 *Microbiology and Molecular Biology Reviews*, 68(4):639–668.


- 1460 Dill, K. A., Ghosh, K., and Schmit, J. D. (2011). Physical limits of cells and proteomes. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*,  
1461 108(44):17876–17882.
- 1462 Dong, H., Nilsson, L., and Kurland, C. G. (1996). Co-variation of tRNA Abundance and Codon Usage in *Escherichia coli* at Different  
1463 Growth Rates. *Journal of Molecular Biology*, 260(5):649–663.
- 1464 Erickson, D. W., Schink, S. J., Patsalo, V., Williamson, J. R., Gerland, U., and Hwa, T. (2017). A global resource allocation strategy  
1465 governs growth transition kinetics of *Escherichia coli*. *Nature*, 551(7678):119–123.
- 1466 Escalante, A., Salinas Cervantes, A., Gosset, G., and Bolívar, F. (2012). Current knowledge of the *Escherichia coli* phosphoenolpyru-  
1467 vate–carbohydrate phosphotransferase system: Peculiarities of regulation and impact on growth and product formation.  
1468 *Applied Microbiology and Biotechnology*, 94(6):1483–1494.
- 1469 Feist, A. M., Henry, C. S., Reed, J. L., Krummenacker, M., Joyce, A. R., Karp, P. D., Broadbelt, L. J., Hatzimanikatis, V., and Palsson,  
1470 B. Ø. (2007). A genome-scale metabolic reconstruction for *Escherichia coli* K-12 MG1655 that accounts for 1260 ORFs and  
1471 thermodynamic information. *Molecular Systems Biology*, 3(1):121.
- 1472 Fernández-Coll, L., Maciąg-Dorszynska, M., Tailor, K., Vadia, S., Levin, P. A., Szalewska-Palasz, A., Cashel, M., and Dunny, G. M.  
1473 (2020). The Absence of (p)ppGpp Renders Initiation of *Escherichia coli* Chromosomal DNA Synthesis Independent of Growth  
1474 Rates. *mBio*, 11(2):45.
- 1475 Fijalkowska, I. J., Schaaper, R. M., and Jonczyk, P. (2012). DNA replication fidelity in *Escherichia coli*: A multi-DNA polymerase affair.  
1476 *FEMS Microbiology Reviews*, 36(6):1105–1121.
- 1477 Finkelstein, I. J. and Greene, E. C. (2013). Molecular Traffic Jams on DNA. *Annual Review of Biophysics*, 42(1):241–263.
- 1478 Gallagher, L. A., Bailey, J., and Manoil, C. (2020). Ranking essential bacterial processes by speed of mutant death. *Proceedings of  
1479 the National Academy of Sciences*.
- 1480 Gama-Castro, S., Salgado, H., Santos-Zavaleta, A., Ledezma-Tejeida, D., Muñiz-Rascado, L., García-Sotelo, J. S., Alquicira-Hernández,  
1481 K., Martínez-Flores, I., Pannier, L., Castro-Mondragón, J. A., Medina-Rivera, A., Solano-Lira, H., Bonavides-Martínez, C., Pérez-  
1482 Rueda, E., Alquicira-Hernández, S., Porrón-Sotelo, L., López-Fuentes, A., Hernández-Koutoucheva, A., Moral-Chávez, V. D.,  
1483 Rinaldi, F., and Collado-Vides, J. (2016). RegulonDB version 9.0: High-level integration of gene regulation, coexpression, motif  
1484 clustering and beyond. *Nucleic Acids Research*, 44(D1):D133–D143.
- 1485 Ge, J., Yu, G., Ator, M. A., and Stubbe, J. (2003). Pre-Steady-State and Steady-State Kinetic Analysis of *E. coli* Class I Ribonucleotide  
1486 Reductase. *Biochemistry*, 42(34):10071–10083.
- 1487 Godin, M., Delgado, F. F., Son, S., Grover, W. H., Bryan, A. K., Tzur, A., Jorgensen, P., Payer, K., Grossman, A. D., Kirschner, M. W., and  
1488 Manalis, S. R. (2010). Using buoyant mass to measure the growth of single cells. *Nature Methods*, 7(5):387–390.
- 1489 Guo, Y., Li, D., Zhang, S., Yang, Y., Liu, J.-J., Wang, X., Liu, C., Milkie, D. E., Moore, R. P., Tulu, U. S., Kiehart, D. P., Hu, J., Lippincott-  
1490 Schwartz, J., Betzig, E., and Li, D. (2018). Visualizing Intracellular Organelle and Cytoskeletal Interactions at Nanoscale Resolution  
1491 on Millisecond Timescales. *Cell*, 175(5):1430–1442.e17.
- 1492 Harris, L. K. and Theriot, J. A. (2018). Surface Area to Volume Ratio: A Natural Variable for Bacterial Morphogenesis. *Trends in  
1493 microbiology*, 26(10):815–832.
- 1494 Harris, R. M., Webb, D. C., Howitt, S. M., and Cox, G. B. (2001). Characterization of PitA and PitB from *Escherichia coli*. *Journal of  
1495 Bacteriology*, 183(17):5008–5014.
- 1496 Hauryliuk, V., Atkinson, G. C., Murakami, K. S., Tenson, T., and Gerdes, K. (2015). Recent functional insights into the role of  
1497 (p)ppGpp in bacterial physiology. *Nature Reviews Microbiology*, 13(5):298–309.
- 1498 Heldal, M., Norland, S., and Tumyr, O. (1985). X-ray microanalytic method for measurement of dry matter and elemental content  
1499 of individual bacteria. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology*, 50(5):1251–1257.
- 1500 Helmstetter, C. E. and Cooper, S. (1968). DNA synthesis during the division cycle of rapidly growing *Escherichia coli* Br. *Journal of  
1501 Molecular Biology*, 31(3):507–518.
- 1502 Henkel, S. G., Beek, A. T., Steinsiek, S., Stagge, S., Bettenbrock, K., de Mattos, M. J. T., Sauter, T., Sawodny, O., and Ederer, M. (2014).  
1503 Basic Regulatory Principles of *Escherichia coli*'s Electron Transport Chain for Varying Oxygen Conditions. *PLoS ONE*, 9(9):e107640.
- 1504 Hui, S., Silverman, J. M., Chen, S. S., Erickson, D. W., Basan, M., Wang, J., Hwa, T., and Williamson, J. R. (2015). Quantitative proteomic  
1505 analysis reveals a simple strategy of global resource allocation in bacteria. *Molecular Systems Biology*, 11(2):e784–e784.
- 1506 Ingledeew, W. J. and Poole, R. K. (1984). The respiratory chains of *Escherichia coli*. *Microbiological Reviews*, 48(3):222–271.

- 1507 Ireland, W. T., Beeler, S. M., Flores-Bautista, E., Belliveau, N. M., Sweredoski, M. J., Moradian, A., Kinney, J. B., and Phillips, R. (2020).  
1508 Deciphering the regulatory genome of *Escherichia coli*, one hundred promoters at a time. *bioRxiv*.
- 1509 Jensen, R. B., Wang, S. C., and Shapiro, L. (2001). A moving DNA replication factory in *Caulobacter crescentus*. *The EMBO journal*,  
1510 20(17):4952–4963.
- 1511 Jun, S., Si, F., Pugatch, R., and Scott, M. (2018). Fundamental principles in bacterial physiology - history, recent progress, and the  
1512 future with focus on cell size control: A review. *Reports on Progress in Physics*, 81(5):056601.
- 1513 Karp, P. D., Billington, R., Caspi, R., Fulcher, C. A., Latendresse, M., Kothari, A., Keseler, I. M., Krummenacker, M., Midford, P. E., Ong,  
1514 Q., Ong, W. K., Paley, S. M., and Subhraveti, P. (2019). The BioCyc collection of microbial genomes and metabolic pathways.  
1515 *Briefings in Bioinformatics*, 20(4):1085–1093.
- 1516 Karr, J. R., Sanghvi, J. C., Macklin, D. N., Gutschow, M. V., Jacobs, J. M., Bolival, B., Assad-Garcia, N., Glass, J. I., and Covert, M. W.  
1517 (2012). A Whole-Cell Computational Model Predicts Phenotype from Genotype. *Cell*, 150(2):389–401.
- 1518 Keseler, I. M., Mackie, A., Santos-Zavaleta, A., Billington, R., Bonavides-Martínez, C., Caspi, R., Fulcher, C., Gama-Castro, S., Kothari,  
1519 A., Krummenacker, M., Latendresse, M., Muñiz-Rascado, L., Ong, Q., Paley, S., Peralta-Gil, M., Subhraveti, P., Velázquez-Ramírez,  
1520 D. A., Weaver, D., Collado-Vides, J., Paulsen, I., and Karp, P. D. (2017). The EcoCyc database: reflecting new knowledge about  
1521 *Escherichia coli*K-12. *Nucleic Acids Research*, 45(D1):D543–D550.
- 1522 Khademi, S., O'Connell, J., Remis, J., Robles-Colmenares, Y., Miercke, L. J. W., and Stroud, R. M. (2004). Mechanism of Ammonia  
1523 Transport by Amt/MEP/Rh: Structure of AmtB at 1.35 Å. *Science*, 305(5690):1587–1594.
- 1524 Khademian, M. and Imlay, J. A. (2017). *Escherichia coli* cytochrome c peroxidase is a respiratory oxidase that enables the use of  
1525 hydrogen peroxide as a terminal electron acceptor. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 114(33):E6922–E6931.
- 1526 Klumpp, S. and Hwa, T. (2014). Bacterial growth: Global effects on gene expression, growth feedback and proteome partition.  
1527 *Current Opinion in Biotechnology*, 28:96–102.
- 1528 Klumpp, S., Scott, M., Pedersen, S., and Hwa, T. (2013). Molecular crowding limits translation and cell growth. *Proceedings of the  
1529 National Academy of Sciences*, 110(42):16754–16759.
- 1530 Klumpp, S., Zhang, Z., and Hwa, T. (2009). Growth Rate-Dependent Global Effects on Gene Expression in Bacteria. *Cell*, 139(7):1366–  
1531 1375.
- 1532 Kostinski, S. and Reuveni, S. (2020). Ribosome Composition Maximizes Cellular Growth Rates in *E. coli*. *Physical Review Letters*,  
1533 125(2):028103.
- 1534 Kraemer, J. A., Sanderlin, A. G., and Laub, M. T. (2019). The Stringent Response Inhibits DNA Replication Initiation in *E. coli*by  
1535 Modulating Supercoiling of oriC. *mBio*, 10(4):822.
- 1536 Lascu, I. and Gonin, P. (2000). The Catalytic Mechanism of Nucleoside Diphosphate Kinases. *Journal of Bioenergetics and  
1537 Biomembranes*, 32(3):237–246.
- 1538 Laxhuber, K. S., Morrison, M. J., Chure, G., Belliveau, N. M., Strandkvist, C., Naughton, K. L., and Phillips, R. (2020). Theoretical  
1539 investigation of a genetic switch for metabolic adaptation. *PLOS ONE*, 15(5):e0226453.
- 1540 Lex, A., Gehlenborg, N., Strobelt, H., Vuillemot, R., and Pfister, H. (2014). UpSet: visualization of intersecting sets. *IEEE Transactions  
1541 on Visualization and Computer Graphics*, 20(12):1983–1992.
- 1542 Li, G.-W., Burkhardt, D., Gross, C., and Weissman, J. S. (2014). Quantifying absolute protein synthesis rates reveals principles  
1543 underlying allocation of cellular resources. *Cell*, 157(3):624–635.
- 1544 Liebermeister, W., Noor, E., Flamholz, A., Davidi, D., Bernhardt, J., and Milo, R. (2014). Visual account of protein investment in  
1545 cellular functions. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 111(23):8488–8493.
- 1546 Liu, M., Durfee, T., Cabrera, J. E., Zhao, K., Jin, D. J., and Blattner, F. R. (2005). Global Transcriptional Programs Reveal a Carbon  
1547 Source Foraging Strategy by *Escherichia coli*. *Journal of Biological Chemistry*, 280(16):15921–15927.
- 1548 Lu, D., Grayson, P., and Schulten, K. (2003). Glycerol Conductance and Physical Asymmetry of the *Escherichia coli* Glycerol Facilitator  
1549 GlpF. *Biophysical Journal*, 85(5):2977–2987.
- 1550 Lynch, M. and Marinov, G. K. (2015). The bioenergetic costs of a gene. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*,  
1551 112(51):15690–15695.
- 1552 Maaløe, O. (1979). *Regulation of the Protein-Synthesizing Machinery—Ribosomes, tRNA, Factors, and So On. Gene Expression*. Springer.


- 1553 Metzl-Raz, E., Kafri, M., Yaakov, G., Soifer, I., Gurvich, Y., and Barkai, N. (2017). Principles of cellular resource allocation revealed by  
1554 condition-dependent proteome profiling. *eLife*, 6:e03528.
- 1555 Mikucki, J. A., Pearson, A., Johnston, D. T., Turchyn, A. V., Farquhar, J., Schrag, D. P., Anbar, A. D., Priscu, J. C., and Lee, P. A. (2009). A  
1556 Contemporary Microbially Maintained Subglacial Ferrous "Ocean". *Science*, 324(5925):397–400.
- 1557 Milo, R., Jorgensen, P., Moran, U., Weber, G., and Springer, M. (2010). BioNumbers—the database of key numbers in molecular  
1558 and cell biology. *Nucleic Acids Research*, 38(suppl\_1):D750–D753.
- 1559 Monod, J. (1947). The phenomenon of enzymatic adaptation and its bearings on problems of genetics and cellular differentiation.  
1560 *Growth Symposium*, 9:223–289.
- 1561 Monod, J. (1949). The Growth of Bacterial Cultures. *Annual Review of Microbiology*, 3(1):371–394.
- 1562 Morgenstein, R. M., Bratton, B. P., Nguyen, J. P., Ouzounov, N., Shaevitz, J. W., and Gitai, Z. (2015). RodZ links MreB to cell wall  
1563 synthesis to mediate MreB rotation and robust morphogenesis. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 112(40):12510–  
1564 12515.
- 1565 Neidhardt, F. C., Ingraham, J., and Schaechter, M. (1991). *Physiology of the Bacterial Cell - A Molecular Approach*, volume 1. Elsevier.
- 1566 Ojkic, N., Serbanescu, D., and Banerjee, S. (2019). Surface-to-volume scaling and aspect ratio preservation in rod-shaped bacteria.  
1567 *eLife*, 8:642.
- 1568 Patrick, M., Dennis, P. P., Ehrenberg, M., and Bremer, H. (2015). Free RNA polymerase in *Escherichia coli*. *Biochimie*, 119:80–91.
- 1569 Pedersen, S. (1978). Patterns of protein synthesis in *E. coli*: a catalog of the amount of 140 individual proteins at different growth  
1570 rates. *Cell*, 14(1):179–190.
- 1571 Peebo, K., Valgepea, K., Maser, A., Nahku, R., Adamberg, K., and Vilu, R. (2015). Proteome reallocation in *Escherichia coli* with  
1572 increasing specific growth rate. *Molecular BioSystems*, 11(4):1184–1193.
- 1573 Phillips, R. (2018). Membranes by the Numbers. In *Physics of Biological Membranes*, pages 73–105. Springer, Cham, Cham.
- 1574 Ramos, S. and Kaback, H. R. (1977). The relation between the electrochemical proton gradient and active transport in *Escherichia*  
1575 *coli* membrane vesicles. *Biochemistry*, 16(5):854–859.
- 1576 Ranganathan, S., Tee, T. W., Chowdhury, A., Zomorodi, A. R., Yoon, J. M., Fu, Y., Shanks, J. V., and Maranas, C. D. (2012). An  
1577 integrated computational and experimental study for overproducing fatty acids in *Escherichia coli*. *Metabolic Engineering*,  
1578 14(6):687–704.
- 1579 Rogers, H., Perkins, H., and Ward, J. (1980). *Microbial Cell Walls and Membranes*. Chapman and Hall, London.
- 1580 Roller, B. R. K., Stoddard, S. F., and Schmidt, T. M. (2016). Exploiting rRNA operon copy number to investigate bacterial reproductive  
1581 strategies. *Nature microbiology*, 1(11):1–7.
- 1582 Rosenberg, H., Gerdes, R. G., and Chegwidden, K. (1977). Two systems for the uptake of phosphate in *Escherichia coli*. *Journal of*  
1583 *Bacteriology*, 131(2):505–511.
- 1584 Rudd, S. G., Valerie, N. C. K., and Helleday, T. (2016). Pathways controlling dNTP pools to maintain genome stability. *DNA Repair*,  
1585 44:193–204.
- 1586 Ruppe, A. and Fox, J. M. (2018). Analysis of Interdependent Kinetic Controls of Fatty Acid Synthases. *ACS Catalysis*, 8(12):11722–  
1587 11734.
- 1588 Sánchez-Romero, M. A., Molina, F., and Jiménez-Sánchez, A. (2011). Organization of ribonucleoside diphosphate reductase during  
1589 multifork chromosome replication in *Escherichia coli*. *Microbiology*, 157(8):2220–2225.
- 1590 Schaechter, M., Maaløe, O., and Kjeldgaard, N. O. (1958). Dependency on Medium and Temperature of Cell Size and Chemical  
1591 Composition during Balanced Growth of *Salmonella typhimurium*. *Microbiology*, 19(3):592–606.
- 1592 Schmidt, A., Kochanowski, K., Vedelaar, S., Ahrné, E., Volkmer, B., Callipo, L., Knoops, K., Bauer, M., Aebersold, R., and Heinemann,  
1593 M. (2016). The quantitative and condition-dependent *Escherichia coli* proteome. *Nature Biotechnology*, 34(1):104–110.
- 1594 Scott, M., Gunderson, C. W., Mateescu, E. M., Zhang, Z., and Hwa, T. (2010). Interdependence of cell growth and gene expression:  
1595 origins and consequences. *Science*, 330(6007):1099–1102.
- 1596 Sekowska, A., Kung, H.-F., and Danchin, A. (2000). Sulfur Metabolism in *Escherichia coli* and Related Bacteria: Facts and Fiction.  
1597 *Journal of Molecular Microbiology and Biotechnology*, 2(2):34.

- 1598 Shi, H., Bratton, B. P., Gitai, Z., and Huang, K. C. (2018). How to Build a Bacterial Cell: MreB as the Foreman of *E. coli* Construction.  
1599 *Cell*, 172(6):1294–1305.
- 1600 Si, F., Le Treut, G., Sauls, J. T., Vadia, S., Levin, P. A., and Jun, S. (2019). Mechanistic Origin of Cell-Size Control and Homeostasis in  
1601 Bacteria. *Current Biology*, 29(11):1760–1770.e7.
- 1602 Si, F., Li, D., Cox, S. E., Sauls, J. T., Azizi, O., Sou, C., Schwartz, A. B., Erickstad, M. J., Jun, Y., Li, X., and Jun, S. (2017). Invariance of  
1603 Initiation Mass and Predictability of Cell Size in *Escherichia coli*. *Current Biology*, 27(9):1278–1287.
- 1604 Sirko, A., Zatyka, M., Sadowy, E., and Hulanicka, D. (1995). Sulfate and thiosulfate transport in *Escherichia coli* K-12: Evidence for a  
1605 functional overlapping of sulfate- and thiosulfate-binding proteins. *Journal of Bacteriology*, 177(14):4134–4136.
- 1606 Sohlenkamp, C. and Geiger, O. (2016). Bacterial membrane lipids: Diversity in structures and pathways. *FEMS Microbiology Reviews*,  
1607 40(1):133–159.
- 1608 Soufi, B., Krug, K., Harst, A., and Macek, B. (2015). Characterization of the *E. coli* proteome and its modifications during growth  
1609 and ethanol stress. *Frontiers in Microbiology*, 6:198.
- 1610 Stasi, R., Neves, H. I., and Spira, B. (2019). Phosphate uptake by the phosphonate transport system PhnCDE. *BMC Microbiology*, 19.
- 1611 Stouthamer, A. H. (1973). A theoretical study on the amount of ATP required for synthesis of microbial cell material. *Antonie van  
1612 Leeuwenhoek*, 39(1):545–565.
- 1613 Stouthamer, A. H. and Bettenhausen, C. W. (1977). A continuous culture study of an ATPase-negative mutant of *Escherichia coli*.  
1614 *Archives of Microbiology*, 113(3):185–189.
- 1615 Svenningsen, S. L., Kongstad, M., Stenum, T. S. n., Muñoz-Gómez, A. J., and Sørensen, M. A. (2017). Transfer RNA is highly unstable  
1616 during early amino acid starvation in *Escherichia coli*. *Nucleic Acids Research*, 45(2):793–804.
- 1617 Szenk, M., Dill, K. A., and de Graff, A. M. R. (2017). Why Do Fast-Growing Bacteria Enter Overflow Metabolism? Testing the  
1618 Membrane Real Estate Hypothesis. *Cell Systems*, 5(2):95–104.
- 1619 Taheri-Araghi, S., Bradde, S., Sauls, J. T., Hill, N. S., Levin, P. A., Paulsson, J., Vergassola, M., and Jun, S. (2015). Cell-size control and  
1620 homeostasis in bacteria. - PubMed - NCBI. *Current Biology*, 25(3):385–391.
- 1621 Taniguchi, Y., Choi, P. J., Li, G.-W., Chen, H., Babu, M., Hearn, J., Emili, A., and Xie, X. S. (2010). Quantifying *E. coli* proteome and  
1622 transcriptome with single-molecule sensitivity in single cells. *Science (New York, N.Y.)*, 329(5991):533–538.
- 1623 Tatusov, R. L., Galperin, M. Y., Natale, D. A., and Koonin, E. V. (2000). The COG database: a tool for genome-scale analysis of  
1624 protein functions and evolution. *Nucleic Acids Research*, 28(1):33–36.
- 1625 Taymaz-Nikerel, H., Borujeni, A. E., Verheijen, P. J. T., Heijnen, J. J., and van Gulik, W. M. (2010). Genome-derived minimal metabolic  
1626 models for *Escherichia coli* mg1655 with estimated in vivo respiratory ATP stoichiometry. *Biotechnology and Bioengineering*,  
1627 107(2):369–381. \_eprint: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1002/bit.22802>.
- 1628 The Gene Ontology Consortium (2018). The Gene Ontology Resource: 20 years and still GOing strong. *Nucleic Acids Research*,  
1629 47(D1):D330–D338.
- 1630 Valgepea, K., Adamberg, K., Seiman, A., and Vilu, R. (2013). *Escherichia coli* achieves faster growth by increasing catalytic and  
1631 translation rates of proteins. *Molecular BioSystems*, 9(9):2344.
- 1632 van Heeswijk, W. C., Westerhoff, H. V., and Boogerd, F. C. (2013). Nitrogen Assimilation in *Escherichia coli*: Putting Molecular Data  
1633 into a Systems Perspective. *Microbiology and Molecular Biology Reviews*, 77(4):628–695.
- 1634 Virtanen, P., Gommers, R., Oliphant, T. E., Haberland, M., Reddy, T., Cournapeau, D., Burovski, E., Peterson, P., Weckesser, W.,  
1635 Bright, J., van der Walt, S. J., Brett, M., Wilson, J., Jarrod Millman, K., Mayorov, N., Nelson, A. R. J., Jones, E., Kern, R., Larson,  
1636 E., Carey, C., Polat, İ., Feng, Y., Moore, E. W., Vand erPlas, J., Laxalde, D., Perktold, J., Cimrman, R., Henriksen, I., Quintero,  
1637 E. A., Harris, C. R., Archibald, A. M., Ribeiro, A. H., Pedregosa, F., van Mulbregt, P., and Contributors, S. . . (2020). SciPy 1.0:  
1638 Fundamental Algorithms for Scientific Computing in Python. *Nature Methods*, 17:261–272.
- 1639 Volkmer, B. and Heinemann, M. (2011). Condition-Dependent Cell Volume and Concentration of *Escherichia coli* to Facilitate Data  
1640 Conversion for Systems Biology Modeling. *PLOS ONE*, 6(7):e23126.
- 1641 Vollmer, W., Blanot, D., and De Pedro, M. A. (2008). Peptidoglycan structure and architecture. *FEMS Microbiology Reviews*,  
1642 32(2):149–167.
- 1643 Weber, J. and Senior, A. E. (2003). ATP synthesis driven by proton transport in F1F0-ATP synthase. *FEBS Letters*, 545(1):61–70.


- 1644 Willsky, G. R., Bennett, R. L., and Malamy, M. H. (1973). Inorganic Phosphate Transport in *Escherichia coli*: Involvement of Two  
1645 Genes Which Play a Role in Alkaline Phosphatase Regulation. *Journal of Bacteriology*, 113(2):529–539.
- 1646 You, C., Okano, H., Hui, S., Zhang, Z., Kim, M., Gunderson, C. W., Wang, Y.-P., Lenz, P., Yan, D., and Hwa, T. (2013). Coordination of  
1647 bacterial proteome with metabolism by cyclic AMP signalling. *Nature*, 500(7462):301–306.
- 1648 Yu, X., Liu, T., Zhu, F., and Khosla, C. (2011). In vitro reconstitution and steady-state analysis of the fatty acid synthase from  
1649 *Escherichia coli*. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 108(46):18643–18648.
- 1650 Zhang, L., Jiang, W., Nan, J., Almqvist, J., and Huang, Y. (2014a). The *Escherichia coli* CysZ is a pH dependent sulfate transporter that  
1651 can be inhibited by sulfite. *Biochimica et Biophysica Acta (BBA) - Biomembranes*, 1838(7):1809–1816.
- 1652 Zhang, Z., Aboulwafa, M., and Saier, M. H. (2014b). Regulation of crp gene expression by the catabolite repressor/activator, cra, in  
1653 *Escherichia coli*. *Journal of Molecular Microbiology and Biotechnology*, 24(3):135–141.
- 1654 Zhu, M. and Dai, X. (2019). Growth suppression by altered (p)ppGpp levels results from non-optimal resource allocation in  
1655 *Escherichia coli*. *Nucleic Acids Research*, 47(9):4684–4693.




**Figure 2-Figure supplement 1.** (A) Estimate for the number of PitA phosphate transport systems needed to maintain a 3% phosphorus *E. coli* dry mass. Points in plot correspond to the total number of PitA transporters per cell. (B) Estimate of the number of CysUWA complexes necessary to maintain a 1% sulfur *E. coli* dry mass. Points in plot correspond to average number of CysUWA transporter complexes that can be formed given the transporter stoichiometry  $[CysA]_2[CysU][CysW][Sbp/CysP]$ . Grey line in (A) and (B) represents the estimated number of transporters per cell at a continuum of growth rates.




**Figure 6–Figure supplement 1.** Estimate of the number of ribonucleotide reductase enzymes needed to facilitate the synthesis of  $\approx 10^7$  dNTPs over the course of a 5000 second generation time. Points in the plot correspond to the total number of ribonucleotide reductase I ( $[\text{NrdA}]_2[\text{NrdB}]_2$ ) and ribonucleotide reductase II ( $[\text{NrdE}]_2[\text{NrdF}]_2$ ) complexes. Grey lines in top panel show the estimated number of complexes needed as a function of growth, the details of which are described in the Appendix.




**Figure 7–Figure supplement 1.** The abundance of  $\sigma^{70}$  as a function of growth rate. Estimated value for the number of RNAP is shown as a translucent brown point and grey line.



**Figure 8-Figure supplement 1.** Estimation for the number of tRNA synthetases that will supply the required amino acid demand. The sum of all tRNA synthetases copy numbers are plotted as a function of growth rate ([ArgS], [CysS], [GlnS], [GltX], [IleS], [LeuS], [ValS], [AlaS]<sub>2</sub>, [AsnS]<sub>2</sub>, [AspS]<sub>2</sub>, [TyrS]<sub>2</sub>, [TrpS]<sub>2</sub>, [ThrS]<sub>2</sub>, [SerS]<sub>2</sub>, [ProS]<sub>2</sub>, [PheS]<sub>2</sub>[PheT]<sub>2</sub>, [MetG]<sub>2</sub>, [lysS]<sub>2</sub>, [HisS]<sub>2</sub>, [GlyS]<sub>2</sub>[GlyQ]<sub>2</sub>).



**Figure 9-Figure supplement 1.** (A) Actively translating ribosomal fraction versus growth rate. The actively translating ribosomal fraction is calculated using the estimated values of  $f_a$  from **Dai et al. (2016)** (shown in inset; see Appendix Calculation of active ribosomal fraction for additional detail). Additional measurements in addition to the proteomic measurements are based on measurements of cellular RNA to protein ratio, with  $\Phi_R \approx$  the cellular RNA to protein ratio divided by 2.1 (**Dai et al., 2016**). (B) Experimental measurements of the cell doubling time  $\tau$  and cell cycle time  $t_{\text{cyc}}$  from **Si et al. (2017)**. Dashed line shows fit to the data, which were used to estimate  $\langle \# \text{ori} \rangle$ .  $t_{\text{cyc}}$  was assumed to vary in proportion to  $\tau$  for doubling times greater than 40 minutes, and reach a minimum value of 73 minutes. See Appendix Estimation of  $\langle \# \text{ori} \rangle / \langle \# \text{ter} \rangle$  and  $\langle \# \text{ori} \rangle$  for additional details exact estimation of rRNA copy number. Red data points correspond to measurements in strain MG1655, while light green points are for strain NCM3722. Schematic shows the expected increase in replication forks (or number of ori regions) as *E. coli* cells grow faster.



**Figure 11–Figure supplement 1.** An interactive version of parts (B) and (C) of **Figure 11** which permit the user to modulate the rate of amino acid supply, the dissociation constant of amino acids to the ribosome, and the fraction of the ribosome pool that is actively translating. This interactive figure, and the code used to generate it, is available on the [paper website](#).