# **Supplemental Computational Analysis**

Design and in vitro realization of carbon-conserving photorespiration

Devin L. Trudeau<sup>1‡</sup>, Christian Edlich-Muth<sup>2‡</sup>, Jan Zarzycki<sup>3</sup>, Marieke Scheffen<sup>3</sup>, Moshe Goldsmith<sup>1</sup>, Olga Khersonsky<sup>1</sup>, Ziv Avizemer<sup>1</sup>, Sarel J. Fleishman<sup>1</sup>, Charles A.R. Cotton<sup>2</sup>, Tobias J. Erb<sup>3</sup>, Dan S. Tawfik<sup>1\*</sup>, Arren Bar-Even<sup>2\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Biomolecular Sciences, Weizmann Institute of Science, 234 Herzl Street, Rehovot 7610001, Israel

<sup>2</sup>Max Planck Institute of Molecular Plant Physiology, Am Mühlenberg 1, 14476 Potsdam-Golm, Germany <sup>3</sup>Max Planck Institute for Terrestrial Microbiology, Karl-von-Frisch-Straße 10, D-35043 Marburg, Germany

# Contents

1	path	$\operatorname{pathSeekR}$		
	1.1	Introduction	5	
	1.2	Compounds	5	
		1.2.1 Repertoire of chemical groups	6	
		1.2.2 Combining groups into molecules	6	
		1.2.3 Disallowed compounds	6	
	1.3	Reactions	7	
	1.4	Network	9	
	1.5	Multi-substrate reactions	9	
	1.6	pathSeekR algorithm	9	
	1.7	Categorisation	10	
	1.8	Results	10	
	1.9	Reactive C2 intermediates	11	
	1.10	Pathway architectures	15	
<b>2</b>	The	stoichiometric-kinetic model	16	
	2.1	Theory	16	
		2.1.1 Pathways	16	
		2.1.2 The stoichiometric consumer model of photosynthesis	19	
		2.1.3 Stoichiometric-kinetic model	23	
		2.1.4 Physicochemical parameters	34	
	2.2	Results	37	
		2.2.1 Parameters and variables	37	
		2.2.2 Rubisco kinetics	38	
		2.2.3 Limitation by light	39	

		2.2.4	Limitation by enzyme activities other than Rubisco	40
		2.2.5	Limitation by a Calvin cycle enzyme	41
		2.2.6	Limitation by a photorespiratory enzyme	44
		2.2.7	Limitation by a photorespiration carboxylase	45
3	Kin	etic m	odels of photorespiration shunts	45
	3.1	Introd	uction $\ldots$	45
	3.2	Generi variabl	c form of a random order rate reaction with one substrate, one products and a le number of co-factors	46
		3.2.1	Abbreviations	46
		3.2.2	Linear reactions	47
		3.2.3	Generic example of a linear reaction	47
		3.2.4	Canonical form of the equation	47
		3.2.5	Linear relation between the concentrations of substrate and product $\ldots$ .	47
		3.2.6	Minimal required activity	48
		3.2.7	Thermodynamic limitations	48
	3.3	Rate la	aws of all photorespiration shunt reactions	48
		3.3.1	Compound abbreviations	49
		3.3.2	Glycolate 2-phosphatase	49
		3.3.3	Glycolyl-CoA synthetase	50
		3.3.4	Glycolyl-CoA transferase	50
		3.3.5	Glycolaldehyde dehydrogenase, Co A-acylating (Glycolyl-Co A reductase) $\ . \ . \ .$	50
		3.3.6	Ar5P aldolase	51
		3.3.7	Ru1P aldolase	51
		3.3.8	Transketolase	52
		3.3.9	Transaldolase	52
		3.3.10	Erythrulose 4-kinase	53

		3.3.11	Xylulose 5-kinase	53
		3.3.12	Ribulose-1-phosphate 5-kinase	53
		3.3.13	Glycolyl-CoA carboxylase	54
		3.3.14	Tartronyl-CoA reductase	54
		3.3.15	Glycerate 3-kinase	55
	3.4	Param	eters	55
		3.4.1	Imputing unknown parameters	55
		3.4.2	Kinetic parameters	55
		3.4.3	Thermodynamic parameters	56
		3.4.4	Kinetic and thermodynamic parameters of the simulation	57
		3.4.5	Steady-state concentrations of co-factors and Calvin cycle intermediates $\ldots$ .	58
		3.4.6	Sampling	58
		3.4.7	Lower and upper limits on pathway metabolites	58
		3.4.8	Summary	60
		3.4.9	Calculating fluxes	60
	3.5	Pareto	analysis	60
		3.5.1	Assumptions	60
		3.5.2	Solving the rate equations	61
		3.5.3	Metabolite distributions	61
		3.5.4	Carrying out the Pareto analysis	61
		3.5.5	Results for all photorespiratory shunts	62
4	patl	hSeekF	R pathway architectures	67
	4.1	Glycol	yl-CoA pathways	67
	4.2	Glycol	aldehyde 2-phosphate pathways	90
	4.3	Glycol	aldehyde pathways	111
	4.4	Glyoxy	ylate pathways	176

4.5	Glycine pathways	202
4.6	Aminoethanol pathways	206
4.7	Aminoacetaldehyde pathways	220

# 5 References

226

# 1 pathSeekR

## 1.1 Introduction

pathSeekR is an algorithm that looks for pathways in a reaction network, starting with a source compound and ending in any of a set of sink compounds. In the context of photorespiration shunts, the source is glycolate 2-phosphate (G2P), and the sink comprises all Calvin cycle intermediates.

pathSeekR creates a reaction network where the nodes are compounds and the (directed) edges reactions. Compounds are assembled from a small repertoire of chemical groups (Section 1.2). A universe of compounds is created by combining all permutations of chemical groups in the repertoire up to a maximal number of groups. The universe is pruned by removing compounds that contravene rules about biological compounds (Section 1.2.3). Importantly, the chemical groups of pathSeekR are achiral which means that all stereoisomers of a compound are represented by a single achiral one.

A chemical reaction maps one compound (the substrate) to another (the product), which is represented as a directed edge between the two nodes in the network (Section 1.4). Co-factors and inorganic substrates are ignored. If the reaction is reversible, two edges, corresponding to the two directions of the reaction are created. If there is more than one substrate (or product), an edge for each of these is created (Section 1.5) and the co-substrate (co-product) becomes an attribute of the edge.

Each reaction is implemented as a simple rule that captures a naturally occurring reaction mechanism (Section 1.3). The rule is defined as a pair of chemical patterns - a sequence of chemical groups - one for the substrate, one for the product. The reaction is implemented by substituting the substrate pattern with the product pattern.

pathSeekR will search the network until a certain number of pathways have been found or to a certain depth (number of reactions). Here we restrict the solutions to a maximal length of 9 nodes (including source and sink), which is equivalent to 8 reactions.

# 1.2 Compounds

In pathSeekR, compounds (or molecules) are represented as a sequence of chemical groups, much like a DNA or protein sequence, but allowing branching. A chemical group in pathSeekR is a carbon atom with or without heavy atom substituents (Table 1), for example aldehyde and hydroxycarbon groups. We differentiate between primary, secondary and tertiary hydroxycarbons, and the aldehyde group is not identical to the keto group. The repertoire of groups can be amended or restricted arbitrarily. We have chosen our set of groups such that most compounds of central metabolism can be generated. CoA-thioesters, phosphate esters and anhydrides have a shorthand notation, effectively representing them as pseudoatoms. To give two examples, in pathSeekR glycerate 3-phosphate is  $(CH_2O-PO_3^{2-}, CHOH, COOH)$  and glycolyl-CoA is  $(CH_2OH, COS-CoA)$ .

With this approach chirality and cyclical compounds cannot be represented. For the purpose of finding photorespiration shunts, we chose to also exclude compounds with double bonds, branched carbon chains and bridging non-carbon atoms (e.g. an oxygen atom between two carbons). The rationale for this is that both the source (G2P) and the sink (Calvin cycle intermediates) are devoid of these features, and a pathways that contained e.g. a double bond, would first have to create one only to then remove it again. Clearly this would lead to much longer pathways. For the same reason, fully

reduced carbon groups  $(CH_2, CH_3)$  were excluded. These are practical decisions (heuristics) that can in principle be reversed.

Group	Description	Position
CH <sub>2</sub> OH	hydroxycarbon	terminal
CHOH	hydroxycarbon	non-terminal
CHO	aldehyde	terminal
CO	carbonyl	non-terminal
COOH	carboxylate	terminal
$COO-PO_3^{2-}$	acyl phosphate anhydride	terminal
COS-CoA	acyl CoA thioester	terminal
$CH_2O-PO_3^{2-}$	phosphate ester	terminal
$CHO-PO_3^{2-}$	phosphate ester	non-terminal
$\mathrm{CH}_2\mathrm{NH}_2$	aminocarbon	terminal
$\mathrm{CHNH}_2$	aminocarbon	non-terminal

## 1.2.1 Repertoire of chemical groups

**Table 1:** Repertoire of chemical groups for finding photorespiration shunts. The repertoire can be expanded to include many other chemistries e.g. double bonds, branched carbon chains.

## 1.2.2 Combining groups into molecules

pathSeekR makes all possible permutations of the repertoire of groups up to a certain size and making sure that terminal groups are present in the correct places. With the repertoire we have chosen, all compounds that are generated are linear (non-branched, non-cyclical). After creating all permutations duplicates (where the order of groups is exactly reversed) are removed.

## 1.2.3 Disallowed compounds

- No more than 7 carbons
- No double bonds, no cycles and no tertiary/quaternary carbons (no branches)
- No bridging heteroatoms in chain
- No methyl or methylene groups
- No more than one carbonyl group (either keto or aldehyde) per molecule
- No more than one thioester per molecule, no phosphate groups in CoA compounds
- No more than one phosphate anhydride per molecule
- No more than two phosphate groups per molecule, only one of which can be non-terminal
- No more than one amine group per molecule
- No imines

Compounds that contravene the above rules are removed. The rules are either motivated by chemistry (e.g. two carbonyl groups next to each other are unstable) or by what is known about metabolism (e.g. no compound with both a CoA and phosphate group, or more than two phosphate groups in central metabolism).

None of these rules are essential. It would therefore be possible to add, amend or remove the rules to define a different set of allowed and disallowed compounds.

## 1.3 Reactions

We defined 27 rules that encode the vast majority of reaction mechanisms in central metabolism. A rule defines the chemical groups the substrate must have, and what the molecule looks like after the reaction has taken place. We call this the substrate and the product pattern respectively. In addition, we classify the reactions as reversible or irreversible and whether or not the enzyme catalysing the reaction is oxygen sensitive. It would also be possible to record other types of information about the reaction, e.g. co-factor requirements. For the purpose of finding new photorespiratory shunts we excluded all oxygen sensitive reactions because the chloroplast is fully oxic, and all energy-dissipating reactions such as phosphatases and acyl-CoA hydrolyases with the exception of 2-phosphoglycolate phosphatase.

Class	Reaction	Substrate	Product	Co-sub	Co-P	R
Oxidoreductase	Alcohol dehydrogenase	C(O)	C(=O)			Υ
Oxidoreductase	Aldehyde dehydrogenase	C(=O)	C(=O)(O)			Ν
Oxidoreductase	Aldehyde dehydrogenase, CoA-acylating	C(=O)	C(=O)(S[CoA])			Υ
Oxidoreductase	Aldehyde dehydrogenase, phosphorylating	C(=O)	C(=O)(O[PO3])			Υ
Oxidoreductase	Amine dehydrogenase <sup><math>a</math></sup>	C(N)	C(=O)			Υ
Activase	Kinase hydroxyl	C(O)	C(O[PO3])			Ν
Activase	Kinase carboxyl	C(=O)(O)	C(=O)(O[PO3])			Ν
Activase	$CoA synthetase^b$	C(=O)(O)	C(=O)(S[CoA])			Ν
Activase	Phosphate CoA-acetyltransferase	C(=O)(O[PO3])	C(=O)(S[CoA])			Υ
Isomerase	Aldo/keto isomerase	C(=O)C(O)	C(O)C(=O)			Υ
Isomerase	Phosphoester isomerase <sup>*</sup>	C(O[PO3])C(O)	C(O)C(O[PO3])			Υ
Isomerase	Phosphoanhydride isomerase*	C(=O)(O[PO3])C(=O)(O)	C(=O)(O)C(=O)(O[PO3])			Υ
Isomerase	Thioester isomerase <sup>*</sup>	C(=O)(O[PO3])C(=O)(O)	C(=O)(O)C(=O)(O[PO3])			Υ
Carboxylase	$\alpha$ -carboxylation (thioester) <sup>c</sup>	C(=O)(S[CoA])C(O)	C(=O)(S[CoA])C(O)C(=O)(O)			Ν
Carboxylase	$\alpha$ -carboxylation (carbonyl)	C(=O)C(O)	C(=O)C(O)C(=O)(O)			Ν
Carboxylase	Reductive $\alpha$ -carboxylation (carbonyl)	C(=O)C(O)	C(O)C(O)C(=O)(O)			Ν
Transferase	Transketolase	C(=O)	C(O)C(=O)C(O)	C(O)C(=O)C(O)	C(=O)	Υ
Transferase	Transaldolase	C(=O)	C(O)C(=O)C(O)C(O)	C(O)C(=O)C(O)C(O)	C(=O)	Υ
Carbo-lyase	Aldolase (carbonyl)	C(=O)C(O)	C(=O)C(O)C(O)	C(=O)		Υ
Carbo-lyase	Aldolase (amine)	C(N)	C(N)C(O)	C(=O)		Υ
Carbo-lyase	Ketolase	C(=O)	C(=O)C(O)	C(=O)		Υ
Carbo-lyase	Aldolase (thioester)	C(=O)(S[CoA])C(O)	C(=O)(S[CoA])C(O)C(O)	C(=O)		Υ
Carbo-lyase	Aldolase (thioester, hydrolysing)	C(=O)(S[CoA])C(O)	C(=O)(O)C(O)C(O)	C(=O)		Υ
Carbo-lyase	Aldolase (carboxyl)	C(=O)(O])C(O)	C(=O)(O)C(O)C(O)	C(=O)		Υ
Carbo-lyase	Acyl-CoA C-transferase (thioester)	C(=O)(S[CoA])C(O)	C(=O)(S[CoA])C(=O)	C(=O)(S[CoA])		Υ
Carbo-lyase	Acyl-CoA C-transferase (amine)	C(N)	$\rm C(N)C(=O)$	C(=O)(S[CoA])		Υ

**Table 2:** pathSeekR reactions. Substrate, product, co-substrate and co-product ('Co-P') are in SMILES notation. CoA and phosphate are represented as pseudo-atoms, [CoA] and [PO3] respectively. 'R' stands for reversibility. All kinase and CoA transferase reactions are irreversible, with one exception: dephosphorylation of 2-phosphoglycolate is explicitly allowed. \* Phosphoester, phosphoanhydride and thioester isomerases also work on non-adjacent groups. Some of the reactions in the table can be carried out by different classes of enzymes: <sup>a</sup> transaminase, <sup>b</sup> CoA transferase, <sup>b</sup> transcarboxylase.

## 1.4 Network

A reaction network consists of nodes (compounds) and edges (reactions). In pathSeekR, every edge is simple, i.e. it connects exactly two nodes. The edges are also directed, which is important for irreversible reactions. Reversible reactions are represented as two irreversible reactions. Edges of a node to itself are forbidden (this could happen in an isomerisation reaction).

The network starts off as nodes without edges. By applying all reaction rules to all compounds, edges are added. Multiple edges in the same direction are combined into one.

## 1.5 Multi-substrate reactions

If a reaction has more than one substrate, neither of which fall into the class of co-factors (which are ignored), special treatment is necessary. We connect both substrate nodes to the product (or products) and record the co-substrate (and co-product if any) as a property of the edge. In this manner, all edges can remain simple but the information on the co-substrate (co-product) is not lost and can be used or reported as appropriate.

In our pathSeekR runs we only allow compounds as co-substrates and co-products that zero or one reaction removed from the Calvin cycle.

## 1.6 pathSeekR algorithm

The algorithm has three steps: creation of compounds, creation of the reaction network and the actual pathway search.

For the actual search, the network is represented as a neighbourhood list: the neighbourhood of a node (compound) consists of all nodes (compounds) that can be reached from the node via an edge (reaction). The search is initialised with the source node as the only proto-path (by this we mean a path that is not terminated). In the first iteration, all nodes from the neighbourhood of the source are added to the proto-path, resulting in as many proto-paths of length 2 as there are nodes in the neighbourhood of the source. In the next and all following iterations, this procedure is repeated with every proto-path and the respective neighbourhood of the terminal node.

This generic path search leads to super-exponential growth in the number of proto-paths. To make the search efficient, it is necessary to kill off as many proto-paths as possible as quickly as possible. In pathSeekR, a proto-path is terminated if

- (i) It ends in a sink (a pathway has been found)
- (ii) It ends in a node that has been visited before (a cycle)
- (iii) There are no nodes in the neighbourhood of the terminal node left that have not been visited before (dead end)

In addition we use some rules and heuristics that accelerate the search.

- (iv) A proto-path is terminated if it ends in a node that has been defined as a forbidden node (this helps to restrict the scope of the search).
- (v) A proto-path is terminated if any other proto-path has visited the node before.

This second rule is a heuristic that reduces the computational complexity very considerably. The reason why it makes sense to exclude nodes that have been visited by other paths is that a) there must be a faster or equally fast reaction path to this node and b) one can later use the solutions from the 'faster' path from that node on and paste them onto the 'slower' proto-path. It is in theory possible to miss out on some solutions (pathways) because the nodes the faster path has visited cannot be visited again but may not have been visited by the slower path and therefore could lead to additional solutions. In practice, if the pathways is meant to be short, and if it has a clear 'directionality' (e.g. from smaller to larger and/or from more oxidised to more reduced compounds) it is very unlikely that interesting candidates are lost.

Finally, any number of rules can be stated as exit criteria

- (vi) Do not extend beyond a certain length
- (vii) Terminate if a certain reaction or type of reaction has taken place more than n times (e.g. forbid dephosphorylation)

It would also be possible to limit the number of ATPs consumed (this would require that the relevant information be defined in the reactions table). All in all there are many possibilities to fine-tune the search - not by adjusting fudge parameters, but by defining explicit rules.

### 1.7 Categorisation

We define two levels of categorisation, class and superclass. To this end we introduce two new concepts: firstly, a 'key reaction' is a reaction that changes the number of carbons from substrate to product, and secondly the 'carbon signature' of a key reaction is a pair of integers representing the number of carbons before and after the reaction. The carbon signature of a pathway is simply the concatenation of the carbon signatures of its key reactions.

Two pathways belong to the same superclass if they have the same carbon signature. They belong to the same class, if, in addition, the source and sink of the pathway, as well as the substrate and product of each key reaction are the same.

## 1.8 Results

Pathway architectures that were discovered with the pathSeekR algorithm are shown in order of ascending length, with a maximum of 8 reactions in the pathway (9 compounds) - which is the number of reactions of native photorespiration (not counting re-fixation of ammonia). The pathway diagrams display phosphate groups as "O-Po" and CoA-thioesters as "S-Co". All co-factors such as ATP and CoA-SH are not shown. All molecules are assumed to be achiral, therefore generic names are given, e.g. C4-ketose is a ketose with 4 carbons, which could be D- or L-erythrose. Most sugars, sugar phosphates etc are named and more unusual compounds are simply numbered in the pathway diagram and given as SMILES string in the table below - "(O-[PO3])" and "(S-[CoA])" representing phosphate and CoA-thioester pseudo-groups.

Every pathway shown in the results section is the **shortest representative** of a pathway class. A **pathway class** is defined by three metabolites: the last C2 intermediate before the key reaction, the compound that is the product of the key reaction and the final compound of the pathway, a Calvin cycle intermediate. A **key reaction** is a reaction that changes the the number of carbons from substrate to product and is either a carboxylase, carbo-ligase or a transferase type reaction. In all pathways shown below, there is only one key reaction (pathway superclass is defined by the number of carbons of the molecules before and after the key reaction(s). As the name suggests, many pathway classes fall into one superclass.

**Co-products** and **co-substrates** of the key reaction (excluding co-factors) are listed in the results section. It is assumed here that for transferase-type reactions such as transketolase, donor-acceptor pairs exist in the Calvin cycle that can regenerate the acylated enzyme intermediate. For all aldolase reactions, the co-substrate is either a Calvin cycle intermediate or a compound that is one reaction removed from the Calvin cycle (excluding aldolase and acyl-transferase type reactions).

## 1.9 Reactive C2 intermediates

We define a **reactive C2 intermediate** as a two-carbon compound with either an aldehyde or amine group. Reactive C2 intermediates are the substrates of key reactions and the first defining compound of a pathway class. Within the restricted set of compounds that are allowed in our analysis (most notably, at least one heteroatom per carbon), reactive C2 intermediates are glycolyl-CoA, glycolaldehdye, glyoxylate, glycine, ethanolamine and aminoacetaldehyde. Other reactive C2 compounds, e.g. glyoxal, are excluded by our rules for compounds (only one carbonyl per molecule).

In the following we enumerate the pathways that generate reactive C2 intermediates from glycolate 2-phosphate. For example, there are several possibilities for producing glycolaldehyde that are all listed here. In the results section, wherever glcyolaldehyde is the reactive C2 intermediate, only one variant of the glycolaldehyde-generating pathways will be shown for reasons of clarity.

### C2 reactive intermediate Pathway 1: Glycolyl-CoA



## C2 reactive intermediate Pathway 2: Glycolaldehyde



## C2 reactive intermediate Pathway 3: Glycolaldehyde



Ο OH

4: glycolaldehyde

C2 reactive intermediate Pathway 4: Glycolaldehyde phosphate



## C2 reactive intermediate Pathway 5: Glycolaldehyde



## C2 reactive intermediate Pathway 6: Glyoxylate



## C2 reactive intermediate Pathway 7: Glycine



## C2 reactive intermediate Pathway 8: Ethanolamine



## C2 reactive intermediate Pathway 9: Aminoacetaldehyde



C2 reactive intermediate Pathway 10: Aminoacetaldehyde



## 1.10 Pathway architectures

The following results combine the output of several pathSeekR runs (159 pathway classes):

- 1. Glycolyl-CoA as source. 23 pathway classes
- 2. Glycolaldehyde 2-phosphate as source. Cosubstrate(s): glycolaldehyde. 21 pathway classes
- 3. Glycolaldehyde as source. Cosubstrate(s): glycolyl-CoA. 65 pathway classes
- 4. Glyoxylate as source. 26 pathway classes
- 5. Glycine as source. Cosubstrate(s): glyoxylate. 4 pathway classes
- 6. Aminoethanol as source. Cosubstrate(s): glycolyl-CoA, glycolaldehyde. 14 pathway classes
- 7. Aminoacetaldehyde as source. Cosubstrate(s): glycolyl-CoA, glycolaldehyde, aminoethanol. 6 pathway classes

The rationale behind this is that intermediates of the same pathway can react with each other, while cross-talk between different reactive C2-generating pathways, e.g glycine with glycolaldehyde are not allowed.

All pathway architectures are listed at the end of this document (Section 4). For each pathway class one example is shown that has the minimal number of reactions; however, there may be other representatives of that class with the same number of reactions and slightly different chemistry (e.g. carboxyl activation with CoA instead of phosphoanhydride prior to reduction to an aldehyde; e.g. Pathway 1) or with a permutation in the reaction sequence (e.g. phosphorylation before reduction instead of the other way round; see Pathway 3, where phosphorylation first would prevent ring closure of the sugar). Further selection of optimal representative of a the most promising pathway classes was carried out manually (see main text).

# 2 The stoichiometric-kinetic model

## 2.1 Theory

Our aim is to develop a framework for modeling C3 photosynthesis (PS) in mesophyll cells that allows us to compare native photorespiration (PR) with engineered photosynthetic shunts. In particular, we want to model conditions that are most relevant to agricultural crops, i.e. a range of light intensities and both ambient and low  $CO_2$  intercellular airspace concentrations. The latter can for example occur in drought when the plant closes its stomata.

### 2.1.1 Pathways

The pathways we are concerned with are the Calvin cycle, native photorespiration, the published tartronic glycerate pathway [1] and the synthetic ribulose 1-phosphate (Ru1P), arabinose 5-phosphate (Ar5P), erythrulose (Eu), xylulose (Xu) and tartronyl CoA (TrCoA) shunts.

The analysis of energy requirements of photorespiration shunts is not straight-forward. Simply counting the number of ATPs and NADPHs that are consumed in a pathway can be misleading. For example, native photorespiration converts one molecule of G2P into half a molecule of PGA, consuming 1 ATP and 0.5 NADPHs in the process (0.5 ATP for re-fixing 0.5 units of ammonia, 0.5 ATP for phosphorylating 0.5 units of glycerate and 0.5 NADPH for reducing 0.5 units of hydroxypyruvate; 0.5



Figure 1: Energy requirements of native photorespiration and the Calvin cycle. Summary of energy consumption of native photorespiration, the reductive and regenerative Calvin cycle.

NADH are generated in the glycine cleavage complex but cancel with the 0.5 units of NADH that are required to regenerate the donor of the transaminase reaction, e.g. glutamate from 2-oxoglutarate). The difficulty arises if we try to compare this number to e.g. a carbon-neutral pathway like the Ru1P pathway. We can count the number of ATPs and NADPHs easily enough but it does not make any sense to compare them to native photorespiration because the product of the Ru1P pathway is RuBP, not PGA.

The solution is to calculate the number of ATPs and NADPHs that are required to regenerate one molecule of RuBP from the products of RuBP oxygenase, PGA and G2P. However, this raises the issue of how to deal with the fact that e.g. native photorespiration is 'carbon negative' - 0.5 units of  $CO_2$  (i.e. 1/6 of a molecule of GAP) are lost, so we cannot regenerate a full molecule of RuBP. We deal with this by making the reasonable assumption that the missing amount of GAP is supplied by the Calvin cycle.



**Figure 2: Energy requirements of synthetic photorespiration shunts.** The carbon-positive tartronyl-CoA shunt converts G2P to PGA. The regenerative phase (from PGA to RuBP) is identical to the Calvin cycle. The four carbon-neutral shunts consist of a generic reductive phase, followed by individual regenerative phases. In the reductive phase, glycolaldehyde (GA) is made from glycolate 2-phosphate (G2P) and in the regenerative phase, GA is combined with either GAP or DHAP to regenerate RuBP. Green arrows indicate non-native reactions, and blue arrows native Calvin cycle or photorespiration reactions.

This description is extremely useful as it allows the comparison of any photorespiration shunt both with one another and native photorespiration. The energy requirements of native photorespiration are calculated in the following manner. G2P is converted to 0.5 PGA consuming 1 ATP and 0.5 NADPH in the process. Together with the molecule of PGA that is also produced by RuBP oxygenase, we have 1.5 PGA which require 1.5 ATP and 1.5 NADPH to form 1.5 molecules of GAP. Now the Calvin cycle supplies the missing 1/6 of a molecule of GAP so that 5/3 GAP + 1 ATP can be converted back to RuBP. All in all 3.5 ATPs and 2 NADPHs have been consumed to achieve this.

The same analysis for the tartronyl-CoA pathway is as follows: G2P is converted to PGA consuming 4 ATPs (2 by CoA synthetase, 1 by the carboxylase and 1 by glycerate kinase) and 2 NADPHs. Together with the molecule of PGA that is also produced by RuBP oxygenase, we have 2 PGA which require 2 ATP and 2 NADPH to form 2 molecules of GAP. The excess 1/3 of a GAP (equivalent to one fixed and reduced CO<sub>2</sub>) is exported from the chloroplast so that 5/3 GAP + 1 ATP can be converted back to RuBP. All in all 7 ATPs and 4 NADPHs have been consumed to achieve this.

For the Ru1P, Ar5P, Erythrulose and Xylulose shunts the narrative is different: in the reductive part that all carbon-neutral shunts share, G2P is converted to GA consuming 2 ATPs and 1 NADPH. The molecule of PGA that is also produced by RuBP oxygenase, consumes 1 ATP and 1 NADPH to form

1 molecules of GAP or DHAP in the reductive part of the Calvin cycle. The two molecules are then combined, to form a pentose phosphate that is ultimately converted to RuBP. In the Ru1P shunt, DHAP and GAP form Ru1P in an aldolase reaction; Ru1P is phosphorylated to RuBP. All in all we have consumed 4 ATPs and 2 NADPHs. The Ar5P shunt is a variation on this theme, also consuming 4 ATPs and 2 NADPHs. In contrast, the Erythrulose shunt forms erythrulose in a transketolase reaction. Erythrulose is phosphorylated and isomerised to E4P. E4P is then condensed with DHAP to form SBP which is dephosphorylated to S7P, the donor of the transketolase reaction. Ultimately, what remains is one molecule of ribose 5-phosphate (R5P) which is converted to Ru5P and finally RuBP. Since an additional phosphorylation (erythrulose kinase) / dephosphorylation (SBPase) occurs, one more unit of ATP is consumed than in the Ru1P/Ar5P shunts. The Xylulose shunt also requires the additional expense of one ATP compared to Ru1P/Ar5P because the regeneration of F6P as the substrate of the transaldolase reaction proceeds via FBP.

### 2.1.2 The stoichiometric consumer model of photosynthesis

Thus, native photorespiration, each of the synthetic photorespiration shunts, and the Calvin Cycle proper, can be understood as isolated cycles that regenerate RuBP and either fix or release  $CO_2$  in the process and thereby produce or consume triose phosphates at the same time (Fig. 3). From this viewpoint, native photorespiration is the process that converts RuBP and one sixth of a molecule of GAP back into one molecule of RuBP plus 0.5 molecules of  $CO_2$ , consuming 3.5 ATPs and 2 NADPHs in the process. The intermediates, e.g. PGA and glycolate-2-phosphate, are irrelevant in this description because they are made and consumed in equal amounts. Moreover, by balancing  $CO_2$  with GAP in each of the pathways, we obtain catalytic cycles for photosynthesis, native photorespiration and synthetic photorespiration shunts that do not depend on one another to supply intermediates.



Figure 3: The consumer model of photosynthesis. The Calvin cycle (CBB, right) and photorespiration (PR, left) are conceptualised as catalytic loops that regenerate RuBP independently of each other. Three stoichiometric coefficients, ( $\alpha$ ,  $\beta$  and  $\gamma$ ) fully define the properties of a pathway.  $\alpha$ (can be negative) is the number of CO<sub>2</sub> molecules,  $\beta$  is the number of ATP molecules and  $\gamma$  is the number of NADPH molecules that are consumed per turn of the cycle (see Table 3). The total amount of CO<sub>2</sub>, ATP or NADPH consumed can be calculated by multiplying the appropriate stoichiometric coefficient with the flux through RuBP oxygenase in photorespiration ( $v_{ox}$ ) or RuBP carboxylase in the Calvin Cycle ( $v_{carb}$ ). The sum of these two processes describes the total amount of CO<sub>2</sub>, ATP or NADPH consumed. For example, total ATP consumption is  $3 v_{carb} + \beta v_{ox} = 3 v_{carb} + 3.5 v_{ox}$  in native photorespiration.

The most important consequence of this description is that despite the fact that native/synthetic photorespiration on the one hand and photosynthesis on the other share some enzymes and metabolic intermediates, the two processes can now be separated and treated in isolation.

Each catalytic pathway that regenerates RuBP is characterised by just three numbers: the number of CO<sub>2</sub> molecules that are consumed ( $\alpha$ , can be negative) per turn of the cycle, the number of ATP molecules that are consumed ( $\beta$ ) per turn of the cycle and the number of NADPH molecules that are consumed ( $\gamma$ ) per turn of the cycle (Table 3). These numbers have to be obtained from the detailed description of the actual pathways(Fig. 1 and 2).

We call this model the consumer model of photosynthesis, since it omits a description of the supply of  $CO_2$  (via diffusion), ATP and NADPH (from the light reactions). The consumer model assumes that supply rates of  $CO_2$ , ATP and NADPH are infinite and therefore not limiting. A supply-demand steady-state model is presented in Section 2.1.3.

When only the consumption (but not the supply) of CO<sub>2</sub> is taken into account, the net carbon fixation rate is defined as the sum of the activities of Rubisco carboxylase  $(v_{carb}^{\dagger})$  and oxygenase  $(v_{ox}^{\dagger})$ , weighted by the parameters  $\alpha_0$  and  $\alpha$  respectively.

$$A^{\dagger} = \alpha_0 \, v_{carb}^{\dagger} + \alpha \, v_{ox}^{\dagger} = v_{carb}^{\dagger} + \alpha \, v_{ox}^{\dagger} \tag{1}$$

The number of carbons that are consumed per turn of the Calvin Cycle is  $\alpha_0 = 1$ , while per turn of the native photorespiration cycle, 0.5 units of CO<sub>2</sub> are released, which is accounted for in our notation as  $\alpha = -0.5$ . In contrast a carbon-neutral shunt, as the name suggest, has  $\alpha = 0$ , and a carbon-fixing shunt has  $\alpha = 1$ . We use the <sup>†</sup> superscript here and in the following to signify that Eq. 1 refers to the consumer model only. The corresponding rate A without superscript is described in the full model that also takes into account limitations imposed by the supply of CO<sub>2</sub>, ATP and NADPH.

The overall number of ATP or NADPH molecules that are consumed is calculated in a similar way, simply by replacing  $\alpha_0$  and  $\alpha$  with  $\beta_0$  and  $\beta$  or  $\gamma_0$  and  $\gamma$  in Eq 1, respectively.

$$N_{atp}^{\dagger} = \beta_0 \, v_{carb}^{\dagger} + \beta \, v_{ox}^{\dagger} = 3 \, v_{carb}^{\dagger} + \beta \, v_{ox}^{\dagger} \tag{2}$$

$$N_{nadp}^{\dagger} = \gamma_0 \, v_{carb}^{\dagger} + \gamma \, v_{ox}^{\dagger} = 2 \, v_{carb}^{\dagger} + \gamma \, v_{ox}^{\dagger} \tag{3}$$

The two numbers  $N_{atp}^{\dagger}$  and  $N_{nadp}^{\dagger}$  therefore describe the number of ATP and NADPH molecules that are consumed by the Calvin Cycle and a given photorespiration pathway, be it native or a synthetic shunt. These two numbers, like  $A^{\dagger}$ , depend on the rates  $v_{carb}^{\dagger}$  and  $v_{ox}^{\dagger}$  that depend in turn on the kinetic parameters of Rubisco and the concentrations of CO<sub>2</sub> and O<sub>2</sub> in the chloroplast.

#### Energy balance at a fixed oxygenation to carboxylation ratio

We describe three performance measures that allow the comparison of a synthetic shunt with native photorespiration when one or the other operates alongside the Calvin Cycle.

The first performance measure defines the number of units of CO<sub>2</sub> that are fixed on average per reaction of Rubisco. The other two describe the number of units of CO<sub>2</sub> that are fixed on average per molecule of ATP or NADPH consumed. These averages can be quickly derived if one assumes a fixed oxygenation proportion,  $\rho = v_{ox}^{\dagger}/(v_{carb}^{\dagger} + v_{ox}^{\dagger})$ , for example  $\rho = 0.25$ . This is a representative value

Pathway	$\alpha$	β	$\gamma$
Native photorespiration	-0.5	3.5	2
Tartronic semialdehyde shunt	-0.5	3	1
Ribulose 1-P shunt	0	4	2
Arabinose 5-P shunt	0	4	2
Erythrulose shunt	0	5	2
Xylulose shunt	0	5	2
Tartronyl-CoA shunt	1	7	4
Calvin cycle	1	3	2

**Table 3: Bypass coefficients.** The coefficient  $\alpha$  describes how many units of CO<sub>2</sub> are fixed per cycle,  $\beta$  and  $\gamma$  describe how many ATPs and NADPHs respectively are consumed in each cycle. The values of the Calvin cycle, denoted with the subscript '0', are  $\alpha_0 = 1$ ,  $\beta_0 = 3$  and  $\gamma_0 = 2$ .

at ambient CO<sub>2</sub> partial pressure, open stomata and saturating light. The value of  $\rho = 0.25$  can be interpreted as meaning that, on average, every fourth reaction of Rubisco is oxygenating, while the three remaining ones are carboxylating (the ratio  $v_{ox}^{\dagger}/v_{carb}^{\dagger} = 0.33$ ). First we calculate the number of CO<sub>2</sub> molecules that are fixed on average per Rubisco reaction. By 'average' we mean the expected number of fixed CO<sub>2</sub> molecules per reaction of Rubisco given that the probability of oxygenation is equal to  $\rho$  and the probability of carboxylation is equal to  $1 - \rho$ . To this end we divide  $A^{\dagger}$  (Eq. 1) by the total activity of Rubisco,  $v_{carb}^{\dagger} + v_{ox}^{\dagger}$ , and use the definition of  $\rho$ :

$$\varepsilon_{CO_2}^{\dagger} = \frac{A^{\dagger}}{v_{carb}^{\dagger} + v_{ox}^{\dagger}} = \alpha_0 \cdot \frac{v_{carb}^{\dagger}}{v_{carb}^{\dagger} + v_{ox}^{\dagger}} + \alpha \cdot \frac{v_{ox}^{\dagger}}{v_{carb}^{\dagger} + v_{ox}^{\dagger}} = \alpha_0 \left(1 - \rho\right) + \alpha \rho \tag{4}$$

We call the performance measure  $\varepsilon_{CO_2}^{\dagger}$  the carbon efficiency of the consumer model. It is positively correlated with  $\alpha$ . For  $\rho = 0.25$ ,  $\varepsilon_{CO_2}^{\dagger}$  is 0.63 for native photorespiration and the glycerate shunt, 0.75 for the carbon-neutral and 1.0 for the carbon-fixing shunts. The carbon-neutral and carbon-fixing shunts are therefore at least 20 and 60% better, respectively, than native photorespiration with respect to carbon efficiency of the consumer model, i.e. given a fixed ratio  $\rho$  of oxygenation and no limitation by the supply of CO<sub>2</sub>, ATP of NADPH.

Next we calculate the average number of ATPs per reaction of Rubisco that are consumed in photorespiration and the Calvin Cycle to regenerate RuBP. This is achieved by dividing  $N_{atp}^{\dagger}$  (Eq. 2) by the total activity of Rubisco,  $v_{carb}^{\dagger} + v_{ox}^{\dagger}$ :

$$\nu_{atp}^{\dagger} = \frac{\beta_0 \, v_{carb}^{\dagger} + \beta \, v_{ox}^{\dagger}}{v_{carb}^{\dagger} + v_{ox}^{\dagger}} = \beta_0 \left(1 - \rho\right) + \beta \, \rho \tag{5}$$

This average in itself it not very useful because it is only meaningful in relation to how many units of CO<sub>2</sub> are fixed on average per reaction of Rubisco. Therefore, to arrive at ATP efficiency, i.e. the number of CO<sub>2</sub> fixed per ATP, we need to divide the carbon efficiency  $\varepsilon_{CO_2}^{\dagger}$  by  $\nu_{atp}^{\dagger}$ :

$$\varepsilon_{atp}^{\dagger} = \frac{\varepsilon_{CO_2}^{\dagger}}{\nu_{atp}^{\dagger}} = \frac{\alpha_0 \left(1 - \rho\right) + \alpha \rho}{\beta_0 \left(1 - \rho\right) + \beta \rho} \tag{6}$$

ATP efficiency is a function of  $\alpha$ ,  $\beta$  and  $\rho$ . For  $\rho = 0.25$ , the ATP efficiencies of native photorespiration and glycerate shunt are 0.2 and 0.21 (i.e. 5.0 and 4.8 ATPs are needed to fix one CO<sub>2</sub>) respectively. All synthetic shunts are more ATP efficient, the Ru1P/Ar5P shunts by 15% ( $\varepsilon_{atp}^{\dagger} = 0.23$ , 4.33 ATPs per CO<sub>2</sub> fixed) and the tartronyl-CoA shunt by 25% ( $\varepsilon_{atp}^{\dagger} = 0.25$ , 4.0 ATPs per CO<sub>2</sub> fixed). The Erythrulose and Xylulose shunts are as ATP efficient as the glycerate shunt. This shows that a higher ATP cost in the photorespiration shunts (i.e.  $\beta \cdot \rho$ ) is more than compensated by the higher carbon efficiency.

If we follow the same procedure for NADPH instead of ATP, we arrive at

$$\nu_{nadp}^{\dagger} = \frac{\gamma_0 \, v_{carb}^{\dagger} + \gamma \, v_{ox}^{\dagger}}{v_{carb}^{\dagger} + v_{ox}^{\dagger}} = \gamma_0 \left(1 - \rho\right) + \gamma \, \rho \tag{7}$$

and

$$\varepsilon_{nadp}^{\dagger} = \frac{\varepsilon_{CO_2}^{\dagger}}{\nu_{nadp}^{\dagger}} = \frac{\alpha_0 \left(1 - \rho\right) + \alpha \rho}{\gamma_0 \left(1 - \rho\right) + \gamma \rho} \tag{8}$$

For native photorespiration, glycerate, all carbon-neutral and tartronyl-CoA shunts  $\varepsilon_{nadp}^{\dagger} = 0.31$ , 0.36, 0.38 and 0.40. The synthetic shunts are 14, 20 and 28% more NADPH efficient than native photorespiration. In summary the consumer model shows that we can expect the synthetic shunts operating alongside the Calvin Cycle to be more energy and carbon efficient than native photorespiration/photosynthesis. Moreover, the carbon-neutral and carbon-fixing shunts are also more efficient than the glycerate shunt.

#### **Rubisco kinetics**

In all of the following, we assume that Rubisco is always saturated with RuBP and that the concentration of RuBP exceeds the concentration of Rubisco. Then

$$v_{carb}^{\dagger} = v_{carb}{}_{-max} \frac{x}{x+k_3} \tag{9}$$

$$v_{ox}^{\dagger} = v_{ox}\_max\,\frac{k_2}{x+k_3}\tag{10}$$

with the following definition for  $k_2$  and  $k_3$ :

$$k_2 = k_c \frac{O}{k_o} \tag{11}$$

$$k_3 = k_c \left(1 + \frac{O}{k_o}\right) \tag{12}$$

#### Supplementary Material

Page 22

The concentration of  $CO_2$  at the site of carboxylation in the stroma  $(C_c)$ , is here given the symbol x.

The parametrisation of Rubisco's carboxylase  $(v_{carb}^{\dagger})$  and oxygenase  $(v_{ox}^{\dagger})$  rates in the consumer model is as follows:  $k_c$  and  $k_o$  are the Michaelis constants for CO<sub>2</sub> and O<sub>2</sub> respectively,  $v_{carb\_max}$  and  $v_{ox\_max}$ are the maximal rates of carboxylase and oxygenase respectively. O is chloroplast O<sub>2</sub> concentration and is assumed to be constant. It is calculated with Henri's law at atmospheric oxygen partial pressure (see Section 2.1.4).

Since  $v_{carb}^{\dagger}$  and  $v_{ox}^{\dagger}$  have the same denominator, it is possible to express one in terms of the other.

$$v_{ox}^{\dagger} = v_{ox\_max} \frac{k_2}{x+k_3} \cdot \frac{v_{carb\_max} \cdot x}{v_{carb\_max} \cdot x} = v_{carb\_max} \frac{x}{x+k_3} \cdot \frac{v_{ox\_max} \cdot k_2}{v_{carb\_max} \cdot x} = v_{carb}^{\dagger} \cdot (\Lambda/x)$$
(13)

with

$$\Lambda = \frac{v_{ox}\_max}{v_{carb}\_max} k_2 = \frac{v_{ox}\_max}{v_{carb}\_max} \frac{k_c}{k_o} O$$
(14)

The <sup>†</sup> superscript indicates that we are still referring to the consumer model of photosynthesis.

#### 2.1.3 Stoichiometric-kinetic model

We now extend the consumer model to a full steady state model that also takes the supply of  $CO_2$ , ATP and NADPH into account. At steady-state, for all three of these, the supply must equal the demand (consumption). This model is in many features very similar to the Farquhar, von Caemmerer and Berry (FvCB) model [2] that has been the cornerstone of most photosynthetic models in the past 30 years. However, we extend and generalise the model, both to our new synthetic shunts and to previously neglected limitations, namely limitations by the enzymatic activities of Calvin Cycle and photorespiration enzymes.

The overall carbon fixation rate A is a function of the environmentally controlled variables light irradiance (I) and intercellular carbon dioxide concentration  $(C_i)$ . The latter is the CO<sub>2</sub> concentration in the intercellular airspaces inside the leaf that are connected to the outside via stomata (pores) on the leaf's surface. CO<sub>2</sub> diffuses from the atmosphere into intercellular airspaces and from there into the photosynthetic (mesophyll) cells. Plants can regulate the amount of CO<sub>2</sub> that diffuses into the intercellular airspaces (which is correlated to water loss) according to their needs (which can change with e.g. temperature and water status), by opening or closing their stomata. Thus, intercellular CO<sub>2</sub> concentration can vary considerably. At any given combination of I and  $C_i$ , A can be described as the minimum of six rates (we ignore limitation by product removal since this only occurs at very high carbon concentrations, well above physiological levels):

$$A = \min\{A_{rbc}, A_{atp}, A_{nadp}, A_{cbb}, A_{pr}, A_{cbx}\}$$

$$(15)$$

The carbon fixation rate is either limited by Rubisco  $(A_{rbc})$ , light, or a second enzyme in either the Calvin Cycle, native photorespiration or the shunt replacing native photorespiration. Light limits both NADPH  $(A_{nadp})$  and ATP  $(A_{atp})$  production and in different circumstances one or the other

can become limiting. As to a second limiting enzyme, we differentiate between enzymes in the Calvin Cycle proper  $(A_{cbb})$  or in native photorespiration / a photorespiration shunt  $(A_{pr})$ . Moreover, when a second carboxylating enzyme is present, as in the carbon-fixing shunt, we treat this enzyme separately  $(A_{cbx})$  because its rate, unlike the others, depends on the concentration of CO<sub>2</sub> in the chloroplast.

In contrast to the FvCB model [2, 3], which is routinely applied to experimental data on photosynthesis, we prefer a 'bottom-up' approach, i.e. we determine chloroplast CO<sub>2</sub> concentration from quadratic equations and A is then calculated from the diffusion equation (Eq. 16; in the FvCB model this sequence is reversed). Since chloroplast CO<sub>2</sub> ( $C_c$ ) has such a central role in our models we give it the symbol x.

$$A = g_i (C_i - x) x = \max\{x_{rbc}, x_{atp}, x_{nadp}, x_{cbb}, x_{pr}, x_{cbx}\}$$
(16)

We omit the day respiration rate from our description since it only adds an offset to the apparent  $C_i$ . The indices of x have the same meaning as for A. In each case it implies a steady state where only the corresponding limitation is in force.

What is not explicitly stated in Eq. 15 is that  $CO_2$  diffusion itself is co-limiting no matter what other limitation we impose because we will never assume (except earlier in the consumer model) that  $CO_2$ supply is unlimited. This is the consequence of the finite and limiting value of  $g_i$  (in relation to  $v_{carb\_max}$ ) which is small enough to lead to a non-negligible difference between  $C_i$  and x, and x needs to be positive. Therefore, in the following, any specific limitation defined in Eq. 15 by implication also means  $CO_2$  diffusion co-limitation.

#### Calculating steady-state chloroplast CO<sub>2</sub> concentration

At steady state,  $CO_2$  diffusion into the chloroplast has to be equal to  $CO_2$  fixation in the chloroplast.

$$A = g_i \left( C_i - x \right) = v_{carb} + \alpha \, v_{ox} \tag{17}$$

Equally,

$$v_{carb} = v_{ox} \cdot (x/\Lambda) \tag{18}$$

and the fundamental diffusion equation (Eq. 17) can be succinctly written as

$$A = g_i \left( C_i - x \right) = v_{carb} \left( 1 + \alpha \Lambda / x \right) \tag{19}$$

or

$$A = g_i \left( C_i - x \right) = v_{ox} \left( x/\Lambda + \alpha \right) \tag{20}$$

#### Rubisco rate parametrisation

We have been careful to distinguish between A and  $A^{\dagger}$ , and also between  $v_{carb}$ ,  $v_{ox}$  and its counterparts  $v_{carb}^{\dagger}$ ,  $v_{ox}^{\dagger}$ , indicating either the supply-demand (no superscript) or the consumer model (with <sup>†</sup>) respectively. The reason we do this is to address a problem that becomes apparent if one expresses the steady-state model in terms of x, the chloroplast CO<sub>2</sub> concentration, and not in terms of A, as in the FvCB model. If we solve Eq. 17 assuming  $v_{carb} = v_{carb}^{\dagger}$  and  $v_{ox} = v_{ox}^{\dagger}$ , i.e. the Rubisco parametrisation introduced earlier (Eqs 9 and 10)), we obtain a single solution for  $x = x_{rbc}$  and fixed values of  $g_i$  and  $C_i$ as well as Rubisco kinetic constants. This implies that there can be no other steady state than  $x = x_{rbc}$ if none of of these parameters change. On the other it is clear that other steady states must exist, e.g. when light is limiting. The FvCB model does not propose that the aforementioned parameters change (this is a justifiable simplification), and as a matter of fact it does not explain how other steady states are possible that simultaneously fullfil the diffusion equation Eq. 17 and the Rubisco rate equations Eq. 9 and 10. The conundrum is hidden rather than resolved in the FvCB model. The focus on Ainstead of x avoids the issue we describe here.

We, too, do not propose that parameters such as  $g_i$  and  $C_i$  need to change to make other steady states possible. Rather, we introduce a new parameter, the attenuation factor  $\tau$  that scales down both the oxygenase and carboxylase activity of Rubisco such that steady states at lower carbon fixation rates (e.g. light limitation) become feasible. This can be easily understood as the down-regulation, inhibition or inactivation of Rubisco at low light. From this perspective,  $\tau$  is the proportion of active enzyme remaining. Thus we define the oxygenase and carboxylase rate as

$$v_{carb} = \tau \cdot v_{carb}{}_{max} \frac{x}{x+k_3} = \tau \cdot v_{carb}^{\dagger}$$
(21)

$$v_{ox} = \tau \cdot v_{ox} \max \frac{k_2}{x + k_3} = \tau \cdot v_{ox}^{\dagger}$$
(22)

and

$$\tau = \frac{A}{A^{\dagger}} = \frac{g_i \left(C_i - x\right)}{v_{carb}^{\dagger} + \alpha \cdot v_{ox}^{\dagger}}$$
$$= \frac{g_i \left(C_i - x\right)}{v_{carb} - max \frac{x + \alpha \Lambda}{x + k_3}}$$
$$0 \le \tau \le 1$$
(23)

The introduction of  $\tau$  makes steady states at net carbon fixation rates less than  $A^{\dagger}$  possible. Importantly, this is not the frivolous introduction of a new parameter, but rather the necessary amendment of the FvCB model in which the light limited chloroplast CO<sub>2</sub> concentration cannot simultaneously fulfil the diffusion and the Rubisco rate equations. Far from constituting an additional degree of freedom, the the new parameter  $\tau$  is fully determined in every limitation that the FvCB model deals with, as we shall see in the following. For each limitation there is a  $(x, \tau)$  pair that fulfils all the equations.

#### Rubisco limited rate $A_{rbc}$

To begin with, we look at the situation where Rubisco is limiting. By this we mean the situation where there is unlimited supply of NADPH and ATP (e.g. at saturating light) and no other enzyme that is limiting. Therefore the steady state is a trade-off between CO<sub>2</sub> diffusion (supply) and Rubisco-dependent carbon fixation (demand) only. We assume under these conditions that Rubisco is fully activated i.e.  $\tau = 1$  and  $A = A^{\dagger}$ . With the definitions of Eqs 17, 21, and 22, we obtain

$$A_{rbc} = g_i \left( C_i - x_{rbc} \right) = \tau \cdot v_{carb\_max} \frac{x_{rbc}}{x_{rbc} + k_3} + \tau \cdot \alpha \, v_{ox\_max} \frac{k_2}{x_{rbc} + k_3}$$
$$= v_{carb\_max} \frac{x_{rbc}}{x_{rbc} + k_3} + \alpha \, v_{ox\_max} \frac{k_2}{x_{rbc} + k_3}$$
$$= v_{carb\_max} \frac{x_{rbc} + \alpha \Lambda}{x_{rbc} + k_3}$$
(24)

After rearranging Eq. 24 we obtain a quadratic equation that has a single positive solution (assuming all parameters other than x are fixed). In other words, the value  $x = x_{rbc}$  is the only (positive) value of x that fulfils the above equation given that  $\tau = 1$ . The generic solution is

$$x = \frac{-b + \sqrt{b^2 - 4ac}}{2a} \tag{25}$$

with the following coefficients when solving for  $x_{rbc}$ .

$$a = 1$$

$$b = \frac{v_{carb} \max}{g_i} + k_3 - C_i$$

$$c = \alpha \frac{v_{carb} \max \Lambda}{g_i} - C_i k_3$$
(26)

The rate  $A_{rbc}$  is then calculated by substituting  $x_{rbc}$  into Eq. 17.

#### **NADPH** limitation

Light irradiance (I) is converted to electron flux (J) and this in turn is used to generate ATP and NADPH. The equations for the first part of this process [4], i.e. conversion of I to J, are described in the Section 2.1.4.

We now make the assumption that when NADPH is limiting a stoichiometric amount of NADPH is made from the available electron flux J, i.e. that the rate of supply of NADPH equals J/2 (two electrons make one NADPH). Since we know how many NADPHs are needed to sustain one turn of the Calvin Cycle (i.e.  $\gamma_0 = 2$ ) and equally how many NADPHs are needed for one turn of a photorespiration cycle (depending on the pathway, e.g.  $\gamma = 2$  in native photorespiration), we can calculate the rate of demand for NADPH as a function of  $v_{ox}$  and  $v_{carb}$ . In this manner we obtain a relationship between the light-dependent supply and the Rubisco-dependent demand for NADPH.

$$0.5 J = \gamma_0 v_{carb} + \gamma v_{ox} = v_{carb} \left(\gamma_0 + \gamma \Lambda / x_{nadp}\right) \tag{27}$$

On the left side of the equation we have the supply of NADPH. The factor of 0.5 reflects that two electrons are needed for the production of one NADPH. On the right side of the equation, the demand for NADPH is expressed in terms of the flux through the carboxylating and oxygenating cycle.  $\gamma_0 = 2$  is the number of NADPHs consumed in the Calvin Cycle and  $\gamma$  is the number NADPHs consumed in the photorespiration shunt.

Next, we arrange Eq. 27, such that we can substitute  $v_{carb}$  with an expression containing only J,  $x_{nadp}$  and fixed parameters.

$$v_{carb} = 0.5 J \frac{x_{nadp}}{\gamma_0 x_{nadp} + \gamma \Lambda}$$
<sup>(28)</sup>

Clearly there is an upper limit of  $v_{carb}$  that can be expressed in terms of J:

$$\lim_{x_{nadp} \to \infty} v_{carb} = \frac{0.5 J}{\gamma_0} = \frac{J}{4}$$
(29)

On substituting Eq. 28 into the diffusion equation (Eq. 17), we obtain

$$A_{nadp} = g_i \left( C_i - x_{nadp} \right) = v_{carb} + \alpha \cdot v_{ox}$$
  
=  $v_{carb} \cdot \left( 1 + \alpha / x_{nadp} \right)$   
=  $0.5 J \frac{x_{nadp}}{\gamma_0 x_{nadp} + \gamma \Lambda} \cdot \left( 1 + \alpha / x_{nadp} \right)$   
=  $0.5 J \frac{x_{nadp} + \alpha \Lambda}{\gamma_0 x_{nadp} + \gamma \Lambda}$   
=  $\frac{J}{2 \gamma_0} \cdot \frac{x_{nadp} + \alpha \Lambda}{x_{nadp} + \frac{\gamma}{\gamma_0} \Lambda}$  (30)

The similarities to Eq. 24 are evident. This also leads to a quadratic equation in  $x_{nadp}$  with the generic solution given in Eq. 25. Here the coefficients are

$$a = \gamma_0$$
  

$$b = \frac{0.5 J}{g_i} + \gamma \Lambda - \gamma_0 C_i$$
  

$$c = \alpha \frac{0.5 J \Lambda}{g_i} - C_i \gamma \Lambda$$
(31)

The rearrangement of Eq. 27 and the subsequent substitution of  $v_{carb}$  (Eq. 30), which is analogously done in the FvCB model, effectively makes  $\tau$  disappear: The final equation does no longer contain the maximal rates of Rubisco, be they scaled by  $\tau$  or not. That is why our model, with  $\tau$ , is equivalent to FvCB without  $\tau$ . However, our model allows us to back-substitute the steady-state solution  $x_{nadp}$  into the first line of Eq. 30 and then use the definition of Eq. 21 and 22:

$$A_{nadp} = g_i \left( C_i - x_{nadp} \right) = v_{carb} + \alpha \cdot v_{ox}$$
  
$$= \tau \cdot v_{carb} \max \frac{x_{nadp}}{x_{nadp} + k_3} + \alpha \cdot \tau \cdot v_{ox} \max \frac{k_2}{x_{nadp} + k_3}$$
  
$$= \tau \cdot v_{carb} \max \frac{x_{nadp} + \alpha \cdot \Lambda}{x_{nadp} + k_3}$$
(32)

Here is the point where the FvCB model breaks because it implies  $\tau = 1$ . The absurd conclusion would be that there is only a steady-state where  $x_{nadp} = x_{rbc}$  and  $A_{nadp} = A_{rbc}$ .

The value of  $\tau$  can be calculated with Eq. 22

$$\tau = \frac{g_i \left(C_i - x_{nadp}\right)}{v_{carb} max \frac{x_{nadp} + \alpha \Lambda}{x_{nadp} + k_3}}$$

$$= \frac{0.5 J \frac{x_{nadp} + \alpha \Lambda}{\gamma_0 x_{nadp} + \gamma \Lambda}}{v_{carb} max \frac{x_{nadp} + \alpha \Lambda}{x_{nadp} + k_3}}$$

$$= \frac{0.5 J \cdot (x_{nadp} + k_3)}{v_{carb} max \cdot (\gamma_0 x_{nadp} + \gamma \Lambda)}$$
(33)

The amount of down-regulation of Rubisco that  $\tau$  represents depends on  $\gamma$  but not on  $\alpha$ . Since the carbon-neutral pathway and native photorespiration have the same  $\gamma$ , the amount of down-regulation represented in  $\tau$  is the same. However, their NADPH-limited assimilation rates  $A_{nadp}$  are not the same because of the higher carbon efficiency of the carbon-neutral pathway.

### ATP limitation

ATP limitation works in exactly the same way as NADPH limitation with two differences:  $\beta$  replaces  $\gamma$  and the number of ATP molecules per electron is 0.75 (we assume that per electron, 3 protons are pumped and that 4 protons are required to make one ATP), not 0.5. Thus

$$A_{atp} = g_i \left( C_i - x_{atp} \right) = 0.75 J \frac{x_{atp} + \alpha \Lambda}{\beta_0 x_{atp} + \beta \Lambda}$$
(34)

The solution to the quadratic is given in Eq. 25 with the coefficients

$$a = \beta_0$$
  

$$b = \frac{0.75 J}{g_i} + \beta \Lambda - \beta_0 C_i$$
  

$$c = \alpha \frac{0.75 J \Lambda}{g_i} - C_i \beta \Lambda$$
(35)

The value of  $\tau$  can be calculated with Eq. 22

$$\tau = \frac{g_i \left(C_i - x_{atp}\right)}{v_{carb} \max \frac{x_{atp} + \alpha \Lambda}{x_{atp} + k_3}}$$

$$= \frac{0.75 J \cdot (x_{atp} + k_3)}{v_{carb} \max \cdot (\beta_0 x_{atp} + \beta \Lambda)}$$
(36)

#### Limitation by a Calvin Cycle enzyme

The FvCB model considers only a subset of the limitations of supply-demand model, namely limitation by Rubisco or light at physiological  $C_i$ . Since this model is ubiquitously applied we define the restricted supply-demanded model fixation rate explicitly as

$$A^* = \min(A_{rbc}, A_{nadp}, A_{atp}) \tag{37}$$

As this definition shows, the FvCB model assumes that none of the Calvin Cycle enzymes other than Rubisco or light are limiting carbon assimilation. This may not always be the case. For example, it has been shown that the activity of sedoheptulose-bisphosphatase (SBPase) can be rate limiting [5]. SBPase, like all other Calvin Cycle enzymes, also participates in native photorespiration because the molecules of PGA that are the outcome of native photorespiration also need to be converted into RuBP. In general, the flux of a given Calvin Cycle enzyme  $v_{cbb}$  can be expressed as

$$v_{cbb} = \eta_{ox} \, v_{ox} + \eta_{carb} \, v_{carb} \tag{38}$$

The values of  $\eta_{ox}$  and  $\eta_{carb}$  depend entirely on the stoichiometry of the Calvin Cycle and photorespiration or the synthetic photorespiratory shunt replacing it. They can be read off Table 4. For many enzymes  $\eta_{ox} = \eta_{carb}$ .

#### Parametrisation of a Calvin Cycle enzyme

We parametrize  $v_{cbb}$  with reversible Michaelis-Menten kinetics adopting the decomposition of [6]. Here the definitions are given for a uni-uni reaction but they can be easily applied to more complex reaction schemes.

$$v = v^{+} \cdot \frac{S/K_{s}}{1 + S/K_{s} + P/K_{p}} \cdot (1 - \frac{P/S}{K'_{eq}})$$
(39)

The three factors in this decomposition are the forward maximal rate , the fractional saturation and the thermodynamic driving force of the reaction. The maximal rate is defined by  $v^+ = k_{cat}^+ \cdot E$ , where E is the total concentration of enzyme and  $k_{cat}^+$  is the maximal forward rate per unit of enzyme. S and P are the concentrations of substrate and product respectively, and  $K_s$  and  $K_p$  are their respective Michaelis constants.  $K'_{eq}$  is the ratio of P to S at equilibrium.

We now combine all three terms of Eq. 39 into a single parameter  $\varphi$  that combines saturation and driving force and expresses the maximal rate in units of the maximal carboxylase rate of Rubisco:

	$\eta_{carb}$	$\eta_{ox}$					
Pathway	Calvin cycle	Native $PR^a$	TrCoA	Ru1P	Ar5P	Eu	Xu
Phosphoglycerate kinase	2	1.5	2	1			
GAP DH	2	1.5 2		1			
Sink	1/3	-1/6 $1/3$ 0					
TPI	2/3			1	0	1	1
Aldolase	2/3			0	0	1	1
FBPase	1/3			0	0	0	1
Transketolase	2/3			0	0	1	0
SBPase	1/3			0	0	1	0
Isomerase	1/3		0	0	1	0	
Epimerase	2/3		0	0	0	1	
Phosphoribulokinase	1		0	1	1	1	

**Table 4:** Flux distribution of the Calvin cycle and photorespiratory bypasses. The table gives the stoichiometric coefficient  $\eta$  for each enzyme. The table gives the stoichiometric coefficient  $\eta$  for each enzyme, that has to be multiplied with the respective base rates,  $v_{carb}$  and  $v_{ox}$ . The total flux through an enzyme is the superposition of the fluxes originating from RuBP oxygenase and carboxylase (Eq. 38). Note that all pathways that channel G2P back to PGA have the same coefficients below the sink. The reason for this is that the entire flux goes via the regenerative part of the Calvin cycle. The carbon neutral shunts do not proceed in this manner, and there are differences within that group. The Ru1P and Ar5P shunts effectively bypass the majority of enzymes of the regenerative phase of the pentose catalyse two reactions each so their coefficient is the sum of the two reactions. Furthermore it is assumed that the Calvin cycle aldolase does not catalyse the aldolase reactions of the Ru1P and Ar5P shunts, but that transketolase does catalyse the transketolase reaction of the Ru1P and Ar5P shunts were the reactions each so their coefficient is the sum of the two reactions. Furthermore it is assumed that the Calvin cycle aldolase does not catalyse the aldolase reactions of the Ru1P and Ar5P shunts, but that transketolase does catalyse the transketolase reaction of the Eu shunt. <sup>a</sup> The values of  $\eta$  are the same for native photorespiration and the TSA shunt.

$$\varphi = \frac{v}{v_{carb\ max}} = \frac{v^+ \cdot \frac{S/K_s}{1+S/K_s+P/K_p} \cdot \left(1 - \frac{P/S}{K'_{eq}}\right)}{v_{carb\ max}}$$
(40)

 $\varphi$  can be interpreted as the maximal rate scaled by the saturation of the enzyme and the thermodynamic driving force. expressed as a fraction of  $v_{carb}$  max

Thus,

$$v_{cbb} = \varphi_{cbb} \cdot v_{carb} max \tag{41}$$

The advantage of this approach is that all the unknowns (in particular substrate concentrations) are condensed into a single scaling factor  $\varphi_{cbb}$ . Whenever the total activity of a Calvin Cycle enzyme is known (e.g. from the literature), it can be used to remove the effect of  $v^+$ .

#### Generic solution

The Calvin Cycle enzyme limited carbon-fixation rate can be found by expressing  $v_{ox}$  in terms of  $v_{cbb}$ and substituting this result into a diffusion equation that is also expressed in terms of  $v_{ox}$  (of course we could have used  $v_{carb}$  instead of  $v_{ox}$  in both cases). We are using the transformation  $v_{carb} = v_{ox} \cdot x/\Lambda$ .

$$v_{cbb} = \eta_{ox} v_{ox} + \eta_{carb} v_{carb} = v_{ox} (\eta_{ox} + \eta_{carb} \cdot x_{cbb} / \Lambda)$$
  
$$\Leftrightarrow v_{ox} = \frac{v_{cbb}}{\eta_{ox} + \eta_{carb} \cdot x_{cbb} / \Lambda}$$
(42)

In the rearranged diffusion equation A is expressed in terms of  $v_{ox}$ :

$$A_{cbb} = g_i \left( C_i - x_{cbb} \right) = v_{carb} + \alpha \, v_{ox} = v_{ox} \cdot \left( x_{cbb} / \Lambda + \alpha \right) \tag{43}$$

Combining these two equation yields

$$A_{cbb} = g_i \left( C_i - x_{cbb} \right) = v_{cbb} \frac{x_{cbb}/\Lambda + \alpha}{\eta_{ox} + \eta_{carb} \cdot x_{cbb}/\Lambda} = v_{cbb} \frac{x_{cbb} + \alpha \cdot \Lambda}{\eta_{carb} \cdot x_{cbb} + \eta_{ox} \cdot \Lambda}$$
(44)

which is a quadratic in  $x_{cbb}$ . The only positive root is defined by the coefficients

$$a = \eta_{carb}$$
  

$$b = v_{cbb}/g_i + \eta_{ox} \cdot \Lambda - \eta_{carb} \cdot C_i$$
  

$$c = \Lambda \cdot (\alpha \cdot v_{cbb}/g_i - \eta_{ox} \cdot C_i)$$
(45)

#### Native photorespiration

On examination of Table 4, one observes that  $\eta_{ox}$  is equal to  $\eta_{carb}$  for a large subset of Calvin Cycle enzymes in native photorespiration and for all Calvin Cycle enzymes in the tartronyl-CoA pathway (but not in the carbon-neutral shunts). The subset of enzymes in native photorespiration consists of all enzymes beyond GAP (where the sink is situated) and includes all enzymes that are known to be poorly expressed, i.e. SBPase, FBPase, transketolase and aldolase [7, 8]. With this in mind, we can afford to ignore the general case  $\eta_{ox} \neq \eta_{carb}$ . Instead, for these two pathways we set  $\eta_{ox} = \eta_{carb}$ :

$$A_{cbb} = g_i \left( C_i - x_{cbb} \right) = v_{cbb} \frac{x_{cbb} + \alpha \cdot \Lambda}{\eta_{carb} \cdot x_{cbb} + \eta_{carb} \cdot \Lambda} = \frac{v_{cbb}}{\eta_{carb}} \cdot \frac{x_{cbb} + \alpha \cdot \Lambda}{x_{cbb} + \Lambda}$$
(46)

If  $\alpha = -0.5$  as in native photorespiration, this is again a quadratic and the solution is given in Eq. 45.

#### Tatronyl-CoA shunt

However when  $\alpha = 1$ , the second fraction of Eq. 46 is equal to one and the solution is

$$A_{cbb} = v_{cbb} / \eta_{carb} \tag{47}$$

Therefore, in the tartronyl-CoA pathway, the rate of carbon fixation when a Calvin Cycle enzymes is limiting takes on a very simple form (Eq. 47) that is not dependent on  $C_i$ , i.e. it is always the same no matter what the CO<sub>2</sub> concentrations inside and outside the chloroplast are. In contrast, the rate of fixation of native photorespiration (Eq. 44) depends on the CO<sub>2</sub> concentrations  $x_{cbb}$  and  $C_i$ . The fixation rate A is proportional to the fraction  $\frac{\Lambda + \alpha x_{cbb}}{\Lambda + x_{cbb}} < 1$  for any positive value of  $x_{cbb}$  and  $\alpha = -0.5$ . Thus, the carbon-fixing shunt always achieves a higher fixation rate A than native photorespiration at a fixed but limiting rate  $v_{cbb}$ .

#### The Ru1P/Ar5P carbon-neutral shunts

Here, Table 4 tells us that  $\eta_{ox}$  is not equal to  $\eta_{carb}$  for all enzymes. However, these carbon-neutral shunts redirects all flux resulting from photorespiration away from the regenerative part of the pentose phosphate pathway;  $\eta_{ox}$  is zero for all Calvin Cycle enzymes situated between the triose phosphates and Ru5P/RuBP. For these enzymes that, as stated earlier, are the ones most likely to be limiting in vivo, we arrive at a much simpler version of Eq. 44: if we substitute  $\alpha = 0$  (carbon-neutral shunts) and  $\eta_{ox} = 0$ , we arrive at

$$A_{cbb} = g_i \left( C_i - x_{cbb} \right) = v_{cbb} \frac{x_{cbb} + 0 \cdot \Lambda}{\eta_{carb} \cdot x_{cbb} + 0 \cdot \Lambda} = v_{cbb} / \eta_{carb}$$
(48)

This is the same result we obtained for the carbon-fixing shunt. By the same token, the limitation by a Calvin Cycle enzyme in these carbon-neutral shunts is also independent of  $CO_2$  concentrations and always higher than native photorespiration at a fixed and limiting value of  $v_{cbb}$ .

#### The Erythrulose/Xylulose carbon-neutral shunts

These pathways have have several things in common: flux through aldolase and one of the bisphosphatases (FBPase and SBPase). This is a case for the generic equation (Eq. 45).

#### Limitation by a photorespiration shunt enzyme

The argument for a photorespiration shunt enzyme is analogous to the previous section.

First we observe that  $v_{pr}$ , the flux a photorespiration enzyme has to carry, is equal to  $v_{ox}$  in all synthetic shunts.

In the tartronyl-CoA pathway, photorespiratory enzymes operate between phosphoglycolate and phosphoglycerate. Since the pathway is linear, it is easy to see that the flux at each step has to be equal to  $v_{ox}$ . In contrast, in the arabinose-5P pathway, 2PG is first converted to glycolaldehyde (GA) in a linear chain of reactions. The flux has to be equal to  $v_{ox}$ . In the next step, GA is stoichiometrically combined with GAP (which is produced by Calvin Cycle enzymes); the rate again has to be equal to  $v_{ox}$  if GA is to be produced and consumed at the same rate (i.e. at steady state). The amount of GAP that is produced from every RuBP oxygenase reaction is also equal to  $v_{ox}$ . The remainder of the pathway is linear, and has to be equal to  $v_{ox}$  (Table 4). Therefore the rate of every enzyme of the arabinose-5P pathway has to be equal to  $v_{ox}$ . The argument would be analogous for the other carbon-neutral shunts described in the main text.

Native photorespiration is more complicated: it is linear in character, however, the flux stoichiometry changes from 1 to 0.5 times the flux of  $v_{ox}$  at the decarboxylation step that is carried out by the glycine cleavage complex. Therefore we define

$$v_{pr} = \epsilon \cdot v_{ox} \tag{49}$$

where  $\epsilon$  is always equal to one for all synthetic shunts, also equal to one for all enzymes in native photorespiration leading up to the decarboxylation reaction and 0.5 thereafter (and also the transaminases and the ammonia refixation reactions). To be conservative, i.e. to assume the conditions that are most favourable to native photorespiration and the glycerate shunt, we can simply use  $\epsilon = 0.5$ , so requirements for a photorespiration enzyme are only half that for an enzyme in a synthetic shunt.

Next we parametrise this enzyme with reversible Michaelis-Menten kinetics and simplify by introducing the scaling factor  $\varphi_{pr}$  in the same manner as we did for the Calvin Cycle enzyme (Eq.41).

$$v_{pr} = \varphi_{pr} \cdot v_{carb} \max$$
<sup>(50)</sup>

We combine the rearranged diffusion equation (Eq. 43) with results from the previous two equations:

$$A_{pr} = g_i \left( C_i - x_{pr} \right) = v_{ox} \left( x_{pr} / \Lambda + \alpha \right)$$
  
=  $v_{pr} / \epsilon \cdot \left( x_{pr} / \Lambda + \alpha \right)$   
=  $\varphi_{pr} \cdot v_{carb} \max \cdot \left( x_{pr} / \Lambda + \alpha \right) / \epsilon$  (51)

Solving for  $x_{pr}$  yields

$$x_{pr} = \frac{C_i - \alpha \frac{\varphi_{pr} \cdot v_{carb\_max}}{\epsilon g_i}}{1 + \frac{\varphi_{pr} \cdot v_{carb\_max}}{\epsilon q_i \Lambda}}$$
(52)

#### Limitation by a photorespiratory shunt enzyme that is a carboxylase

We now investigate the more difficult case where the photorespiration shunt enzyme is a carboxylase, and hence its rate will depend on x directly. The argument is very similar to a non-carboxylating enzyme therefore we can use Eq. 49 without modification except that we call the rate of the carboxylating enzyme  $v_{cbx}$  and not  $v_{pr}$ . The reaction it catalysis is

$$S + CO_2 \rightarrow P$$
 (53)

The difference appears in the parametrisation of the kinetic rate  $v_{cbx}$ :

$$v_{cbx} = v_{cbx}{}_{max} \frac{x}{x + K_{cbx}} \cdot \frac{S}{S + K_M} = \varphi_{cbx} v_{carb}{}_{max} \frac{x}{x + K_{cbx}}$$
(54)

As in the previous section,  $\varphi_{pr}$  is a scaling factor expressed in units of  $v_{carb\_max}$  that include the saturation with all substrates other than CO<sub>2</sub>, in this case the acceptor molecule of the carboxylation reaction.  $v_{cbx\_max}$  is the maximal rate.  $K_{cbx}$  is the apparent Michaelis constant for CO<sub>2</sub>. When the substrate of the carboxylase is HCO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup>, we calculate  $K_{cbx}$  based on the assumption that CO<sub>2</sub> is in equilibrium with HCO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> due to the activity of carbonic anhydrase in the chloroplast. The carboxylases for HCO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> is in the range of  $1 \, mM$  [9]. Since the equilibrium constant for the hydration of carbon dioxide is about 100 in favour of HCO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> we arrive at  $K_{cbx} = 1 \, mM/100 = 10 \, \mu M$  at a pH of 8.0 and an ionic strength of 0.25 which are the conditions in the stroma of the chloroplast (see Section 2.1.4).

Finally, we substitute Eq. 54 into the rearranged diffusion equation (Eq. 43). We also set  $\alpha = 1$  since this only applies to the carbon-fixing shunt.

$$A_{cbx} = g_i (C_i - x) = v_{ox} (x/\Lambda + 1)$$
  
=  $v_{cbx} (x/\Lambda + 1)$   
=  $\varphi_{cbx} v_{carb} max (x/\Lambda + 1) \frac{x}{x + K_{cbx}}$  (55)

The equation is again quadratic in x and the generic solution is given in Eq. 25 with the coefficients

$$a = 1 + \frac{\varphi_{cbx} v_{carb} max}{g_i \Lambda}$$
  

$$b = \alpha \frac{\varphi_{cbx} v_{carb} max}{g_i} + K_{cbx} - C_i$$
  

$$c = -C_i K_{cbx}$$
(56)

#### 2.1.4 Physicochemical parameters

#### Henri's law

The solubility of a gas like  $CO_2$  or  $O_2$  in water is given by Henri's law [10]

$$c_{aq} = p_{gas} \cdot k_H \tag{57}$$

where  $c_{aq}$  is the molar concentration of the gas in solution,  $p_{gas}$  is the partial pressure of the gas and  $k_H$  is Henri's constant. For CO<sub>2</sub>,  $k_H = 0.034 \ M \ (atm)^{-1}$  at 25 ° C (298.15 K). The partial pressure of CO<sub>2</sub> in the intercellular airspace when the stomate are open is about 220 ppm [11], therefore the equivalent concentration of CO<sub>2</sub> in water at 25 ° C is 7.5  $\mu M$ . The temperature dependence of  $k_H$  can be expressed in the form of the van't Hoff equation [10]:

$$k_H(T) = k_H(T_{ref}) \cdot e^{C \cdot (\frac{1}{T} - \frac{1}{T_{ref}})}$$
(58)

The constant C = 2400 K for CO<sub>2</sub>; T is absolute temperature and  $T_{ref}$  is the reference temperature, 298.15 K. For example, at 30 ° C,  $k_H$  is 12% lower than at 25 ° C.

For O<sub>2</sub>, Henri's constant is  $k_H = 0.0013 M (atm)^{-1}$  and the temperature dependency is C = 1700 K.

#### The equilibrium constant and steady state concentration of HCO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup>

It is assumed that the concentration of aqueous  $CO_2$  (representing both the species of  $CO_2(aq)$  and  $H_2CO_3$ ) is in equilibrium with the gaseous phase (see Henri's law). Furthermore, dissolved  $CO_2$  is assumed to be in equilibrium with  $HCO_3^-$  by the action of carbonic anhydrase. Then the concentration of  $HCO_3^-$  is given by

$$HCO_3^- = K_{eq} \cdot CO_2 \tag{59}$$

where  $K_{eq}$  is the equilibrium constant of the combined hydration and dissociation reaction

$$CO_2 + H_2O \iff HCO_3^- + H^+$$
 (60)

 $K_{eq}$  is often expressed on the log scale as a  $pK_a$ ,

$$K_{eq} = 10^{-pK_a} \Leftrightarrow pK_a = -log_{10}(K_{eq}) \tag{61}$$

so that the well-known Henderson-Hasselbach [12] equation can be applied to find the concentration of  $HCO_3^-$  when pH, the  $pK_a$  and the concentration of  $CO_2$  are known.

$$pH = pK_a + \log_{10} \frac{HCO_3^-}{CO_2} \Leftrightarrow HCO_3^- = CO_2 \cdot 10^{pH - pK_a}$$
(62)

#### Calculating the $pK_a$

The  $pK_a$  for Eq. 60 is often over- or underestimated because it is either measured in pure water or seawater, while the chloroplast has a salinity and ionic strength between pure water and saltwater.

Empirical formulae for this  $pK_a$  have been developed, depending on (absolute) temperature T and salinity S. According to Roy et al.[13] the  $ln(K_{eq})$  (not the decadic logarithm) is calculated with:

$$ln(K_{eq}) = a_1 + \frac{a_2}{T} + a_3 ln(T) + (b_1 + \frac{b_2}{T}) S^{0.5} + c S + d S^{1.5}$$
(63)
With the parameters

$$a_{1} = 2.83655$$

$$a_{2} = -2307.1266$$

$$a_{3} = -1.5529413$$

$$b_{1} = -0.20760841$$

$$b_{2} = -4.0484$$

$$c = 0.08468345$$

$$d = -.00654208$$
(64)

The  $pK_a$  on the more common negative decadic logarithm scale is

$$pK_a = log_{10}(exp(ln(K_{eq}))) \tag{65}$$

### Salinity and ionic strength

The above formulae have been developed for and applied to seawater where salinity is well-defined. The term has some correspondence to the ionic strength (I) of intracellular fluids, however, since both salinity and ionic strength depend on the composition of the 'salts' in solution, again an empirical conversion has to be used [14]:

$$I = \frac{19.92 S}{1 + 1.005 S} \Leftrightarrow S = \frac{I}{19.92 + 1.005 I}$$
(66)

### Calculation of $K_{eq}$ in the chloroplast

We assume that the pH in the chloroplast is 8.0 [15] and that ionic strength is 0.25 [16]. The latter corresponds to a salinity of 0.14 (roughly 40% of the salinity of seawater, Eq. 61). Applying Eq. 64, we obtain a  $pK_a$  of 5.98. Since there are close to two pH units between the  $pK_a$  and the pH, the equilibrium contant is  $K_{eq} = 10^2 = 100$ . This is the value we use in our calculations.

### Mathematical model of the light reactions

The light reactions are modelled by the empirical equation [17]

$$J = \frac{I_2 + J_{max} - \sqrt{(I_2 + J_{max})^2 - 4\theta J_{max} I_2}}{2\theta}$$
(67)

where

$$I_2 = \frac{a\left(1-f\right)}{2} \cdot I \tag{68}$$

 $I_2$  is the amount of light photosystem II absorbs; a = 0.85 is the absorptance of leaves, f = 0.15 is a correction for spectral quality. The denominator of two is a consequence of each photosystem absorbing half of the light. I is irradiance and  $\theta = 0.7$  is a curvature factor (values taken from [3].  $J_{max}$  is the maximal electron flux.

#### Light limitation

When light is limiting, the model is either ATP or NADPH limited (Eq. 34 and Eq. 30 respectively). However, at steady state the correct amounts of both ATP and NADPH that are dictated by the stoichiometry of the Calvin Cycle and photorespiration need to be produced. We take the approach that we assume that the amount of ATP that is produced is limiting, and that the excess of NADPH that would produced by linear electron flow at the required electron flux for ATP production is by some mechanism corrected to the necessary stoichiometric amount. It has been shown that in this scenario, the maximal capacity of the electron chain can be extrapolated by calculating  $J_{max} = 2.3 \cdot v_{carb}max}$  [18]. Conversely, we could have used the approach that assumes that NADPH is limiting, in which case the ratio of  $J_{max}$  to  $v_{carb}max}$  would be close to 2.0. Both approaches give very similar results.

### Carbon dioxide transfer conductances

We only use a single conductance because our synthetic pathways and the glycerate shunt are contained in a single compartment, the chloroplast. Including more conductances into the model would only affect native photorespiration, and in a negative manner. By using a single conductance we are being conservative in the sense that native photorespiration is described as being 100% efficient in recycling photorespiratory  $CO_2$  from mitochondria to chloroplasts, which is unrealistic. As von Caemmerer and colleagues have shown, several conductances/resistances can be modelled, resulting in a worse performance of native photorespiration with respect to the glycerate shunt [3].

### 2.2 Results

In this Section, we will put the methodology that we established in the previous one into practice. To this end we need to put some actual numbers on the kinetics constants of Rubisco's rate equation and carbon dioxide diffusion that are representative of C3 photosynthesis.

#### 2.2.1 Parameters and variables

The parameters listed in Table 5 are mostly identical to the ones von Caemmerer and colleagues have used in numerous publications [19, 17]. All partial pressures have been converted to molar concentrations. We note that the maximal carboxylation rate is close to four times the maximal oxygenation rate. The units of the rates are  $\mu mole \ m^{-2} \ s^{-1}$ , and the value of  $v_{carb\_max} = 80 \ \mu mole \ m^{-2} \ s^{-1}$  corresponds to a  $k_{cat}$  of 3.5  $s^{-1}$  and 2.3 mM Rubisco. The effective Michaelis constant for both the carboxylase and oxygenase reactions,  $k_3$ , is 18.7  $\mu M$ . The value of  $\Lambda$ , which is related to the carbon-compensation point [19] of native photorespiration ( $\Gamma_* = 0.5 \Lambda$ ) is 2.6  $\mu M$ .

Light irradiance and intercellular airspace  $CO_2$  concentration are the key environmental variables that

determine the carbon fixation rate A. We use a light range between 200 and 1500  $\mu E m^{-2} s^{-1}$  (from 'low' to 'high' light). The latter is considered 'saturating', in the sense that A levels off well before that point. However, light irradiance can be as high as 2000 on a clear day in central Europe [20]. The intercellular airspace CO<sub>2</sub> concentration  $C_i$  is the concentration of CO<sub>2</sub> inside the leaf but outside the photosynthetic cells. Since diffusion of CO<sub>2</sub> from the atmosphere into the leaf is correlated to diffusion of water vapour out of the leaf, there are experimental methods to estimate  $C_i$  [11]. Atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> (partial pressure of 400 ppm) corresponds to a concentration of  $13.6\mu M$  (Henri's law) and the  $C_i$  is considerably lower than that. Recently, careful measurements of  $C_i$  gave a value of about 220 ppm (7.5  $\mu M$ ) when the stomata were open and about 65 ppm (2.2  $\mu M$ ) when the stomata were closed [11]. Therefore, to cover the full range of physiologically possible values, we use a 'high'  $C_i$  value of 8  $\mu M$ and a 'low'  $C_i$  value of  $C_i = 2 \mu M$ .

The CO<sub>2</sub> transfer conductance from intercellular airspace to chloroplast  $(g_i)$  is also central to our model. We use a value of 9  $\mu$ mole  $m^{-2} s^{-1} \mu$ mole<sup>-1</sup> which corresponds to 0.3  $\mu$ mole  $m^{-2} s^{-1} \mu$ bar<sup>-1</sup>, which is in the middle of the range that has been measured in plants [17]. A recent microscale simulation of photosynthesis also arrived at the same value of  $g_i$  [21].

### 2.2.2 Rubisco kinetics

The two equations that govern the carboxylase and oxygenase activity of Rubisco are given in Section 2.1.3. On plugging in the numbers from our parameter set, we obtain two curves that show the dependence of these rates on the chloroplast CO<sub>2</sub> concentration x (Fig. 4A). The oxygenase activity,  $v_{ox}^{\dagger}$  only depends on x indirectly, as a competitive inhibitor of its substrate O<sub>2</sub> (which is constant). Therefore the curve falls moderately but monotonically with increasing x. In contrast, the carboxylation rate  $v_{carb}^{\dagger}$  displays apparent Michaelis-Menten kinetics with respect to x. The the <sup>†</sup> superscript indicates the consumer model where x which determines  $\rho$  is a free variable. In the kinetic-stoichiometric model, x cannot be chosen freely but is fully determined by the limitations imposed on the model, e.g. CO<sub>2</sub> diffusion into the chloroplast. It monotonically increases with x. The apparent Michaelis constant  $k_3 = 18.7 \ \mu M$  which takes into account competitive inhibition by O<sub>2</sub> is considerably higher than the

Name	Explanation	value	units
0	Chloroplast oxygen concentration	252	$\mu M$
x	Chloroplast $CO_2$ concentration	0 - 8	$\mu M$
$C_i$	Intercellular $CO_2$ concentration	2 - 8	$\mu M$
$g_i$	Transfer conductance	9.0	$\mu mole  m^{-2}  s^{-1}  (\mu M)^{-1}$
$v_{carb}$ max	RuBP carboxylase $V_{max}$	80	$\mu mole  m^{-2}  s^{-1}$
$k_c$	Rubisco Michaelis constant for $CO_2$	8.6	$\mu M$
$v_{ox}$ max	RuBP oxygenase $V_{max}$	20	$\mu mole  m^{-2}  s^{-1}$
$k_o$	Rubisco Michaelis constant for $O_2$	215	$\mu M$
$k_2$	$k_2 = k_c  O/k_o$	10.1	$\mu M$
$k_3$	$k_3 = k_c \left(1 + O/k_o ight)$	18.7	$\mu M$
Λ	$\Lambda = rac{v_{ox}\_maxk_c}{v_{carb}\_maxk_o}O$	2.6	$\mu M$
Ι	Irradiance	200 - 1500	$\mu E  m^{-2}  s^{-1}$
$v_{ox \ max}/v_{carb \ max}$	Ratio of maximal velocities	0.255	
$k_{cat}$ –	Catalytic constant	3.5	$s^{-1}$

Table 5: Kinetic constants of Rubisco and  $CO_2$  diffusion. The values are taken from [19, 17] and were converted from partial pressures in bar to molar concentrations.  $g_i$  is the transfer conductance of  $CO_2$  from the intercellular airspace to the chloroplast.

upper limit of  $x \ (x \le C_i \le 8 \ \mu M)$ . Importantly, Rubisco is always sub-saturated with respect to CO<sub>2</sub>, which limits its rate to less than 30 % of its nominal  $v_{max}$  (which is measured at saturating CO<sub>2</sub>).

The net carbon fixation rate  $A^{\dagger}$  is a linear combination of the rates  $v_{carb}^{\dagger}$  and  $v_{ox}^{\dagger}$ . The contribution of  $v_{carb}^{\dagger}$ , i.e. the Calvin cycle, is always positive with respect to  $A^{\dagger}$  (i.e. carbon-fixing) no matter which photorespiration pathway it is paired with. The contribution of  $v_{ox}^{\dagger}$  can be negative (i.e. releasing CO<sub>2</sub>, as in native photorespiration), neutral or positive. This is encapsulated in the parameter  $\alpha$  of each pathway (Table 3). Fig. 4B graphically depicts the net fixation rates of the four photorespiration pathways when each is paired with the Calvin cycle. Each combination of photorespiration pathway with the Calvin cycle is a function of x, but since there is no interaction between the Calvin cycle and the photorespiration pathway or shunt, one can simply view the resulting carbon fixation rate  $A^{\dagger}$  as a superposition of the two base rates  $v_{carb}^{\dagger}$  and  $v_{ox}^{\dagger}$ : The carbon-fixing pathway paired with the Calvin cycle is the sum of the  $v_{carb}^{\dagger}$  and  $v_{ox}^{\dagger}$ . A carbon-neutral shunt paired with the Calvin cycle is is neither a positive nor a negative contribution from  $v_{ox}^{\dagger}$ .



Figure 4: Rubisco kinetics and net carbon fixation rates in the consumer model. A: The rates of RuBP carboxylase  $(v_{carb}^{\dagger}, \text{cyan})$  and RuBP oxygenase  $(v_{ox}^{\dagger}, \text{red})$  are plotted as a function of chloroplast CO<sub>2</sub> concentration. The two rate equations are shown in the plot. B: Net carbon fixation rates of photosynthesis, i.e. the Calvin cycle paired with a photorespiration pathway as a function of chloroplast CO<sub>2</sub> concentration. The blue and green lines are the net fixation rates of the Calvin cycle paired with a carbon-fixing or a carbon-neutral shunts respectively (it applies equally to all four carbon-neutral shunts). Native photorespiration and Calvin cycle is shown as black line (the glycerate shunt gives identical results). The underlying assumption of the consumer model (Section 2.1.2) is that the rates are not limited by the supply of CO<sub>2</sub>, ATP or NADPH. The kinetic parameters for these plots can be found in Table 5.

#### 2.2.3 Limitation by light

The variable x is of central importance, as the curves in Fig 4 clearly show. The ratio of activities of either of our synthetic shunts to native photorespiration, i.e. the activity of a synthetic photorespiration shunt paired with the Calvin cycle expressed divided by the the activity of native photorespiration

paired with the Calvin cycle<sup>1</sup> at the same x, is much bigger at low  $C_i$  than at high x. Unfortunately, x cannot be controlled in an experiment or even directly measured and has to be inferred, i.e. calculated from a model. The variables that can be manipulated are light irradiance and  $C_i$ . Therefore it is common practice to measure the response curves of the net carbon fixation rate with respect to light and  $C_i$  [17].

The restricted kinetic-stoichiometric model, which is equivalent to the FvCB model [17] calculates the carbon fixation rate  $A^*$  using the assumption that only light and Rubisco are limiting. We will also use this assumption for the present time, but we will later introduce additional factors that can limit A (see Section 2.2.4). The light response curve of the restricted kinetic-stoichiometric model (Fig. 5) has two readily distinguishable phases, first rising monotonically with increasing irradiance and then reaching a plateau. The two phases correspond to light limitation (here via ATP) and limitation by Rubisco. The amount of Rubisco and the available CO<sub>2</sub> that diffuses into the cell define the upper limit  $A_{rbc}$  above which it does not matter if additional energy in the form of ATP and NADPH becomes available.

The light response curve has a different appearance at low  $C_i = 2\mu M$  (Fig. 5B) compared to high  $C_i = 8\mu M$  (Fig. 5A): The curves reach the plateau much earlier. In other words, Rubisco becomes limiting much earlier and this is because at low  $C_i$  the contribution of  $v_{ox}$  is much more important than at high  $C_i$ . The effect is two-fold: first, for pathways with negative  $\alpha$  (native photorespiration and glycerate shunt),  $v_{ox}$  is subtracted from  $v_{carb}$ . Second, in pathways where  $\alpha$  is non-negative, the much lower absolute rate of  $v_{carb}$  leads to the largest decrease in the fixation rate. For example, in the carbon-fixing shunt, the two rates,  $v_{carb}$  and  $v_{ox}$  are added 1:1. One may naively expect that in these circumstances the loss in  $v_{carb}$  might be compensated by the increase in  $v_{ox}$ . This is not the case: the maximal rate of  $v_{carb}$  is four times higher than  $v_{ox}$ , and also the fall in its activity is much sharper at low  $C_i$  than the corresponding rise in  $v_{ox}$ .

The differences between the different photorespiration pathways is immediately visible in their light response curves. The carbon-neutral shunts peaks later in the light curve than native photorespiration and glycerate shunt. The carbon-fixing shunt is just about Rubisco-limited at 'saturating light' ( $I = 1500 \mu E \ m^{-2} \ s^{-1}$ ). The reason is not that the synthetic shunts use light more efficiently (which they do), but that their limitation by Rubisco/CO<sub>2</sub> only kicks in at a higher level (because  $A_{rbc}^{fix} > A_{rbc}^{nat} > A_{rbc}^{nat}$ , where the superscript indicate the carbon-fixing shunt, carbon-neutral shunts and native photorespiration respectively). The higher  $A_{rbc}$ , the less it is limiting, and the curve is dominated by ATP-limitation. Thus our first conclusion is that our synthetic pathways should lead to higher net fixation rates (for the present time ignoring limitation by enzymatic activities other than Rubisco). This result does not depend on Rubisco kinetic parameters but is largely a consequence of the non-negativity of  $\alpha$ . The second conclusion is that the advantage of the synthetic pathways should be greater the lower  $C_i$  falls.

# 2.2.4 Limitation by enzyme activities other than Rubisco

The FvCB steady-state model assumes that light and Rubisco/ $CO_2$  are the only factors that limit the net carbon assimilation rate. In our mathematical framework, we can in addition treat three more limitations (see Section 2.1.3).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Since we are only concerned with situations where a photorespiration pathway operates alongside the Calvin cycle, and never without it, we will hereafter no longer explicitly write 'paired with the Calvin cycle' whenever we mention 'the activity' or 'the fixation rate' of a photorespiration pathway.



Figure 5: Light response curves of the restricted kinetic-stoichiometric model. A: Light response curves at high intercellular CO<sub>2</sub> concentration ( $C_i = 8 \ \mu M$ ). B: Light response curves at low intercellular CO<sub>2</sub> concentration ( $C_i = 2 \ \mu M$ ). Net carbon fixation rates of photosynthesis, i.e. the Calvin cycle paired with a photorespiration pathway, are plotted against light irradiance. In the restricted kinetic-stoichiometric model, the net fixation rate  $A^*$  is the minimum of the Rubisco-limited and the light-limited rate (here: ATP limited). The five pathways (native photorespiration, glycerate shunt, Ru1P/Ar5P shunt, Eu/Xu shunt, carbon-fixing shunt) are coloured according to the legend. The parameters for these plots can be found in Table 5. The values of the Rubisco-limited rate of the carbon-fixing shunt ( $A_{rbc}^{fix}$ ), carbon-neutral shunts ( $A_{rbc}^{neu}$ ) and native photorespiration ( $A_{rbc}^{nat}$ ) are indicated.

# 2.2.5 Limitation by a Calvin cycle enzyme

It is known that Calvin cycle enzymes other than Rubisco can limit photosynthesis. The best known example is sedoheptulose bisphosphatase (SBPase) [5]. From our theoretical analysis we know that this limitation would be more severe for native photorespiration than for the synthetic shunts. In native photorespiration, SBPase activity must carry one third of the flux generated by  $v_{carb}$  and one third of the flux generated by  $v_{ox}$ . This is the same as in the carbon-fixing shunt. However, the consumer model tells us that native photorespiration fixes only 2.5 carbons in the same time that the carbon-fixing shunt fixes 4 (i.e. the carbon-fixing shunt is 60% more carbon efficient at high  $C_i$  and saturating light). Therefore, with a fixed amount of Calvin cycle enzyme activity, a higher carbon fixation rate is achieved with the carbon-fixing shunt.

In contrast, the Ru1P/Ar5P carbon-neutral shunts have a different mechanism of reducing the load of a potentially limiting Calvin cycle enzymes such as SBPase: the flux originating from photorespiration is completely redirected past all Calvin cycle enzymes that lie sequentially behind GAP (Fig. 2). Careful analysis (Section 2.1.3) shows that the SBPase-limited rate would be same in the carbon-fixing and these carbon-neutral shunts and that this Calvin cycle-limited rate  $(A_{cbb})$  is independent of the  $C_i$ . This analysis applies equally to FBPase, aldolase and transketolase (for all of these  $\eta_{carb} = \eta_{ox}$  in native photorespiration and the carbon-fixing shunt and  $\eta_{ox} = 0$  in the Ru1P/Ar5P carbon-neutral shunts, see Table 4).

To illustrate the effect of a limiting Calvin cycle enzyme, we define the scaling factor  $\varphi_{cbb}$  (Section 2.1.3)



Figure 6: Limitation by a Calvin cycle enzyme. A and C: Carbon fixation rates assuming only a Calvin cycle enzyme activity is limiting  $(A_{cbb})$ , at high intercellular CO<sub>2</sub> concentrations  $(C_i = 8 \ \mu M)$ . B and D:  $A_{cbb}$  at low intercellular CO<sub>2</sub> concentrations  $(C_i = 2 \ \mu M)$ . The scaling factor  $\varphi_{cbb}$  expresses the activity of the Calvin cycle enzyme as the fraction of the maximal activity of RuBP carboxylase  $(v_{cbb} = \varphi_{cbb} \cdot v_{carb} \ max)$ . The curve shown in panels A and B belongs to an enzyme that carries one third of the Calvin cycle flux  $(\eta_{carb} = 1/3)$ , such as SBPase and FBPase. The curve shown in panels C and D belongs to an enzyme that carries two thirds of the Calvin cycle flux  $(\eta_{carb} = 2/3)$ , such as aldolase and transketolase. Horizontal dotted lines represent the Rubisco-limited rate of the carbonfixing shunt  $(A_{rbc}^{fix}, blue)$ , carbon-neutral shunts  $(A_{rbc}^{neu}, green)$  and native photorespiration  $(A_{rbc}^{nat}, black,$ identical to glycerate shunt). The blue and solid green line are identical and are shifted slightly to the right to make them both visible.

that expresses the activity of a Calvin cycle enzyme in units of  $v_{carb}max$ , the maximal carboxylation rate of Rubisco<sup>2</sup>. In Fig. 6, we plot the fixation rate  $A_{cbb}$  against  $\varphi_{cbb}$  for an enzyme like SBPase

 $<sup>^{2}\</sup>varphi_{cbb}$  absorbs the  $v_{max}$  of an enzyme and all factors concerning the saturation with substrates and products and the thermodynamics driving force of the reaction [6]. Thus, a value of  $\varphi_{cbb} = 0.1$  does not describe a single state, it could

 $(\eta_{carb} = 1/3)$  and aldolase  $(\eta_{carb} = 1/3 - \text{aldolase catalyses two reactions})$ . We compare this to the pathway-dependent Rubisco-limited rate  $A_{rbc}$  (horizontal dotted lines). At the intersection of the  $A_{cbb}$  with  $A_{rbc}$  of the same pathway (e.g. the black solid line with the black dotted line), Rubisco becomes limiting, and at values of  $\varphi_{cbb}$  lower than this point, the Calvin cycle enzyme is limiting. We call the value of  $\varphi_{cbb}$  at the intersection point the threshold  $\varphi_{cbb}^{TH}$ . About 1/10 of the maximal activity of Rubisco is required for a Calvin cycle enzyme to be non-limiting in native photorespiration. At high  $C_i$ , also the carbon-fixing and carbon-neutral pathways require about 1/10 of  $v_{carb}\_max}$  to be at least as high as their respective  $A_{rbc}$ . In contrast, both synthetic pathways only require a much smaller fraction of  $v_{carb}\_max}$  at low  $C_i$ .

Although  $\varphi_{cbb} \approx 1/10$  seems to be sufficient in all cases to support a pathway's Rubisco-limited rate, it is important to stress that the synthetic pathways are capable of supporting a higher absolute rate of carbon fixation than native photorespiration with the same  $\varphi_{cbb}$ . With a given amount of enzyme, the synthetic pathways achieve much higher rates of carbon fixation, especially at low  $C_i$ . In other words, our synthetic pathways are more parsimonious.

Activity	Full name	EC	Latzko	Peterkofsky	Normalised range
Rubisco	rubisco $(CO_2)$	4.1.1.39	0.9	150	1
PGAK	phosphoglycerate kinase	2.7.2.3	130	4500	30-140
GAPDH	GAP dehydrogenase	1.2.1.13	15	260	2-17
TPI	triose phosphate isomerase	5.3.1.1	110	1100	7-120
ALD	aldolase (F6P)	4.1.2.13	5.3	300	2-6
FBPase	fructose bisphosphatase	3.1.3.11	2.4	39	0.3-3
SBPase	sedoheptulose bisphosphatase	3.1.3.37	0.2	8	0.05 - 0.2
ΤK	transketolase	2.2.1.1	10	300	2-11
ISO	phosphopentose isomerase	5.3.1.6	16	510	3-18
EPI	phosphopentose epimerase	5.1.3.1	8.4	1600	9-11
R5PK	phosphoribulokinase	2.7.1.19	16	600	4-18

Table 6: Calvin cycle enzyme total activities. The datasets of Latzko [7] and Peterkofsky [8] were rounded to two significant digits. The activity of GAPDH is the geometric mean of two values in the original tables that were obtained with different co-factors. The normalised ranges (last column) were obtained by scaling each set separately with the activity of Rubisco. SBP aldolase activity was not measured. The units of Latzko and Peterkofsky are  $\mu mole$  (mg protein)<sup>-1</sup>  $h^{-1}$  and  $\mu mole$  (mg chlorophyll)<sup>-1</sup>  $h^{-1}$  respectively, while the combined activity is unitless.

In order to compare our theoretical results with measured activities of Calvin cycle enzymes in relation to Rubisco, we present two datasets from spinach in Table 6. Clearly the lowest  $v_{max}$  is the activity of SBPase (between 0.05 and 0.2  $\cdot v_{carb}_{max}$ ). Overall the results in Table 6 indicate that SBPase activity in spinach that is most likely to be limiting (in agreement with e.g. [5]). The average activity calculated from the two datasets is very close to  $\varphi_{cbb} = 0.1$ , the threshold value of native photorespiration that we calculated from our model. The activity of SBPase will in practice be lower than the total activity shown in Table 6 because the latter are measured at full saturation at maximal substrate saturation and thermodynamic driving force. Thus, there is very good agreement between the model and experimental evidence. In contrast, both of our synthetic shunts achieve higher rates of carbon fixation because their  $A_{cbb}$  curve is shifted to lower values of  $\varphi_{cbb}$ , in other words they can do more with less. In summary, native photorespiration (and the glycerate shunt) are considerably more vulnerable to the limiting activity of a Calvin cycle enzyme such as SBPase.

equally mean that the enzyme is saturated with substrate and the  $v_{max}$  is 1/10 of  $v_{carb\_max}$ , or that the enzyme is only 10% saturated and the  $v_{max}$  is equal to  $v_{carb\_max}$ . Maximal rates such  $v_{carb\_max}$  are defined as  $v_{max} = k_{cat} E_{tot}$ , where  $E_{tot}$  is the total concentration (abundance) of enzyme.



#### 2.2.6 Limitation by a photorespiratory enzyme

Figure 7: Limitation by a photorespiration enzyme. A: photorespiration (shunt) enzymelimited carbon assimilation rates  $(A_{pr})$  at high intercellular CO<sub>2</sub> concentrations  $(C_i = 8 \ \mu M)$ . B: photorespiration (shunt) enzyme-limited carbon assimilation rates at low intercellular CO<sub>2</sub> concentrations  $(C_i = 2 \ \mu M)$ . The scaling factor  $\varphi_{cbb}$  expresses the activity of the shunt enzyme as the fraction of the maximal activity of RuBP carboxylase  $(v_{cbb} = \varphi_{cbb} \cdot v_{carb} \ max)$ . The native photorespiration curve shown belongs to an enzyme that carries one half of photorespiration flux ( $\epsilon = 1/2$ ), whereas in the two synthetic pathways the enzyme is assumed to carry all of  $v_{ox}$ . The glycerate shunt is identical to native photorespiration. Horizontal dotted lines represent the Rubisco-limited rate of the carbon-fixing shunt  $(A_{rbc}^{fix}, blue)$ , carbon-neutral shunts  $(A_{rbc}^{neu}, green)$  and native photorespiration  $(A_{rbc}^{nat}, black, identical$ to glycerate shunt).

The enzymes of an synthetic pathway need to be expressed at a sufficient level to achieve the improvements calculated in Section 2.2.3. Equally, in native photorespiration, also the non-Calvin cycle enzymes need to be expressed in sufficient amounts to achieve a Rubisco or light-limited fixation rate. In the following we will calculate this level of activity relative to Rubisco's  $v_{carb}$  max.

The application of this principle to the synthetic pathways is straight-forward since they consist of two linear branches that carry equal flux (since RuBP oxygenase creates equal amounts of PGA and G2P, 2-phosphoglycolate) and are eventually combined in a 1:1 condensation reaction. Thus all enzymatic steps carry the same flux,  $v_{ox}$ . In contrast, the description of native photorespiration is not as straight-forward because the flux decreases from  $v_{ox}$  to  $0.5 v_{ox}$  in the middle of the G2P branch at the point of glycine condensation. We solve this problem by taking a conservative approach and assuming that in native photorespiration and the glycerate shunt, the limiting enzyme needs to only support  $0.5 v_{ox}$ .

Theoretical consideration show that, at low  $C_i$ , the fixation rate  $A_{pr}$  of synthetic pathways is always higher than native photorespiration (and glycerate shunt). This is illustrated in Fig. 7B. However, at high  $C_i$  (Fig. 7A) and low values of  $\varphi_{pr}$  native photorespiration performs almost identically to the carbon-fixing shunt and slightly better than the carbon-neutral shunts. We again compare the value of  $\varphi_{pr}^{TH}$  at which the photorespiration-limited rate equals the Rubisco-limited activity: At high  $C_i$ this value for all pathways is between 1/10 and 1/20. At low  $C_i$ , the main difference is that the two synthetic pathways reach the level of  $A_{rbc}$  of native photorespiration much earlier, at  $\varphi_{pr}^{TH} = 1/28$  and  $\varphi_{pr}^{TH} = 1/69$  for carbon-neutral and carbon-fixing pathways. In summary, the synthetic pathways are less likely to be limited by a PR enzyme at low  $C_i$  which is the more relevant condition. At high  $C_i$  all pathways are relatively similar in performance.

# 2.2.7 Limitation by a photorespiration carboxylase

The carbon-fixing pathway contains an enzyme that is a carboxylase. Unlike all other enzymes except Rubisco, this enzyme depends directly on chloroplast CO<sub>2</sub> concentration. For this reason, we separate the saturation with CO<sub>2</sub> from the saturation with all other metabolites (Eq. 54) which is described by  $\varphi_{cbx}$ . The effective Michaelis constant for CO<sub>2</sub> is expected to lie close to 10  $\mu M$  (see Section 2.1.4, equivalent to a  $K_M$  of 1mM for bicarbonate). However, the flux in photorespiration shunt depends on RuBP oxygenase. Therefore, the situation may become critical at low values of x where  $v_{ox}$  is moderately increased (disinhibited), but the rate of the carboxylase is severely reduced.

This is indeed what we see in Figure 8B: at low  $C_i$  the scaling factor  $\varphi_{cbx}$  needs to be 2.6 (i.e. the rate needs to be 2.6 times Rubisco's maximal carboxylation rate) to reach the Rubisco-limited rate of the carbon-fixing shunt. However, it is not necessary to reach to theoretical maximum of A to achieve an improvement. To reach the carbon-neutral's theoretical maximum only one third of  $v_{carb}$  max is required, and to compete with  $A_{rbc}$  of native photorespiration, only one tenth. The values are considerably higher than for a non-carboxylase shunt enzyme (Fig 7B), where the three values were 1/9, 1/17 and 1/19. Thus, to achieve the same level of net carbon fixation as the carbon-neutral pathway, the carboxylase of the carbon-fixing pathway needs to have six times more activity than any non-carboxylase enzyme.

At high  $C_i$  (Figure 8A), the requirements for the rate of the carboxylase are also considerable: 1/3 of  $v_{carb\_max}$  to match its own  $A_{rbc}$ , 1/5 of  $v_{carb\_max}$  to match the  $A_{rbc}$  of the carbon-fixing pathway and 1/7 of  $v_{max}$  to match the  $A_{rbc}$  of native photorespiration. These values are much closer to the requirements of a non-carboxylase enzyme in either of the synthetic shunts. What is required to reap the full benefits of the carbon-fixing shunt is about 3 times the activity of SBPase.

# 3 Kinetic models of photorespiration shunts

# 3.1 Introduction

The purpose of kinetic modeling of photorespiration shunts is to gain understanding how the kinetic parameters of every enzyme influence both one another and the concentration of the metabolic intermediates. In particular, we want to find the kinetic parameters that would allow the pathway to carry the full photorespiratory flux while keeping all metabolic intermediates within a biologically plausible range.

For this purpose, every reaction of a photorespiration shunt is parametrized with reversible Michaelis-Menten kinetics (Section 3.3); Michaelis constants are taken from the literature (Section 3.4); missing values were substituted with database averages (Section 3.4.2), equilibrium constants are estimated with eQuilibrator (Section 3.4.3) and Calvin cycle metabolite and co-factor concentrations are taken from the literature (see Section 3.4.5). The rate equations are solved one-by-one (Section 3.5.2) and the solutions of a large number of simulations in which all parameters are randomly sampled (Section 3.4.6) lead to distributions of all metabolite concentrations. The fluxes are calculated with the kineticstoichiometric photosynthesis model (Section 3.4.9).



Figure 8: Limitation by a photorespiration carboxylase. A: photorespiration-carboxylaselimited carbon assimilation rates  $(A_{cbx})$  at high intercellular CO<sub>2</sub> concentrations  $(C_i = 8 \ \mu M)$ . B: photorespiration-carboxylase-limited carbon assimilation rates at low intercellular CO<sub>2</sub> concentrations  $(C_i = 2 \ \mu M)$ . This enzyme only exists in the carbon-fixing pathway. It is assumed to have an apparent Michaelis constant for CO<sub>2</sub> of  $10 \ \mu M$  (which corresponds to a  $K_M$  of 1 mM for HCO<sub>3</sub>, see Section 2.1.3). The scaling factor  $\varphi_{cbx}$  expresses the activity of the carboxylase as the fraction of the maximal activity of RuBP carboxylase ( $v_{cbx} = \varphi_{cbx} \cdot v_{carb\_max}$ ). Horizontal dotted lines represent the Rubisco-limited rate of the carbon-fixing shunt  $(A_{rbc}^{fix}, \text{ blue})$ , carbon-neutral shunts  $(A_{rbc}^{neu}, \text{ green})$  and native photorespiration  $(A_{rbc}^{nat}, \text{ black}, \text{ identical to glycerate shunt})$ .

Ultimately we identify optimal kinetic parameter pairs - the lowest  $k_{cat}$  at a given  $K_M$  - for each enzyme that are able to support a given flux through a photorespiration shunt at substrate and product concentrations within a biologically meaningful range. We call this a Pareto analysis (Section 3.5).

# 3.2 Generic form of a random order rate reaction with one substrate, one products and a variable number of co-factors

#### 3.2.1 Abbreviations

- = Concentration of metabolite X
- $K_{\rm X}$  = Michaelis constant of metabolite X
- $K_{\mathbf{X}}^* =$ Apparent Michaelis constant of metabolite X
- $V_{max} =$ Maximal rate

- (69)
- $K'_{eq} =$  Equilibrium constant (ratio of products over substrates at equilibrium)
  - $\kappa=$  Co-factor adjusted equilibrium constant (dimensionless)
  - $\omega =$ Co-factor saturation (dimensionless)
  - v = Flux (forward minus reverse rate) of a reaction. Assumed to be positive.

The unit of all concentrations and Michaelis constants is mM. The unit if flux is mM/s.

### 3.2.2 Linear reactions

All concentrations of co-factors and Calvin cycle intermediates (see Table 8) are assumed to be constant, which for every reaction leaves a single concentration variable on either side of the reaction. We call these reactions linear because they give rise to a linear relation between the only remaining substrate and the only remaining product.

#### 3.2.3 Generic example of a linear reaction

The example here is a random order bi-bi reaction where X and Y are a co-factor pair such as ATP and ADP.

$$A + X \rightleftharpoons B + Y \tag{70}$$

### 3.2.4 Canonical form of the equation

We want to define a canonical form of the rate equation that makes finding analytical solutions straightforward. This can be achieved in the following manner:

$$v = V_{max} \cdot \omega \cdot \frac{[A] - [B]/\kappa}{[A] + K_A^*}$$

$$\omega = \frac{[X]}{[X] + K_X \cdot (1 + [Y]/K_Y)}$$

$$\kappa = K'_{eq} \cdot \frac{[X]}{[Y]}$$

$$K_A^* = K_A \cdot (1 + [B]/K_B)$$
(71)

The constants  $\kappa$  and  $\omega$  are dimensionless and the apparent Michaelis constant for the substrate,  $K_A^*$  is in the same units as all Michaelis constants.

### 3.2.5 Linear relation between the concentrations of substrate and product

Given the concentration of product ([B]) one can straight-forwardly calculate the concentration of substrate ([A])

$$[A] = \frac{\left(\frac{K_{A}}{K_{B}} + \frac{V_{max} \cdot \omega}{v \cdot \kappa}\right) \cdot [B] + K_{A}}{\frac{V_{max} \cdot \omega}{v} - 1} = \frac{K_{A}^{*} + \frac{V_{max} \cdot \omega}{v \cdot \kappa} \cdot [B]}{\frac{V_{max} \cdot \omega}{v} - 1}$$
(72)

This solution is always available if the rate equation can be expressed in the canonical form. We will show in the following that this is possible for all reactions in our pathways, under the above-mentioned assumptions (constant co-factor and Calvin cycle intermediate concentrations and known flux v).

### 3.2.6 Minimal required activity

The denominator of Eq. 72 implies that, to support a positive flux v, a minimum activity  $\tilde{V}_{max}$  is required:

$$\frac{V_{max} \cdot \omega}{v} - 1 > 0$$

$$V_{max} \ge \tilde{V}_{max}$$

$$\tilde{V}_{max} = v/\omega$$
(73)

If  $\omega = 1$  the trivial result  $\tilde{V}_{max} = v$  is obtained.

# 3.2.7 Thermodynamic limitations

Even if the reaction is kinetically feasible, i.e. when  $V_{max} \ge v/\omega$ , it can be thermodynamically infeasible. This is because we require the flux to be positive and thus

$$-[B]/\kappa > 0$$

$$[B]/\kappa < [A]$$
(74)

This can become a problem if we set a - biological - upper limit on [A], e.g. an upper limit on [glycolaldehyde] of 1 mM because it would otherwise become toxic. If such a limit,  $[A]_{max}$  exists, it effectively restricts the concentration of [B], too:

$$/\kappa < [A]_{\max}$$

$$[B]_{\max} = [A]_{\max} \cdot \kappa$$
(75)

The limit on [A] is a biological one, which necessarily leads to a thermodynamic limit on [B].

### 3.3 Rate laws of all photorespiration shunt reactions

In this section, we formulate the rate laws in the canonical form (Eq 71).

# 3.3.1 Compound abbreviations

$$\begin{aligned} & \operatorname{Ac} = \operatorname{acetate} \\ & \operatorname{AcCoa} = \operatorname{acetyl} \operatorname{CoA} \\ & \operatorname{G} = \operatorname{glycolate} \\ & \operatorname{G2P} = \operatorname{glycolate} 2\operatorname{-phosphate} \\ & \operatorname{GICoA} = \operatorname{glycolyl-CoA} \\ & \operatorname{GA} = \operatorname{glycolaldehyde} \\ & \operatorname{GAP} = \operatorname{glyceraldehyde} 3\operatorname{-phosphate} \\ & \operatorname{DHAP} = \operatorname{dihydroxyacetone} \operatorname{phosphate} \\ & \operatorname{PGA} = \operatorname{glycerate} 3\operatorname{-phosphate} \\ & \operatorname{TrCoA} = \operatorname{tartronyl-CoA} \\ & \operatorname{Eu} = \operatorname{erythrulose} \\ & \operatorname{Eu4P} = \operatorname{erythrulose} 4\operatorname{-phosphate} \\ & \operatorname{Ru1P} = \operatorname{ribulose} 1\operatorname{-phosphate} \\ & \operatorname{Ru1P} = \operatorname{ribulose} 1\operatorname{,5-bisphosphate} \\ & \operatorname{Ru3P} = \operatorname{ribulose} 1\operatorname{,5-bisphosphate} \\ & \operatorname{Xu} = \operatorname{xylulose} \\ & \operatorname{Xu5P} = \operatorname{xylulose} 5\operatorname{-phosphate} \\ & \operatorname{Ru5P} = \operatorname{ribulose} 5\operatorname{-phosphate} \\ & \operatorname{Ru5P} = \operatorname{ribulos} \operatorname{ribulos} \operatorname{ribulos} 5\operatorname{-phosphate} \\ & \operatorname{Ru5P} = \operatorname{ribulos} \operatorname{ribulos} \operatorname{ribulos} \operatorname{ribulos} \operatorname{ribul$$

# 3.3.2 Glycolate 2-phosphatase

$$G2P \rightleftharpoons G + P_i \tag{77}$$

Rate law in canonical form

$$v = V_{max} \cdot \omega \cdot \frac{[\text{G2P}] - [\text{G}]/\kappa}{[\text{G2P}] + K_{\text{G2P}}^*}$$

$$\omega = 1$$

$$\kappa = K'_{eq}/[\text{P}_i]$$

$$K_{\text{G2P}}^* = K_{\text{G2P}} \cdot (1 + [\text{G}]/K_{\text{G}}) \cdot (1 + [\text{P}_i]/K_{\text{P}_i})$$
(78)

### 3.3.3 Glycolyl-CoA synthetase

Here we are assuming two sites on the enzyme, one for ATP, AMP and  $PP_i$  and the other for glycolate, glycolyl-CoA (GlCoA) and CoA.

$$G + ATP + CoA \rightleftharpoons GlCoA + AMP + PP_i$$
(79)

### Rate law in canonical form

$$v = V_{max} \cdot \omega \cdot \frac{[G] - [GlCoA]/\kappa}{[G] + K_{G}^{*}}$$

$$\omega = \frac{[ATP]}{[ATP] + [AMP] + K_{ATP} + [PP_{i}] \cdot (1 + [AMP]/K_{ATP})} \cdot \frac{[CoA]}{[CoA] + K_{CoA}}$$

$$\kappa = \frac{K'_{eq} \cdot [CoA] \cdot [ATP]}{[AMP] \cdot [PP_{i}]}$$

$$K_{G}^{*} = K_{G} \cdot (1 - (1 - \omega) \cdot [GlCoA]/K_{CoA})$$
(80)

# 3.3.4 Glycolyl-CoA transferase

$$AcCoA + G \rightleftharpoons GlCoA + Ac$$
 (81)

This is a ping-pong mechanism.

Rate law in canonical form

$$v = V_{max} \cdot \omega \cdot \frac{[G] - [GlCoA]/\kappa}{K_{G}^{*} + [G]}$$

$$D = [AcCoA] + K_{CoA} + [GlCoA]$$

$$\omega = [AcCoA]/D$$

$$\kappa = K'_{eq} \cdot [AcCoA]/[Ac]$$

$$K_{G}^{*} = K_{G} \cdot \left(1 + [Ac]/K_{Ac} - K_{CoA}/D\right)$$
(82)

# 3.3.5 Glycolaldehyde dehydrogenase, CoA-acylating (Glycolyl-CoA reductase)

$$GlCoA + NADPH \rightleftharpoons GA + NADP + CoA$$
 (83)

Rate law in canonical form

$$v = V_{max} \cdot \omega \cdot \frac{[\text{GlCoA}] - [\text{GA}]/\kappa}{[\text{GlCoA}] + K_{\text{GlCoA}}^*}$$

$$\omega = \frac{[\text{NADPH}]}{[\text{NADPH}] + K_{\text{NADPH}} + [\text{NADP}]}$$

$$\kappa = K_{eq}' \cdot \frac{[\text{NADPH}]}{[\text{NADP}] \cdot [\text{CoA}]}$$

$$K_{\text{GlCoA}}^* = K_{\text{GlCoA}} \cdot (1 + [\text{GA}]/K_{\text{GA}}) \cdot (1 + [\text{CoA}]/K_{\text{CoA}})$$
(84)

# 3.3.6 Ar5P aldolase

$$GA + GAP \rightleftharpoons Ar5P$$
 (85)

In this reaction, GA is the donor and GAP is the acceptor.

# Rate law in canonical form

We are assuming an ordered reaction mechanism.

$$v = V_{max} \cdot \omega \cdot \frac{[\text{GA}] - [\text{Ar5P}]/\kappa}{K_{\text{GA}}^* + [\text{GA}]}$$

$$\omega = \frac{[\text{GAP}]}{[\text{GAP}] + K_{\text{GAP}}}$$

$$\kappa = K_{eq}' \cdot [\text{GAP}]$$

$$K_{\text{GA}}^* = K_{\text{GA}} \cdot \frac{1 + [\text{Ar5P}]/K_{\text{Ar5P}}}{1 + [\text{GAP}]/K_{\text{GAP}}}$$
(86)

# 3.3.7 Ru1P aldolase

$$DHAP + GA \rightleftharpoons Ru1P \tag{87}$$

In this reaction, DHAP is the donor and GA is the acceptor.

# Rate law in canonical form

Again we are assuming an ordered reaction mechanism.

$$v = V_{max} \cdot \omega \cdot \frac{[\text{GA}] - [\text{Ru1P}]/\kappa}{K_{\text{GA}}^* + [\text{GA}]}$$

$$\omega = 1$$

$$\kappa = K_{eq}' \cdot [\text{DHAP}]$$

$$K_{\text{GA}}^* = K_{\text{GA}} \cdot \frac{1 + [\text{Ru1P}]/K_{\text{Ru1P}} + [\text{DHAP}]/K_{\text{DHAP}}}{[\text{DHAP}]/K_{\text{DHAP}}}$$
(88)

# 3.3.8 Transketolase

$$S7P + GA \rightleftharpoons R5P + Eu$$
 (89)

### Rate law in canonical form

This is a ping-pong mechanism.

$$v = V_{max} \cdot \omega \cdot \frac{[\text{GA}] - [\text{Eu}]/\kappa}{K_{\text{GA}}^* + [\text{GA}]}$$

$$D = [\text{S7P}] + K_{\text{S7P}} \cdot (1 + [\text{Eu}]/K_{\text{Eu}})$$

$$\omega = [\text{S7P}]/D$$

$$\kappa = K_{eq}' \cdot [\text{S7P}]/[\text{R5P}]$$

$$K_{\text{GA}}^* = K_{\text{GA}} \cdot \left(1 + [\text{R5P}]/K_{\text{R5P}} - K_{\text{S7P}}/D\right)$$
(90)

# 3.3.9 Transaldolase

$$F6P + GA \rightleftharpoons GAP + Xu$$
 (91)

### Rate law in canonical form

This is a ping-pong mechanism.

$$v = V_{max} \cdot \omega \cdot \frac{[GA] - [Xu]/\kappa}{K_{GA}^* + [GA]}$$

$$D = [F6P] + K_{F6P} \cdot (1 + [Xu]/K_{Xu})$$

$$\omega = [F6P]/D$$

$$\kappa = K_{eq}' \cdot [F6P]/[GAP]$$

$$K_{GA}^* = K_{GA} \cdot \left(1 + [GAP]/K_{GAP} - K_{F6P}/D\right)$$
(92)

# 3.3.10 Erythrulose 4-kinase

$$Eu + ATP \rightleftharpoons Eu4P + ADP$$
 (93)

Rate law in canonical form

$$v = V_{max} \cdot \omega \cdot \frac{[\text{Eu}] - [\text{Eu}4\text{P}]/\kappa}{[\text{Eu}] + K_{\text{Eu}}^*}$$

$$\omega = \frac{[\text{ATP}]}{[\text{ATP}] + K_{\text{ATP}} + [\text{ADP}]}$$

$$\kappa = K'_{eq} \cdot \frac{[\text{ATP}]}{[\text{ADP}]}$$

$$K_{\text{Eu}}^* = K_{\text{Eu}} \cdot (1 + [\text{Eu}4\text{P}]/K_{\text{Eu}4\text{P}})$$
(94)

# 3.3.11 Xylulose 5-kinase

$$Xu + ATP \rightleftharpoons Xu5P + ADP \tag{95}$$

Rate law in canonical form

$$v = V_{max} \cdot \omega \cdot \frac{[\text{Xu}] - [\text{Xu5P}]/\kappa}{[\text{Xu}] + K_{\text{Xu}}^*}$$

$$\omega = \frac{[\text{ATP}]}{[\text{ATP}] + K_{\text{ATP}} + [\text{ADP}]}$$

$$\kappa = K_{eq}' \cdot \frac{[\text{ATP}]}{[\text{ADP}]}$$

$$K_{\text{Xu}}^* = K_{\text{Xu}} \cdot (1 + [\text{Xu5P}]/K_{\text{Xu5P}})$$
(96)

# 3.3.12 Ribulose-1-phosphate 5-kinase

$$Ru1P + ATP \rightleftharpoons RuBP + ADP \tag{97}$$

Rate law in canonical form

$$v = V_{max} \cdot \omega \cdot \frac{[\text{Ru1P}] - [\text{RuBP}]/\kappa}{[\text{Ru1P}] + K_{\text{Ru1P}}^*}$$

$$\omega = \frac{[\text{ATP}]}{[\text{ATP}] + K_{\text{ATP}} + [\text{ADP}]}$$

$$\kappa = K'_{eq} \cdot \frac{[\text{ATP}]}{[\text{ADP}]}$$

$$K_{\text{Ru1P}}^* = K_{\text{Ru1P}} \cdot (1 + [\text{RuBP}]/K_{\text{RuBP}})$$
(98)

# 3.3.13 Glycolyl-CoA carboxylase

$$GlCoA + CO_2 + ATP \rightleftharpoons TrCoA + ADP + P_i$$
 (99)

### Rate law in canonical form

We assume independent binding sites for  $CO_2$ ,  $ATP/ADP/P_i$ , and GlCoA/TrCoA.

$$v = V_{max} \cdot \omega \cdot \frac{[\text{GlCoA}] - [\text{TrCoA}]/\kappa}{[\text{GlCoA}] + K_{\text{GlCoA}}^*}$$

$$\omega = \frac{[\text{ATP}]}{[\text{ATP}] + [\text{ADP}] + K_{\text{ATP}} \cdot (1 + [\text{P}_i]/K_{\text{P}_i})} \cdot \frac{[\text{CO}_2]}{[\text{CO}_2] + K_{\text{CO}_2}}$$

$$\kappa = K_{eq}' \cdot \frac{[\text{ATP}] \cdot [\text{CO}_2]}{[\text{ADP}] \cdot [\text{P}_i]}$$

$$K_{\text{GlCoA}}^* = K_{\text{CoA}} + [\text{TrCoA}]$$
(100)

# 3.3.14 Tartronyl-CoA reductase

$$TrCoA + 2 NADPH \rightleftharpoons glycerate + 2 NADP + CoA$$
 (101)

### Rate law in canonical form

The two-step reduction is modeled as a single reaction assuming that the intermediate, tartronate semialdehyde, does not leave the active site.

$$v = V_{max} \cdot \omega \cdot \frac{[\text{TrCoA}] - [\text{glycerate}]/\kappa}{[\text{TrCoA}] + K_{\text{TrCoA}}^*}$$

$$\omega = \frac{[\text{NADPH}]}{[\text{NADPH}] + K_{\text{NADPH}} + [\text{NADP}]}$$

$$\kappa = K_{eq}' \cdot \frac{[\text{NADPH}]^2}{[\text{NADP}]^2 \cdot [\text{CoA}]}$$

$$K_{\text{TrCoA}}^* = K_{\text{CoA}} \cdot (1 + [\text{glycerate}]/K_{\text{glycerate}} + [\text{CoA}]/K_{\text{CoA}})$$
(102)

#### 3.3.15 Glycerate 3-kinase

$$glycerate + ATP \rightleftharpoons PGA + ADP \tag{103}$$

#### Rate law in canonical form

We include an inhibition term for RuBP.

$$v = V_{max} \cdot \omega \cdot \frac{[\text{glycerate}] - [\text{PGA}]/\kappa}{[\text{glycerate}] + K_{\text{glycerate}}^*}$$

$$\omega = \frac{[\text{ATP}]}{[\text{ATP}] + K_{\text{ATP}} + [\text{ADP}]}$$

$$\kappa = K_{eq}' \cdot \frac{[\text{ATP}]}{[\text{ADP}]}$$

$$K_{\text{glycerate}}^* = K_{\text{glycerate}} \cdot (1 + [\text{PGA}]/K_{\text{PGA}} + [\text{RuBP}]/K_{\text{RuBP}})$$
(104)

#### 3.4 Parameters

### 3.4.1 Imputing unknown parameters

### 3.4.2 Kinetic parameters

Values for kinetic parameters were either taken directly from the literature, or from a database (BRENDA [22] and/or [23]).

Wherever possible,  $K_M$  values from the literature were taken for the actual enzyme, reaction and compound. When several values were available they were averaged (median). In most cases, since the enzymes of the synthetic shunts perform reactions that do not exist in nature, values of similar enzymes, compounds and reactions were averaged (median). For CoA-compounds, a database analysis showed that most values are in a similar range (median  $K_M$  of 30  $\mu M$ ). Therefore one generic value (named 'class average' hereafter) was used for all CoA-compounds including free CoA. For adenosine nucleotides, the same approach was used: a class average was used for ATP, ADP and AMP. Similarly, a class average  $K_M$  value for NADPH and NADP was used.

All reactions are modelled as reversible; since  $K_M$  values for products (i.e. the substrate in the reverse direction) are often not available at all, default values of 1 mM were used.

# 3.4.3 Thermodynamic parameters

All  $\Delta G'^m$  values and equilibrium constants were calculated with eQuilibrator [24], at pH 8.0 and ionic strength of 0.25. Equilibrium constants for reactions that are not available directly in eQuilibrator were calculated as the average of several proxy reactions. The proxy reactions for Ru1P kinase were ribulose kinase, fructose 1-phosphate 6-kinase and fructose 6-phosphate 1-kinase. Proxy reactions for glycolyl-CoA synthetase were reactions with acetate, propionate, hydroxypropionate, butyrate and acetoacetate. Proxy reactions for acetyl-CoA:glycolate CoA transferase were reactions with acetyl-CoA, propionyl-CoA and hydroxypropionyl-CoA. The proxy reactions for glycolyl-CoA carboxylase were acetyl-CoA to malonyl-CoA and propionyl-CoA to methylmalonyl-CoA. The proxy reactions for tartronyl-CoA reductase were succinyl-CoA, malonyl-CoA and methylmalonyl-CoA reduction to the corresponding hydroxyacid. The proxy reactions for glycolyl-CoA and hydroxypropionyl-CoA. The proxy reaction for Ru1P aldolase was fuculose 1-phosphate aldolase. When applicable, the arithmetic mean of the  $\Delta G'$  values was calculated, which is equivalent to the geometric mean of the equilibrium constants.

	Pathway	Reaction	Parameter	Value	Unit	Method
1		Generic	K <sub>ATP</sub>	0.2	mM	Average <sup>1</sup>
2			$K_{CoA}$	0.03	mМ	$Average^2$
3			$K_{NADPH}$	0.03	mМ	$Average^3$
4	Xu	Xylulose kinase	$K_{Xu5P}$	1	mМ	Default
5			$K'_{eq}$	8e4		eQuilibrator
6	Xu	Transaldolase	$K_{eq}'$	1		eQuilibrator
7			$K_{F6P}$	1.2	mМ	[25]
8			$K_{Xu}$	1	mМ	Default
9			$K_{GAP}$	0.04	mМ	[25]
10	Eu	Transketolase	$K'_{eq}$	0.4		eQuilibrator
11			$ m K_{ m Eu}$	1	mМ	Default
12			$K_{S7P}$	2	mМ	[26]
13			$K_{R5P}$	0.5	mМ	[26]
14	Eu	Eu kinase	$K'_{eq}$	800		eQuilibrator
15			$K_{Eu4P}$	1	mМ	Default
16	Eu	Erythrose isomeras	$K'_{eq}$	6		eQuilibrator
17	Eu	Erythrulose isomerase	$K_{eq}^{i'}$	1		Assumed
18	TcoA	Reductase	$K_{eq}^{i'}$	76		eQuilibrator
19			$K_{glvcerate}$	1	mM	Default
20	TcoA	Carboxylase	$K_{HCO_3}$	1	mМ	Average
21			$K'_{eq}$	67		eQuilibrator
22	TcoA	Glycerate kinase	$K_{PGA}$	1.5	mМ	[27]
23			$K_{RuBP}$	2.5	mМ	[27]
24			$K'_{eq}$	800		eQuilibrator
25	Ru1P	Ru1P kinase	$K_{eq}'$	5.4e4		eQuilibrator
26			K <sub>RuBP</sub>	5	mM	Assumed
27	Ru1P	Aldolase	$K'_{eq}$	3	$({\rm mM})^{-1}$	eQuilibrator
28			K <sub>DHAP</sub>	0.4	mМ	Average
29			$K_{Ru1P}$	0.1	mМ	Assumed
30	Ar5P	Aldolase	$K'_{eq}$	0.5	$({ m mM})^{-1}$	eQuilibrator
31			$K_{GAP}$	0.8	mМ	[28]
32			$K_{Ar5P}$	0.1	mМ	Assumed
33	Ar5P	Ar5P isomerase	$K'_{eq}$	0.35		eQuilibrator
34	Carbon neutral	Reductase	$K'_{eq}$	3	mМ	eQuilibrator
35			K <sub>GA</sub>	1	mМ	Default
36	All	Phosphatase	$K'_{eq}$	1e8		eQuilibrator
37			Κ <sub>G</sub>	1	mM	Default
38	All	CoA synthetase	$K'_{eq}$	4		eQuilibrator
39	All	CoA transferase	$K'_{eq}$	0.06		eQuilibrator
40			$K_{Ac}$	same as ${\rm K}_{\rm G}$		Assumed

# 3.4.4 Kinetic and thermodynamic parameters of the simulation

**Table 7:** Parameters. Averages were calculated with the database from [23], with some more recent additions from BRENDA [22]. Mutant enzymes were excluded. Wherever the value was taken from a single publication, this is indicated. The default value for product  $K_M$ 's is 1 mM. The default for a  $K_M$  of a product is 1 mM.<sup>1</sup> Class average for ATP, ADP and AMP.<sup>2</sup> Class average for CoA and all acyl-CoA compounds.<sup>3</sup> Class average for NADPH and NADP. Some  $K_M$ 's, e.g. of the reverse reaction of a kinase, have never been measured, therefore the values were 'assumed'.

Compound	Concentration (mM)
D.	2.000
	2.000
$PP_i$	0.300
AMP	0.500
ADP	1.000
ATP	2.000
PGA	5.000
RuBP	5.000
NADPH	0.500
NADP	0.500
CoA	0.005
AcCoA	0.050
acetate	0.010
Xu5P	0.100
R5P	0.100
Ru5P	0.100
S7P	1.000
DHAP	0.500
GAP	0.050
E4P	0.100
F6P	1.000

### 3.4.5 Steady-state concentrations of co-factors and Calvin cycle intermediates

Table 8: The values shown are rounded and averaged values from [29, 30, 31].

# 3.4.6 Sampling

To reflect the uncertainty in the parameters, we draw parameter values from a log-normal distribution centered on the literature value and a with log-standard deviation of 2 (i.e. 70% of all values are within a factor of 2 of the log-mean). All parameters and fixed concentrations that enter the calculations are treated in this manner.

# 3.4.7 Lower and upper limits on pathway metabolites

The default lower limit is 1  $\mu$ M for all compounds. The default upper limit is 10 mM. For reasons of toxicity/known inhibition of Calvin cycle enzymes, the upper limits for [GA] and [G2P] were set to 1 mM and 0.1 mM respectively [32, 33, 34, 35]. The upper limit of all CoA-species was set to 0.05 mM because of the relatively low abundance of these compounds in the stroma [36]. The upper limit for glycerate was also set to 0.1 mM for similar reasons [37]. For a number of compounds, an effective thermodynamic upper/lower limit needs to be considered too.

# Ru1P pathway: upper limit on [Ru1P]

Since the upper limit on [GA] is 1 mM, there is an effective thermodynamic upper limit on [Ru1P]. According to Eq. 75

$$\max = [GA]_{\max} \cdot \kappa$$

$$[Ru1P]_{\max} = [GA]_{\max} \cdot K'_{eq}[DHAP]$$

$$= 1 \, mM \cdot 3 \, (mM)^{-1} \cdot 0.5 = 1.5 \, mM$$
(105)

To allow for some degrees of freedom in the kinetic parameters, we set the limit to 1 mM.

### Ar5P pathway: upper and lower limit on [Ar5P]

The upper limit for Ar5P is derived in the same manner as for Ru1P:

$$\max_{\text{max}} = [\text{GA}]_{\text{max}} \cdot \kappa$$
$$[\text{Ar5P}]_{\text{max}} = [\text{GA}]_{\text{max}} \cdot K'_{eq} \cdot [\text{GAP}]$$
$$= 1 \, mM \cdot 0.5 \, (mM)^{-1} \cdot 0.05 = 0.025 \, mM$$
(106)

This upper limit is in fact very low. In addition, there is a lower limit on [Ar5P] because of the isomerisation to Ru5P that follows the aldolase reaction. The concentration of Ru5P is below 0.1 mM, perhaps as low as 0.02 mM. The equilibrium constant is close to 1; eQuilibrator calculates 0.35.

$$_{\rm min} = [{\rm Ru5P}]_{\rm max} / K'_{eq}$$

$$[{\rm Ar5P}]_{\rm min} = 0.02 / 0.35 \approx 0.067 mM$$
(107)

Thus the lower limit for Ar5P is higher than the upper limit. Even if we changed both equilibrium constants and [Ru5P] to more favorable values, we would end up with an extremely narrow range for [Ar5P]. Thus, to stay in this range, the kinetics of the enzyme would have to be spot on, a situation which is unlikely to be achievable in vivo. However, if it were possible to substantially increase [GAP], the Ar5P pathway would become thermodynamically feasible.

### Eu pathway: upper limit on [Eu]

$$_{\max} = [GA]_{\max} \cdot \kappa$$

$$[Eu]_{\max} = [GA]_{\max} \cdot K'_{eq} \cdot [S7P] / [R5P] = 1 mM \cdot 0.4 \cdot 1 mM / 0.1 mM = 4 mM$$
(108)

Due to the ratio of [S7P] to [Ru5P] (or equally, [F6P] to [E4P]) this upper limit is thermodynamically unproblematic. Since millimolar concentrations of erythrulose may not be tolerated by the chloroplast, we decided to set the upper limit to 0.1 mM. The more restrictive upper limit has two consequences: the kinetic parameters of transketolase need to be 'better' (e.g. higher  $k_{cat}$ ), and, conversely, those of erythrulose kinase can be 'worse'.

### Xu pathway: upper limit on [Xu]

$$_{\max} = [GA]_{\max} \cdot \kappa$$

$$[Xu]_{\max} = [GA]_{\max} \cdot K'_{eq} \cdot [F6P]/[GAP] = 1 \, mM \cdot 1 \cdot 1 \, mM/0.05 mM = 20 \, mM$$
(109)

# Supplementary Material

Page 59

The thermodynamic driving force is to a large part derived from the high ratio of [F6P] to [E4P]. Again, for biological reasons we decided to set the upper limit to 0.1 mM.

#### 3.4.8 Summary

	lower bound	upper bound
glycolate	0.001	10.000
glycolate 2-phosphate	0.0001	0.100
glycolaldehyde	0.001	1.000
ribulose 1-phosphate	0.001	1.000
erythrulose	0.001	0.100
xylulose	0.001	0.100
glycerate	0.001	0.100
glycolyl-CoA	0.001	0.050
tartronyl-CoA	0.001	0.050

Table 9: Upper and lower limits in millimolar units.

### 3.4.9 Calculating fluxes

For every pathway, two types of fluxes are calculated at high and low  $C_i$ : the Rubisco-limited flux of the pathway, and the flux through the pathway that results in the same carbon-fixation rate as native photorespiration under the same circumstances. The former serves as an upper limit as it corresponds to the maximal carbon fixation rate of the pathway ('maximal gain'), and the latter as a lower limit in the sense that above this flux the pathway has a higher carbon fixation rate than native photorespiration ('minimal gain'). In each case it is assumed that the photorespiration shunt completely replaces native photorespiration.

	Native	Carbon neutral	Carbon positive
High $C_i$ , maximal gain	0.83	0.84	0.86
High $C_i$ , minimal gain	0.83	0.66	0.46
Low $C_i$ , maximal gain	1.00	1.02	1.07
Low $C_i$ , minimal gain	1.00	0.28	0.12

**Table 10:** Photorespiration fluxes assuming Rubisco limitation in units of mM/s. All carbon neutral pathways have the same flux. Maximal and minimal gain are explained in the text.

### 3.5 Pareto analysis

By Pareto analysis we mean that, for every enzyme in a pathway, we try to find the lowest  $k_{cat}$  over a range of  $K_M$  values at a given flux under biological constraints on metabolic concentrations.

### 3.5.1 Assumptions

1. We assume the flux through the shunt is known from the photosynthesis model. Flux is calculated at either at high or low  $C_i$  (8 and 2  $\mu$ M respectively), and for maximal or minimal gain (Section 3.4.9).

- 2. We assume that co-factor and Calvin cycle metabolite and concentrations will not be shifted by a synthetic photorespiration bypass. They are treated as fixed concentrations (Section 3.4.5).
- 3. For convenience we set the abundance of every enzyme (the total concentration of enzyme,  $[E_0]$ ) to 1 mM. Results for a different value of  $[E_0]$  can be simply obtained by adjusting the value of  $k_{cat}$  since what matters is the maximal activity  $V_{max} = [E_0]k_{cat}$ .
- 4. We assume that there are upper and lower limits for the concentration of each metabolite (Section 3.4.7).
- 5. Isomerase reactions are not explicitly modeled. We assume that all isomerases are at equilibrium.

# 3.5.2 Solving the rate equations

Given the rate laws, and fixed co-factor and Calvin cycle intermediate concentrations, it is possible to formulate an analytical solution for each reaction step (see Section 3.2.5). Thus, one by one, we obtain solutions for the concentrations of all metabolites in the pathway:

- 1. A parameter set is drawn with log-normal sampling (see Section 3.4.6)
- 2. The rate equation of the last reaction of the pathway (for which the concentration of product, a Calvin cycle intermediate, is known) is solved, leading to a solution for the concentration of substrate.
- 3. This substrate is the product of the previous reaction. Each reaction in turn is solved, using the solution of the previous reaction.

# 3.5.3 Metabolite distributions

The procedure described in the previous section can be carried out a very large number of times, leading to distributions of metabolite concentrations. We define a parameter combination as feasible if the  $20^{th}$  and  $80^{th}$  percentile of the distribution of every metabolite stay within the bounds of the constraints that have been defined (Section 3.4.7).

# 3.5.4 Carrying out the Pareto analysis

Ranges for the  $k_{cat}$  and  $K_M$  for the substrate of each reaction are defined on a logarithmic grid.  $K_M$ 's are varied between 0.01 mM and 100 mM in 161 increments.  $k_{cat}$ 's are varied between 1 s<sup>-1</sup> and 1000 s<sup>-1</sup> in 129 increments.

The following algorithm finds the minimal  $k_{cat}$  (if any) at a given  $K_M$ :

For each value of  $k_{cat}$  on the grid, starting with lowest value that can support the flux (Section 3.2.6), do the following:

1. Calculate metabolite distributions from 1e6 simulations with randomly drawn parameters.

2. If the parameter set is feasible stop. If not try the next-higher  $k_{cat}$ .

The Pareto pairs over the  $K_M$  range constitute the Pareto front shown in the main article. The results depend on the flux through the pathway, therefore the procedure is repeated for every flux value.

# 3.5.5 Results for all photorespiratory shunts

For each pathway the Pareto analysis of each enzyme is shown at high and low  $C_i$  and at maximal and minimal gain.



TrCoA shunt

Figure 9: Pareto analysis of the Tartronyl-CoA shunt. Any point on a line represents the minimal  $k_{cat}$  at the given  $K_M$  that would support the flux through a photorespiration shunt. The fluxes were calculated with the photosynthesis model assuming either high or low intercellular CO<sub>2</sub> concentrations ( $C_i$  of 8 and 2  $\mu M$  respectively). We show both the maximal gain curve (where the maximal possible carbon fixation rate of a shunt is achieved) and the minimal gain curve (where the flux through the shunt matches the carbon fixation rate of native photorespiration).



**Ru1P** shunt

Figure 10: Pareto analysis of the Ru1P shunt. Any point on a line represents the minimal  $k_{cat}$  at the given  $K_M$  that would support the flux through a photorespiration shunt. The fluxes were calculated with the photosynthesis model assuming either high or low intercellular CO<sub>2</sub> concentrations  $(C_i \text{ of } 8 \text{ and } 2 \ \mu M \text{ respectively})$ . We show both the maximal gain curve (where the maximal possible carbon fixation rate of a shunt is achieved) and the minimal gain curve (where the flux through the shunt matches the carbon fixation rate of native photorespiration).



# **Erythrulose shunt**

Figure 11: Pareto analysis of the Erythrulose shunt. Any point on a line represents the minimal  $k_{cat}$  at the given  $K_M$  that would support the flux through a photorespiration shunt. The fluxes were calculated with the photosynthesis model assuming either high or low intercellular CO<sub>2</sub> concentrations ( $C_i$  of 8 and 2  $\mu M$  respectively). We show both the maximal gain curve (where the maximal possible carbon fixation rate of a shunt is achieved) and the minimal gain curve (where the flux through the shunt matches the carbon fixation rate of native photorespiration).



# Xylulose shunt

Figure 12: Pareto analysis of the Xylulose shunt. Any point on a line represents the minimal  $k_{cat}$  at the given  $K_M$  that would support the flux through a photorespiration shunt. The fluxes were calculated with the photosynthesis model assuming either high or low intercellular CO<sub>2</sub> concentrations ( $C_i$  of 8 and 2  $\mu M$  respectively). We show both the maximal gain curve (where the maximal possible carbon fixation rate of a shunt is achieved) and the minimal gain curve (where the flux through the shunt matches the carbon fixation rate of native photorespiration).

# 4 pathSeekR pathway architectures

# 4.1 Glycolyl-CoA pathways

# Pathway 1



Number of reactions5Pathway superclass2:5Key C2 intermediateglycolyl-CoAKey C5 intermediateC(=O)(O)C(O)C(O)C(O)C(O]PO3])Calvin cycle sinkC5-aldose 5-phosphateKey reactionThioester aldolase with thioester hydrolysis (donor)Co-reactantGAPCo-product-







3: glycolyl-CoA

1: glycolate 2-phosphate





2: glycolate



4: tartronyl-CoA



5: tartronic semialdehyde

6: glycerate

7: glycerate 3-phosphate

Number of reactions Pathway superclass Key C2 intermediate Key C3 intermediate Calvin cycle sink Key reaction Co-reactant Co-product 6 2:3 glycolyl-CoA tartronyl-CoA glycerate 3-phosphate Thioester activated carboxylation



7: C4-aldose 4-phosphate

6
2:4
glycolyl-CoA
C(=O)(S[CoA])C(O)C(=O)C(O)
C4-aldose 4-phosphate
Thioester activated acyl-CoA C-transferase (acceptor and donor)
glycolyl-CoA



7: C5-ketose 5-phosphate

Number of reactions	6
Pathway superclass	2:5
Key C2 intermediate	glycolyl-CoA
Key C5 intermediate	C(O[PO3])C(O)C(N)C(=O)C(O)
Calvin cycle sink	C5-ketose 5-phosphate
Key reaction	Amine activated acyl-CoA C-transferase (acceptor)
Co-reactant	C(N)C(O)C(O[PO3])
Co-product	



7: C5-aldose 5-phosphate

Number of reactions	6
Pathway superclass	2:5
Key C2 intermediate	glycolyl-CoA
Key C5 intermediate	C(=O)(O)C(O)C(O)C(O[PO3])C(O)
Calvin cycle sink	C5-aldose 5-phosphate
Key reaction	Thioester aldolase with thioester hydrolysis (donor)
Co-reactant	C(=O)C(O[PO3])C(O)
Co-product	


7: C6-ketose 6-phosphate

Number of reactions	6
Pathway superclass	2:6
Key C2 intermediate	glycolyl-CoA
Key C6 intermediate	C(O[PO3])C(O)C(O)C(N)C(=O)C(O)
Calvin cycle sink	C6-ketose 6-phosphate
Key reaction	Amine activated acyl-CoA C-transferase (acceptor)
Co-reactant	C(N)C(O)C(O)C(O[PO3])
Co-product	



7: C6-ketose 6-phosphate

Number of reactions	6
Pathway superclass	2:6
Key C2 intermediate	glycolyl-CoA
Key C6 intermediate	C(=O)(O)C(O)C(O)C(O)C(O)C(O[PO3])
Calvin cycle sink	C6-ketose 6-phosphate
Key reaction	Thioester aldolase with thioester hydrolysis (donor)
Co-reactant	C4-aldose 4-phosphate
Co-product	





7: C7-ketose 7-phosphate

Number of reactions	6
Pathway superclass	2:7
Key C2 intermediate	glycolyl-CoA
Key C7 intermediate	C(O[PO3])C(O)C(O)C(O)C(N)C(=O)C(O)
Calvin cycle sink	C7-ketose 7-phosphate
Key reaction	Amine activated acyl-CoA C-transferase (acceptor)
Co-reactant	C(N)C(O)C(O)C(O)C(O[PO3])
Co-product	





7: C7-ketose 7-phosphate

Number of reactions	6
Pathway superclass	2:7
Key C2 intermediate	glycolyl-CoA
Key C7 intermediate	C(=O)(O)C(O)C(O)C(O)C(O)C(O)C(O[PO3])
Calvin cycle sink	C7-ketose 7-phosphate
Key reaction	Thioester aldolase with thioester hydrolysis (donor)
Co-reactant	C5-aldose 5-phosphate
Co-product	







3: glycolyl-CoA

1: glycolate 2-phosphate





2: glycolate





5: tartronic semialdehyde

6: glycerate





7: glyceroyl phosphate

7



Number of reactions Pathway superclass Key C2 intermediate Key C3 intermediate Calvin cycle sink Key reaction Co-reactant Co-product

2:3 glycolyl-CoA tartronyl-CoA glycerate 1,3-bisphosphate Thioester activated carboxylation



Number of reactions
Pathway superclass
Key C2 intermediate
Key C5 intermediate
Calvin cycle sink
Key reaction
Co-reactant
Co-product

2:5 glycolyl-CoA C(O[PO3])C(O)C(N)C(=O)C(O)C5-ketose 1,5-bisphosphate Amine activated acyl-CoA C-transferase (acceptor) C(N)C(O)C(O[PO3])



Number of reactions Pathway superclass Key C2 intermediate Key C5 intermediate Calvin cycle sink Key reaction Co-reactant Co-product 7 2:5 glycolyl-CoA C(O[PO3])C(O)C(N)C(=O)C(O)C5-aldose 5-phosphate Amine activated acyl-CoA C-transferase (acceptor) C(N)C(O)C(O[PO3])



Number of reactions
Pathway superclass
Key C2 intermediate
Key C5 intermediate
Calvin cycle sink
Key reaction
Co-reactant
Co-product

7 2:5 glycolyl-CoA C(=O)(O)C(O)C(O)C(O[PO3])C(O)C5-ketose 5-phosphate Thioester aldolase with thioester hydrolysis (donor) C(=O)C(O[PO3])C(O)



Number of reactions Pathway superclass Key C2 intermediate Key C6 intermediate Calvin cycle sink Key reaction Co-reactant Co-product 7 2:6 glycolyl-CoA C(O[PO3])C(O)C(O)C(N)C(=O)C(O)C6-ketose 1,6-bisphosphate Amine activated acyl-CoA C-transferase (acceptor) C(N)C(O)C(O)C(O[PO3])



7: C6-aldose 6-phosphate



Number of reactions	7
Pathway superclass	2:6
Key C2 intermediate	glyc
Key C6 intermediate	C(=
Calvin cycle sink	C6-
Key reaction	Thi
Co-reactant	C(=
Co-product	

2:6 glycolyl-CoA C(=O)(O)C(O)C(O)C(O)C(O[PO3])C(O)C6-ketose 6-phosphate Thioester aldolase with thioester hydrolysis (donor) C(=O)C(O)C(O[PO3])C(O)



Number of reactions Pathway superclass Key C2 intermediate Key C7 intermediate Calvin cycle sink Key reaction Co-reactant Co-product 7 2:7 glycolyl-CoA C(O[PO3])C(O)C(O)C(O)C(N)C(=O)C(O)C7-ketose 1,7-bisphosphate Amine activated acyl-CoA C-transferase (acceptor) C(N)C(O)C(O)C(O)C(O[PO3])



7: C7-aldose 7-phosphate



Number of reactions	7
Pathway superclass	2:
Key C2 intermediate	gl
Key C7 intermediate	С
Calvin cycle sink	С
Key reaction	Т
Co-reactant	С
Co-product	

2:7 glycolyl-CoA C(=O)(O)C(O)C(O)C(O)C(O)C(O[PO3])C(O)C7-ketose 7-phosphate Thioester aldolase with thioester hydrolysis (donor) C(=O)C(O)C(O)C(O[PO3])C(O)







3: glycolyl-CoA

1: glycolate 2-phosphate





2: glycolate



6: glycerate











7: glyceroyl phosphate

8



9: GAP

Number of reactions Pathway superclass Key C2 intermediate Key C3 intermediate Calvin cycle sink Key reaction Co-reactant Co-product

2:3 glycolyl-CoA tartronyl-CoA GAP Thioester activated carboxylation



Number of reactions Pathway superclass Key C2 intermediate Key C5 intermediate Calvin cycle sink Key reaction Co-reactant Co-product

8 2:5 glycolyl-CoA C(=O)(O)C(O)C(O)C(O[PO3])C(O)C5-ketose 1,5-bisphosphate Thioester aldolase with thioester hydrolysis (donor) C(=O)C(O[PO3])C(O)











OH

0

Po

Po

OH

ОН

0

Number of reactions Pathway superclass Key C2 intermediate Key C6 intermediate Calvin cycle sink Key reaction Co-reactant Co-product 8 2:6 glycolyl-CoA C(=O)(O)C(O)C(O)C(O)C(O)C(O[PO3]) C6-ketose 1,6-bisphosphate Thioester aldolase with thioester hydrolysis (donor) C4-aldose 4-phosphate



9: C6-ketose 1,6-bisphosphate

Number of reactions Pathway superclass Key C2 intermediate Key C6 intermediate Calvin cycle sink Key reaction Co-reactant Co-product

8 2:6glycolyl-CoA C(=O)(O)C(O)C(O)C(O)C(O[PO3])C(O)C6-ketose 1,6-bisphosphate Thioester aldolase with thioester hydrolysis (donor) C(=O)C(O)C(O[PO3])C(O)



Number of reactions Pathway superclass Key C2 intermediate Key C7 intermediate Calvin cycle sink Key reaction Co-reactant Co-product 8 2:7 glycolyl-CoA C(=O)(O)C(O)C(O)C(O)C(O)C(O)C(O[PO3]) C7-ketose 1,7-bisphosphate Thioester aldolase with thioester hydrolysis (donor) C5-aldose 5-phosphate



Number of reactions8Pathway superclass2:Key C2 intermediateglKey C7 intermediateCCalvin cycle sinkCKey reactionTCo-reactantCCo-productC

2:7 glycolyl-CoA C(=O)(O)C(O)C(O)C(O)C(O)C(O[PO3])C(O)C7-ketose 1,7-bisphosphate Thioester aldolase with thioester hydrolysis (donor) C(=O)C(O)C(O)C(O[PO3])C(O)

## 4.2 Glycolaldehyde 2-phosphate pathways

## Pathway 24



4: C4-aldose 4-phosphate

Number of reactions	3
Pathway superclass	2:4
Key C2 intermediate	glycolaldehyde 2-phosphate
Key C4 intermediate	C4-aldose 4-phosphate
Calvin cycle sink	C4-aldose 4-phosphate
Key reaction	Carbonyl aldolase (acceptor)
Co-reactant	glycolaldehyde
Co-product	



4: C5-ketose 1,5-bisphosphate

Number of reactions	3
Pathway superclass	2:5
Key C2 intermediate	glycolaldehyde 2-phosphate
Key C5 intermediate	C5-ketose 1,5-bisphosphate
Calvin cycle sink	C5-ketose 1,5-bisphosphate
Key reaction	Carbonyl aldolase (acceptor) or Ketolase (donor)
Co-reactant	GAP or DHAP
Co-product	







1: glycolate 2-phosphate

2: glycolate bisphosphate

3: glycolaldehyde 2-phosphate



4: C5-ketose 5-phosphate

Number of reactions Pathway superclass Key C2 intermediate Key C5 intermediate Calvin cycle sink Key reaction Co-reactant Co-product 3 2:5 glycolaldehyde 2-phosphate C5-ketose 5-phosphate C5-ketose 5-phosphate Transaldolase (acceptor)





1: glycolate 2-phosphate

2: glycolate bisphosphate

3: glycolaldehyde 2-phosphate



4: C6-ketose 1,6-bisphosphate

Number of reactions Pathway superclass Key C2 intermediate Key C6 intermediate Calvin cycle sink Key reaction Co-reactant Co-product

2:6 glycolaldehyde 2-phosphate C6-ketose 1,6-bisphosphate

3

C6-ketose 1,6-bisphosphate C6-ketose 1,6-bisphosphate Ketolase (donor) C4-aldose 4-phosphate







1: glycolate 2-phosphate

2: glycolate bisphosphate

3: glycolaldehyde 2-phosphate





Number of reactions Pathway superclass Key C2 intermediate Key C7 intermediate Calvin cycle sink Key reaction Co-reactant Co-product 3 2:7

glycolaldehyde 2-phosphate C7-ketose 1,7-bisphosphate C7-ketose 1,7-bisphosphate Ketolase (donor) C5-aldose 5-phosphate



Number of reactions4Pathway superclass2:4Key C2 intermediateglycolaldehyde 2-phosphateKey C4 intermediateC4-ketose 4-phosphateCalvin cycle sinkC4-aldose 4-phosphateKey reactionKetolase (acceptor) or Transketolase (acceptor)Co-reactantglycolaldehydeCo-product



5: C5-ketose 1,5-bisphosphate

0

Ο

Number of reactions Pathway superclass Key C2 intermediate Key C5 intermediate Calvin cycle sink Key reaction Co-reactant Co-product

4:

42:5glycolaldehyde 2-phosphate C(O[PO3])C(O)C(=O)C(O)C(O[PO3])C5-ketose 1,5-bisphosphate Ketolase (acceptor)  $\operatorname{GAP}$ 







Po

Ο

3: glycolaldehyde 2-phosphate

5: C5-ketose 1,5-bisphosphate

Number of reactions Pathway superclass Key C2 intermediate Key C5 intermediate Calvin cycle sink Key reaction  $\operatorname{Co-reactant}$ Co-product

42:5glycolaldehyde 2-phosphate C(O[PO3])C(=O)C(O)C(O[PO3])C(O)C5-ketose 1,5-bisphosphate Ketolase (donor) C(=O)C(O[PO3])C(O)



Number of reactions	4
Pathway superclass	2:6
Key C2 intermediate	glycolaldehyde 2-phosphate
Key C6 intermediate	C(O[PO3])C(O)C(=O)C(O)C(O)C(O[PO3])
Calvin cycle sink	C6-ketose 1,6-bisphosphate
Key reaction	Carbonyl aldolase (acceptor) or Ketolase (acceptor)
Co-reactant	C4-ketose 4-phosphate or C4-aldose 4-phosphate
Co-product	



4
2:6
glycolaldehyde 2-phosphate
C(O[PO3])C(=O)C(O)C(O)C(O[PO3])C(O)
C6-ketose 1,6-bisphosphate
Ketolase (donor)
C(=O)C(O)C(O[PO3])C(O)



Number of reactions4Pathway superclass2:7Key C2 intermediateglydKey C7 intermediateC(CCalvin cycle sinkC7-Key reactionKetCo-reactantC5-Co-productC5-

2:7 glycolaldehyde 2-phosphate C(O[PO3])C(O)C(=O)C(O)C(O)C(O)C(O[PO3]) C7-ketose 1,7-bisphosphate Ketolase (acceptor) C5-aldose 5-phosphate



Number of reactions4Pathway superclass2:7Key C2 intermediateglycolaldehyde 2-phosphateKey C7 intermediateC(O[PO3])C(=O)C(O)C(O)C(O)C(O[PO3])C(O)Calvin cycle sinkC7-ketose 1,7-bisphosphateKey reactionKetolase (donor)Co-reactantC(=O)C(O)C(O)C(O[PO3])C(O)Co-productC(=O)C(O)C(O)C(O[PO3])C(O)



Number of reactions Pathway superclass Key C2 intermediate Key C4 intermediate Calvin cycle sink Key reaction Co-reactant Co-product 5 2:4 glycolaldehyde 2-phosphate C(O[PO3])C(=O)C(O)C(O)C4-aldose 4-phosphate Ketolase (donor) glycolaldehyde





5





3: glycolaldehyde 2-phosphate



6: C5-ketose 1,5-bisphosphate

Number of reactions Pathway superclass Key C2 intermediate Key C5 intermediate Calvin cycle sink Key reaction Co-reactant Co-product

2:5 glycolaldehyde 2-phosphate C(O[PO3])C(O)C(N)C(O)C(O[PO3]) C5-ketose 1,5-bisphosphate Amine aldolase (acceptor) C(N)C(O)C(O[PO3])





1: glycolate 2-phosphate



5



2: glycolate bisphosphate

3: glycolaldehyde 2-phosphate



6: C5-ketose 1,5-bisphosphate

Number of reactions Pathway superclass Key C2 intermediate Key C5 intermediate Calvin cycle sink Key reaction Co-reactant Co-product

2:5 glycolaldehyde 2-phosphate C(O[PO3])C(O)C(=O)C(O[PO3])C(O)C5-ketose 1,5-bisphosphate Ketolase (acceptor) C(=O)C(O[PO3])C(O)



Number of reactions Pathway superclass Key C2 intermediate Key C6 intermediate Calvin cycle sink Key reaction Co-reactant Co-product 5 2:6 glycolaldehyde 2-phosphate C(O[PO3])C(O)C(N)C(O)C(O)C(O[PO3]) C6-ketose 1,6-bisphosphate Amine aldolase (acceptor) C(N)C(O)C(O)C(O[PO3])



Number of reactions Pathway superclass Key C2 intermediate Key C6 intermediate Calvin cycle sink Key reaction Co-reactant Co-product 5 2:6 glycolaldehyde 2-phosphate C(O[PO3])C(O)C(=O)C(O)C(O[PO3])C(O)C6-ketose 1,6-bisphosphate Ketolase (acceptor) C(=O)C(O)C(O[PO3])C(O)



Number of reactions5Pathway superclass2:Key C2 intermediateglKey C7 intermediateCCalvin cycle sinkCKey reactionCCo-reactantCCo-productC

2:7 glycolaldehyde 2-phosphate C(O[PO3])C(O)C(O)C(O)C(O)C(O)C(O[PO3]) C7-ketose 1,7-bisphosphate Carbonyl aldolase (acceptor) C5-ketose 5-phosphate


Number of reactions Pathway superclass Key C2 intermediate Key C7 intermediate Calvin cycle sink Key reaction Co-reactant Co-product 5

2:7 glycolaldehyde 2-phosphate C(O[PO3])C(O)C(N)C(O)C(O)C(O)C(O[PO3]) C7-ketose 1,7-bisphosphate Amine aldolase (acceptor) C(N)C(O)C(O)C(O)C(O[PO3])



Number of reactions Pathway superclass Key C2 intermediate Key C7 intermediate Calvin cycle sink Key reaction Co-reactant Co-product 5

2:7 glycolaldehyde 2-phosphate C(O[PO3])C(O)C(=O)C(O)C(O)C(O[PO3])C(O)C7-ketose 1,7-bisphosphate Ketolase (acceptor) C(=O)C(O)C(O)C(O[PO3])C(O)



7: C7-ketose 1,7-bisphosphate

Number of reactions	6
Pathway superclass	2:7
Key C2 intermediate	glycolaldehyde 2-phosphate
Key C7 intermediate	C(O[PO3])C(O)C(O)C(=O)C(O)C(O[PO3])C(O)
Calvin cycle sink	C7-ketose 1,7-bisphosphate
Key reaction	Carbonyl aldolase (acceptor)
Co-reactant	C(O)C(=O)C(O)C(O[PO3])C(O)
Co-product	

# 4.3 Glycolaldehyde pathways

# Pathway 45



Number of reactions	4
Pathway superclass	2:5
Key C2 intermediate	glycolaldehyde
Key C5 intermediate	C5-aldose 5-phosphate
Calvin cycle sink	C5-aldose 5-phosphate
Key reaction	Carbonyl aldolase (donor)
Co-reactant	GAP
Co-product	



- Number of reactions Pathway superclass Key C2 intermediate Key C5 intermediate Calvin cycle sink Key reaction Co-reactant Co-product
- 4 2:5 glycolaldehyde C5-ketose 5-phosphate Ketolase (donor) GAP



Number of reactions Pathway superclass Key C2 intermediate Key C6 intermediate Calvin cycle sink Key reaction Co-reactant Co-product 4 2:6 glycolaldehyde C6-ketose 6-phosphate C6-ketose 6-phosphate Ketolase (donor) C4-aldose 4-phosphate



- Number of reactions Pathway superclass Key C2 intermediate Key C7 intermediate Calvin cycle sink Key reaction Co-reactant Co-product
- 4 2:7 glycolaldehyde C7-ketose 7-phosphate C7-ketose 7-phosphate Ketolase (donor) C5-aldose 5-phosphate



Number of reactions5Pathway superclass2:3Key C2 intermediateglycolKey C3 intermediateglycerCalvin cycle sinkglycerKey reactionReducCo-reactantCo-product

2:3 glycolaldehyde glycerate glycerate 3-phosphate Reductive carbonyl  $\alpha$ -carboxylation





Number of reactions Pathway superclass Key C2 intermediate Key C5 intermediate Calvin cycle sink Key reaction Co-reactant Co-product 5 2:5 glycolaldehyde C5-ketose 1-phosphate C5-ketose 1,5-bisphosphate Carbonyl aldolase (acceptor) DHAP



Number of reactions Pathway superclass Key C2 intermediate Key C5 intermediate Calvin cycle sink Key reaction Co-reactant Co-product 5 2:5 glycolaldehyde C(=O)C(O)C(O)C(O[PO3])C(O)C5-aldose 5-phosphate Carbonyl aldolase (donor) C(=O)C(O[PO3])C(O)



Number of reactions Pathway superclass Key C2 intermediate Key C5 intermediate Calvin cycle sink Key reaction Co-reactant Co-product 5 2:5 glycolaldehyde C(O[PO3])C(O)C(=O)C(O)C(O) C5-ketose 5-phosphate Ketolase (acceptor) GAP



Number of reactions Pathway superclass Key C2 intermediate Key C5 intermediate Calvin cycle sink Key reaction Co-reactant Co-product 5 2:5 glycolaldehyde C(O)C(=O)C(O)C(O[PO3])C(O)C5-ketose 5-phosphate Ketolase (donor) C(=O)C(O[PO3])C(O)



- Number of reactions Pathway superclass Key C2 intermediate Key C5 intermediate Calvin cycle sink Key reaction Co-reactant Co-product
- 5 2:5 glycolaldehyde C5-ketose C5-ketose 5-phosphate Transaldolase (acceptor)



Number of reactions Pathway superclass Key C2 intermediate Key C6 intermediate Calvin cycle sink Key reaction Co-reactant Co-product 5 2:6 glycolaldehyde C6-aldose 6-phosphate C6-ketose 6-phosphate Carbonyl aldolase (donor) C4-aldose 4-phosphate



Number of reactions Pathway superclass Key C2 intermediate Key C6 intermediate Calvin cycle sink Key reaction Co-reactant Co-product 5 2:6 glycolaldehyde C(O[PO3])C(O)C(O)C(=O)C(O)C(O) C6-ketose 6-phosphate Ketolase (acceptor) C4-aldose 4-phosphate



Number of reactions Pathway superclass Key C2 intermediate Key C6 intermediate Calvin cycle sink Key reaction Co-reactant Co-product 5 2:6 glycolaldehyde C(O)C(=O)C(O)C(O)C(O[PO3])C(O)C6-ketose 6-phosphate Ketolase (donor) C(=O)C(O)C(O[PO3])C(O)



Number of reactions Pathway superclass Key C2 intermediate Key C7 intermediate Calvin cycle sink Key reaction Co-reactant Co-product 5 2:7 glycolaldehyde C7-aldose 7-phosphate C7-ketose 7-phosphate Carbonyl aldolase (donor) C5-aldose 5-phosphate



Number of reactions Pathway superclass Key C2 intermediate Key C7 intermediate Calvin cycle sink Key reaction Co-reactant Co-product 5 2:7 glycolaldehyde C(O[PO3])C(O)C(O)C(O)C(=O)C(O)C(O) C7-ketose 7-phosphate Ketolase (acceptor) C5-aldose 5-phosphate



Number of reactions Pathway superclass Key C2 intermediate Key C7 intermediate Calvin cycle sink Key reaction Co-reactant Co-product 5 2:7 glycolaldehyde C(O)C(=O)C(O)C(O)C(O)C(O[PO3])C(O)C7-ketose 7-phosphate Ketolase (donor) C(=O)C(O)C(O)C(O[PO3])C(O)



7: glycerate 3-phosphate

Number of reactions Pathway superclass Key C2 intermediate Key C3 intermediate Calvin cycle sink Key reaction Co-reactant Co-product 6 2:3 glycolaldehyde tartronic semialdehyde glycerate 3-phosphate Carbonyl  $\alpha$ -carboxylation



7: glycerate 1,3-bisphosphate

0

Number of reactions	6
Pathway superclass	2:3
Key C2 intermediate	glycolaldehyde
Key C3 intermediate	glycerate
Calvin cycle sink	glycerate 1,3-bisphosphate
Key reaction	Reductive carbonyl $\alpha\text{-carboxylation}$
Co-reactant	
Co-product	



7: C4-aldose 4-phosphate

Number of reactions	6
Pathway superclass	2:4
Key C2 intermediate	glycolaldehyde
Key C4 intermediate	C(=O)(S[CoA])C(O)C(O)C(O)
Calvin cycle sink	C4-aldose 4-phosphate
Key reaction	Thioester aldolase (acceptor)
Co-reactant	glycolyl-CoA
Co-product	



<sup>7:</sup> C4-aldose 4-phosphate

Number of reactions	6
Pathway superclass	2:4
Key C2 intermediate	glycolaldehyde
Key C4 intermediate	C4-ketose
Calvin cycle sink	C4-aldose 4-phosphate
Key reaction	Ketolase (acceptor and donor) or Transketolase (acceptor)
Co-reactant	glycolaldehyde
Co-product	



Number of reactions Pathway superclass

OH

7: C5-ketose 5-phosphate

6

Key C2 intermediate Key C5 intermediate Calvin cycle sink Key reaction Co-reactant Co-product

0

2:5 glycolaldehyde C5-ketose 1-phosphate C5-ketose 5-phosphate Carbonyl aldolase (acceptor) DHAP



7: C5-aldose 5-phosphate

0

6
2:5
glycolaldehyde
C5-ketose 1-phosphate
C5-aldose 5-phosphate
Carbonyl aldolase (acceptor)
DHAP

0



7: C5-ketose 5-phosphate

OH

Number of reactions	6
Pathway superclass	2:5
Key C2 intermediate	glycolaldehyde
Key C5 intermediate	C(=O)C(O)C(O)C(O[PO3])C(O)
Calvin cycle sink	C5-ketose 5-phosphate
Key reaction	Carbonyl aldolase (donor)
Co-reactant	C(=O)C(O[PO3])C(O)
Co-product	



7: C5-ketose 5-phosphate

6

Number of reactions
Pathway superclass
Key C2 intermediate
Key C5 intermediate
Calvin cycle sink
Key reaction
Co-reactant
Co-product

2:5 glycolaldehyde C(O[PO3])C(O)C(N)C(O)C(O) C5-ketose 5-phosphate Amine aldolase (acceptor) C(N)C(O)C(O[PO3])



7: C5-ketose 1,5-bisphosphate

6

OH

Number of reactions Pathway superclass Key C2 intermediate Key C5 intermediate Calvin cycle sink Key reaction Co-reactant Co-product

2:5 glycolaldehyde C(O[PO3])C(O)C(=O)C(O)C(O) C5-ketose 1,5-bisphosphate Ketolase (acceptor) GAP



7: C5-ketose 5-phosphate

Number of reactions	6
Pathway superclass	2:5
Key C2 intermediate	glycolaldehyde
Key C5 intermediate	C(O)C(O[PO3])C(=O)C(O)C(O)
Calvin cycle sink	C5-ketose 5-phosphate
Key reaction	Ketolase (acceptor)
Co-reactant	C(=O)C(O[PO3])C(O)
Co-product	



7: C5-aldose 5-phosphate

Number of reactions6Pathway superclass2:5Key C2 intermediateglydKey C5 intermediateC(CCalvin cycle sinkC5-Key reactionKetCo-reactantGACo-productKet

2:5 glycolaldehyde C(O[PO3])C(O)C(=O)C(O)C(O) C5-aldose 5-phosphate Ketolase (acceptor) GAP



7: C5-aldose 5-phosphate

Number of reactions	6
Number of feactions	0
Pathway superclass	2:5
Key C2 intermediate	glycolaldehyde
Key C5 intermediate	C(O)C(=O)C(O)C(O[PO3])C(O)
Calvin cycle sink	C5-aldose 5-phosphate
Key reaction	Ketolase (donor)
Co-reactant	C(=O)C(O[PO3])C(O)
Co-product	



7: C5-ketose 1,5-bisphosphate

6
2:5
glycolaldehyde
C(O)C(=O)C(O)C(O[PO3])C(O)
C5-ketose 1,5-bisphosphate
Ketolase (donor)
C(=O)C(O[PO3])C(O)









4: glycolaldehyde



5: C5-ketose

6: C5-ketose 1-phosphate

7: C5-ketose 1,5-bisphosphate

Number of reactions6Pathway superclass2:5Key C2 intermediateglycolaldehyKey C5 intermediateC5-ketoseCalvin cycle sinkC5-ketose 1.Key reactionTransaldolasCo-reactantCo-product

2:5 glycolaldehyde C5-ketose C5-ketose 1,5-bisphosphate Transaldolase (acceptor)



Number of reactions6Pathway superclass2:Key C2 intermediateglKey C5 intermediateCCalvin cycle sinkCKey reactionTCo-reactantCCo-productT

7: C5-aldose 5-phosphate

HO

Ро

2:5 glycolaldehyde C5-ketose C5-aldose 5-phosphate Transaldolase (acceptor)

OH

0



7: C6-ketose 6-phosphate

Number of reactions	6
Pathway superclass	2:
Key C2 intermediate	$\operatorname{gl}$
Key C6 intermediate	С
Calvin cycle sink	С
Key reaction	С
Co-reactant	С
Co-product	

2:6 glycolaldehyde C(O[PO3])C(O)C(=O)C(O)C(O)C(O) C6-ketose 6-phosphate Carbonyl aldolase (acceptor) C4-ketose 4-phosphate


7: C6-ketose 1,6-bisphosphate

6

OH

Number of reactions
Pathway superclass
Key C2 intermediate
Key C6 intermediate
Calvin cycle sink
Key reaction
Co-reactant
Co-product

OH

2:6 glycolaldehyde C(O[PO3])C(O)C(=O)C(O)C(O)C(O) C6-ketose 1,6-bisphosphate Carbonyl aldolase (acceptor) C4-ketose 4-phosphate



7: C6-ketose 6-phosphate

OH

Number of reactions	6
Pathway superclass	2:6
Key C2 intermediate	glycolaldehyde
Key C6 intermediate	C(=O)C(O)C(O)C(O)C(O[PO3])C(O)
Calvin cycle sink	C6-ketose 6-phosphate
Key reaction	Carbonyl aldolase (donor)
Co-reactant	C(=O)C(O)C(O[PO3])C(O)
Co-product	



7: C6-ketose 6-phosphate

6

Number of reactions Pathway superclass Key C2 intermediate Key C6 intermediate Calvin cycle sink Key reaction Co-reactant Co-product

2:6 glycolaldehyde C(O[PO3])C(O)C(O)C(N)C(O)C(O) C6-ketose 6-phosphate Amine aldolase (acceptor) C(N)C(O)C(O)C(O[PO3])



7: C6-ketose 1,6-bisphosphate

ОН

OH

Number of reactions	6
Pathway superclass	2:6
Key C2 intermediate	glyc
Key C6 intermediate	C(C
Calvin cycle sink	C6-
Key reaction	Ket
Co-reactant	C4-
Co-product	

2:6 glycolaldehyde C(O[PO3])C(O)C(O)C(=O)C(O)C(O) C6-ketose 1,6-bisphosphate Ketolase (acceptor) C4-aldose 4-phosphate



7: C6-ketose 6-phosphate

Number of reactions	6
Pathway superclass	2:6
Key C2 intermediate	glycolaldehyde
Key C6 intermediate	C(O)C(O[PO3])C(O)C(=O)C(O)C(O)
Calvin cycle sink	C6-ketose 6-phosphate
Key reaction	Ketolase (acceptor)
Co-reactant	C(=O)C(O)C(O[PO3])C(O)
Co-product	



7: C6-ketose 1,6-bisphosphate

ОН

OH

Number of reactions	6
Pathway superclass	2:6
Key C2 intermediate	glycolaldehyde
Key C6 intermediate	C(O)C(=O)C(O)C(O)C(O[PO3])C(O)
Calvin cycle sink	C6-ketose 1,6-bisphosphate
Key reaction	Ketolase (donor)
Co-reactant	C(=O)C(O)C(O[PO3])C(O)
Co-product	

Po



7: C7-ketose 7-phosphate

Number of reactions	6
Pathway superclass	2:7
Key C2 intermediate	glycolaldehyde
Key C7 intermediate	C(O[PO3])C(O)C(O)C(=O)C(O)C(O)C(O)
Calvin cycle sink	C7-ketose 7-phosphate
Key reaction	Carbonyl aldolase (acceptor)
Co-reactant	C5-ketose 5-phosphate
Co-product	



7: C7-ketose 7-phosphate

Number of reactions	6
Pathway superclass	2:7
Key C2 intermediate	glycolaldehyde
Key C7 intermediate	C(=O)C(O)C(O)C(O)C(O)C(O[PO3])C(O)
Calvin cycle sink	C7-ketose 7-phosphate
Key reaction	Carbonyl aldolase (donor)
Co-reactant	C(=O)C(O)C(O)C(O[PO3])C(O)
Co-product	



7: C7-ketose 7-phosphate

Number of reactions	6
Pathway superclass	2:7
Key C2 intermediate	glycolaldehyde
Key C7 intermediate	C(O[PO3])C(O)C(O)C(O)C(N)C(O)C(O)
Calvin cycle sink	C7-ketose 7-phosphate
Key reaction	Amine aldolase (acceptor)
Co-reactant	C(N)C(O)C(O)C(O)C(O[PO3])
Co-product	



Number of reactions Pathway superclass Key C2 intermediate Key C7 intermediate Calvin cycle sink Key reaction Co-reactant Co-product 6 2:7 glycolaldehyde C(O[PO3])C(O)C(O)C(O)C(=O)C(O)C(O) C7-ketose 1,7-bisphosphate Ketolase (acceptor) C5-aldose 5-phosphate



7: C7-ketose 7-phosphate

OH

ОН

6
2:7
glycolaldehyde
C(O)C(O[PO3])C(O)C(O)C(=O)C(O)C(O)
C7-ketose 7-phosphate
Ketolase (acceptor)
C(=O)C(O)C(O)C(O[PO3])C(O)



7: C7-ketose 1,7-bisphosphate

Number of reactions	6
Pathway superclass	2:7
Key C2 intermediate	glycolaldehyde
Key C7 intermediate	C(O)C(=O)C(O)C(O)C(O)C(O[PO3])C(O)
Calvin cycle sink	C7-ketose 1,7-bisphosphate
Key reaction	Ketolase (donor)
Co-reactant	C(=O)C(O)C(O)C(O[PO3])C(O)
Co-product	



7: glyceroyl phosphate



Number of reactions Pathway superclass Key C2 intermediate Key C3 intermediate Calvin cycle sink Key reaction Co-reactant Co-product 7 2:3 glycolaldehyde tartronic semialdehyde glycerate 1,3-bisphosphate Carbonyl  $\alpha$ -carboxylation



7: glyceraldehyde

7

8: GAP

Number of reactions Pathway superclass Key C2 intermediate Key C3 intermediate Calvin cycle sink Key reaction Co-reactant Co-product

2:3glycolaldehyde glycerate GAP Reductive carbonyl  $\alpha\text{-carboxylation}$ 



Number of reactions Pathway superclass Key C2 intermediate Key C4 intermediate Calvin cycle sink Key reaction Co-reactant Co-product 7 2:4 glycolaldehyde C(=O)(O)C(O)C(O)C(O)C4-aldose 4-phosphate Thioester aldolase with thioester hydrolysis (acceptor) glycolyl-CoA



8: C5-ketose 1,5-bisphosphate

Number of reactions Pathway superclass Key C2 intermediate Key C5 intermediate Calvin cycle sink Key reaction Co-reactant Co-product

7:

7 2:5 glycolaldehyde C(O[PO3])C(O)C(N)C(O)C(O) C5-ketose 1,5-bisphosphate Amine aldolase (acceptor) C(N)C(O)C(O[PO3])



8: C5-ketose 1,5-bisphosphate

Number of reactions Pathway superclass Key C2 intermediate Key C5 intermediate Calvin cycle sink Key reaction Co-reactant Co-product

7:

7

2:5 glycolaldehyde C(O)C(O[PO3])C(=O)C(O)C(O)C5-ketose 1,5-bisphosphate Ketolase (acceptor) C(=O)C(O[PO3])C(O)



8: C5-aldose 5-phosphate

0

Number of reactions Pathway superclass Key C2 intermediate Key C5 intermediate Calvin cycle sink Key reaction Co-reactant Co-product

C

OH

7

7:

2:5 glycolaldehyde C(O)C(O[PO3])C(=O)C(O)C(O)C5-aldose 5-phosphate Ketolase (acceptor) C(=O)C(O[PO3])C(O)

Po



Number of reactions Pathway superclass Key C2 intermediate Key C6 intermediate Calvin cycle sink Key reaction Co-reactant Co-product

2:6 glycolaldehyde C6-aldose 6-phosphate C6-ketose 1,6-bisphosphate Carbonyl aldolase (donor) C4-aldose 4-phosphate





Number of reactions Pathway superclass Key C2 intermediate Key C6 intermediate Calvin cycle sink Key reaction Co-reactant Co-product

72:6glycolaldehyde C(O[PO3])C(O)C(O)C(N)C(O)C(O)C6-ketose 1,6-bisphosphate Amine aldolase (acceptor) C(N)C(O)C(O)C(O[PO3])



Number of reactions Pathway superclass Key C2 intermediate Key C6 intermediate Calvin cycle sink Key reaction Co-reactant Co-product 7 2:6 glycolaldehyde C(O)C(O[PO3])C(O)C(=O)C(O)C(O)C6-ketose 1,6-bisphosphate Ketolase (acceptor) C(=O)C(O)C(O[PO3])C(O)



7:

7



Number of reactions Pathway superclass Key C2 intermediate Key C7 intermediate Calvin cycle sink Key reaction Co-reactant Co-product

2:7 glycolaldehyde C(O[PO3])C(O)C(O)C(=O)C(O)C(O)C(O) C7-ketose 1,7-bisphosphate Carbonyl aldolase (acceptor) C5-ketose 5-phosphate



Number of reactions Pathway superclass Key C2 intermediate Key C7 intermediate Calvin cycle sink Key reaction Co-reactant Co-product 7 2:7 glycolaldehyde C(O)C(O[PO3])C(O)C(=O)C(O)C(O)C(O)C7-ketose 7-phosphate Carbonyl aldolase (acceptor) C(O)C(=O)C(O)C(O[PO3])C(O)



Number of reactions Pathway superclass Key C2 intermediate Key C7 intermediate Calvin cycle sink Key reaction Co-reactant Co-product

2:7 glycolaldehyde C7-aldose 7-phosphate C7-ketose 1,7-bisphosphate Carbonyl aldolase (donor) C5-aldose 5-phosphate



Number of reactions Pathway superclass Key C2 intermediate Key C7 intermediate Calvin cycle sink Key reaction

Co-reactant

Co-product

 $\overline{7}$ 

2:7 glycolaldehyde C(O[PO3])C(O)C(O)C(O)C(O)C(O)C7-ketose 1,7-bisphosphate Amine aldolase (acceptor) C(N)C(O)C(O)C(O)C(O[PO3])



7:

7



Number of reactions Pathway superclass Key C2 intermediate Key C7 intermediate Calvin cycle sink Key reaction Co-reactant Co-product

2:7 glycolaldehyde C(O)C(O[PO3])C(O)C(O)C(=O)C(O)C(O)C7-ketose 1,7-bisphosphate Ketolase (acceptor) C(=O)C(O)C(O)C(O[PO3])C(O)



7: glyceryl-CoA





8

8: glyceraldehyde

9: GAP

Number of reactions Pathway superclass Key C2 intermediate Key C3 intermediate Calvin cycle sink Key reaction Co-reactant Co-product

2:3glycolaldehyde tartronic semialdehyde GAP Carbonyl $\alpha\text{-}\mathrm{carboxylation}$ 



7: glyceraldehyde

8



8: DHA



9: DHAP

Number of reactions Pathway superclass Key C2 intermediate Key C3 intermediate Calvin cycle sink Key reaction Co-reactant Co-product

2:3glycolaldehyde glycerate DHAP Reductive carbonyl  $\alpha\text{-carboxylation}$ 



8:

9: C5-ketose 1,5-bisphosphate

Number of reactions Pathway superclass Key C2 intermediate Key C5 intermediate Calvin cycle sink Key reaction Co-reactant Co-product

7:

8 2:5 glycolaldehyde C(=O)C(O)C(O)C(O[PO3])C(O)C5-ketose 1,5-bisphosphate Carbonyl aldolase (donor) C(=O)C(O[PO3])C(O)



OH 7:





9: C6-ketose 1,6-bisphosphate

Number of reactions Pathway superclass Key C2 intermediate Key C6 intermediate Calvin cycle sink Key reaction Co-reactant Co-product

8 2:6glycolaldehyde C(=O)C(O)C(O)C(O)C(O[PO3])C(O)C6-ketose 1,6-bisphosphate Carbonyl aldolase (donor) C(=O)C(O)C(O[PO3])C(O)



Number of reactions
Pathway superclass
Key C2 intermediate
Key C7 intermediate
Calvin cycle sink
Key reaction
Co-reactant
Co-product

8

2:7 glycolaldehyde C(O)C(O[PO3])C(O)C(=O)C(O)C(O)C(O)C7-ketose 1,7-bisphosphate Carbonyl aldolase (acceptor) C(O)C(=O)C(O)C(O[PO3])C(O)



8:

9: C7-ketose 1,7-bisphosphate

Number of reactions
Pathway superclass
Key C2 intermediate
Key C7 intermediate
Calvin cycle sink
Key reaction
Co-reactant
Co-product

7:

8

2:7 glycolaldehyde C(=O)C(O)C(O)C(O)C(O)C(O[PO3])C(O)C7-ketose 1,7-bisphosphate Carbonyl aldolase (donor) C(=O)C(O)C(O)C(O[PO3])C(O)

# 4.4 Glyoxylate pathways

# Pathway 110



7: C5-aldose 5-phosphate

Number of reactions6Pathway superclass2:5Key C2 intermediateglyoxylateKey C5 intermediateC(=O)(O)C(O)C(O)C(=O)C(O[PO3])Calvin cycle sinkC5-aldose 5-phosphateKey reactionCarbonyl aldolase (acceptor)Co-reactantDHAPCo-product-





2: glycolate



1: glycolate 2-phosphate







3: glyoxylate



7: C5-aldose 5-phosphate

Number of reactions Pathway superclass Key C2 intermediate Key C5 intermediate Calvin cycle sink Key reaction Co-reactant Co-product

6 2:5 glyoxylate C(=O)(O)C(O)C(O)C(O[PO3]) C5-aldose 5-phosphate Ketolase (acceptor) GAP





2: glycolate



1: glycolate 2-phosphate









3: glyoxylate

HO Po O

7: C5-aldose 5-phosphate

Number of reactions6Pathway superclass2:5Key C2 intermediateglyoxylateKey C5 intermediateC(=O)(O)C(=O)C(O)C(O)C(O[PO3])Calvin cycle sinkC5-aldose 5-phosphateKey reactionKetolase (donor)Co-reactantGAPCo-productC







7: C4-aldose

7



Number of reactions Pathway superclass Key C2 intermediate Key C4 intermediate Calvin cycle sink Key reaction Co-reactant Co-product

2:4 glyoxylate C(=O)(O)C(O)C(=O)C(O)C4-aldose 4-phosphate Transketolase (acceptor)






1: glycolate 2-phosphate





2: glycolate



6:

3: glyoxylate







Number of reactions Pathway superclass Key C2 intermediate Key C5 intermediate Calvin cycle sink Key reaction Co-reactant Co-product 7 2:5 glyoxylate C(=O)(O)C(O)C(N)C(O)C(O[PO3])C5-aldose 5-phosphate Amine aldolase (acceptor) C(N)C(O)C(O[PO3])







1: glycolate 2-phosphate



3: glyoxylate













Number of reactions Pathway superclass Key C2 intermediate Key C5 intermediate Calvin cycle sink Key reaction Co-reactant Co-product 7 2:5 glyoxylate C(=O)(O)C(O)C(=O)C(O[PO3])C(O)C5-aldose 5-phosphate Ketolase (acceptor) C(=O)C(O[PO3])C(O)



1: glycolate 2-phosphate





2: glycolate











4:



0

8: C5-aldose 5-phosphate

Number of reactions Pathway superclass Key C2 intermediate Key C5 intermediate Calvin cycle sink Key reaction Co-reactant Co-product 7 2:5 glyoxylate C(=O)(O)C(=O)C(O)C(O[PO3])C(O)C5-aldose 5-phosphate Ketolase (donor) C(=O)C(O[PO3])C(O)







5:



6:







Number of reactions Pathway superclass Key C2 intermediate Key C5 intermediate Calvin cycle sink Key reaction Co-reactant Co-product 7 2:5 glyoxylate C(=O)(O)C(O)C(O)C(=O)C(O)C5-aldose 5-phosphate Transaldolase (acceptor)







1: glycolate 2-phosphate



3: glyoxylate



4:









5:

7: C6-aldose 6-phosphate

7



Number of reactions Pathway superclass Key C2 intermediate Key C6 intermediate Calvin cycle sink Key reaction Co-reactant Co-product

2:6 glyoxylate C(=O)(O)C(O)C(O)C(=O)C(O)C(O[PO3]) C6-ketose 6-phosphate Carbonyl aldolase (acceptor) C4-ketose 4-phosphate





0



7: C6-aldose 6-phosphate



5:

OH



6:





Number of reactions Pathway superclass Key C2 intermediate Key C6 intermediate Calvin cycle sink Key reaction Co-reactant Co-product

72:6glyoxylate C(=O)(O)C(O)C(=O)C(O)C(O)C(O[PO3])C6-ketose 6-phosphate Ketolase (acceptor) C4-aldose 4-phosphate





7: C6-aldose 6-phosphate

4:









8: C6-ketose 6-phosphate

Number of reactions Pathway superclass Key C2 intermediate Key C6 intermediate Calvin cycle sink Key reaction Co-reactant Co-product

glyoxylate C(=O)(O)C(=O)C(O)C(O)C(O)C(O[PO3])C6-ketose 6-phosphate Ketolase (donor) C4-aldose 4-phosphate



Supplementary Material



7: C7-aldose 7-phosphate



Number of reactions7Pathway superclass2:7Key C2 intermediateglyaKey C7 intermediateC(=Calvin cycle sinkC7-Key reactionCanCo-reactantC5-Co-productC5-

2:7 glyoxylate C(=O)(O)C(O)C(O)C(=O)C(O)C(O)C(O[PO3])C7-ketose 7-phosphate Carbonyl aldolase (acceptor) C5-ketose 5-phosphate



7: C7-aldose 7-phosphate



Number of reactions7Pathway superclass2:7Key C2 intermediateglydKey C7 intermediateC(=Calvin cycle sinkC7-Key reactionKetCo-reactantC5-Co-productC5-

2:7 glyoxylate C(=O)(O)C(O)C(=O)C(O)C(O)C(O)C(O[PO3])C7-ketose 7-phosphate Ketolase (acceptor) C5-aldose 5-phosphate



7: C7-aldose 7-phosphate



Number of reactions	7
Pathway superclass	2:7
Key C2 intermediate	glyoxylate
Key C7 intermediate	C(=O)(O)C(=O)C(O)C(O)C(O)C(O)C(O[PO3])
Calvin cycle sink	C7-ketose 7-phosphate
Key reaction	Ketolase (donor)
Co-reactant	C5-aldose 5-phosphate
Co-product	









2: glycolate

Ο

OH









6:



9: C5-ketose 5-phosphate

Number of reactions Pathway superclass Key C2 intermediate Key C5 intermediate Calvin cycle sink Key reaction Co-reactant Co-product 8 2:5 glyoxylate C(=O)(O)C(O)C(N)C(O)C(O[PO3])C5-ketose 5-phosphate Amine aldolase (acceptor) C(N)C(O)C(O[PO3])







8:



9: C5-ketose 5-phosphate

Number of reactions Pathway superclass Key C2 intermediate Key C5 intermediate Calvin cycle sink Key reaction Co-reactant Co-product 8 2:5 glyoxylate C(=O)(O)C(O)C(=O)C(O[PO3])C(O)C5-ketose 5-phosphate Ketolase (acceptor) C(=O)C(O[PO3])C(O)







8:



9: C5-ketose 5-phosphate

Number of reactions Pathway superclass Key C2 intermediate Key C5 intermediate Calvin cycle sink Key reaction Co-reactant Co-product 8 2:5 glyoxylate C(=O)(O)C(=O)C(O)C(O[PO3])C(O)C5-ketose 5-phosphate Ketolase (donor) C(=O)C(O[PO3])C(O)





4:











6:

9: C5-ketose 5-phosphate

Number of reactions Pathway superclass Key C2 intermediate Key C5 intermediate Calvin cycle sink Key reaction Co-reactant Co-product 8 2:5 glyoxylate C(=O)(O)C(=O)C(O)C(O)C(O[PO3]) C5-ketose 5-phosphate Ketolase (donor) GAP







ОН

0

8



5:



3: glyoxylate





8: C5-ketose



9: C5-ketose 5-phosphate

7: C5-aldose

Number of reactions Pathway superclass Key C2 intermediate Key C5 intermediate Calvin cycle sink Key reaction Co-reactant Co-product

2:5 glyoxylate C(=O)(O)C(O)C(O)C(=O)C(O)C5-ketose 5-phosphate Transaldolase (acceptor)











он он

Number of reactions Pathway superclass Key C2 intermediate Key C6 intermediate Calvin cycle sink Key reaction Co-reactant Co-product 8 2:6 glyoxylate C(=O)(O)C(O)C(N)C(O)C(O)C(O[PO3])C6-ketose 6-phosphate Amine aldolase (acceptor) C(N)C(O)C(O)C(O[PO3])



ОН OH OH 7:

8







OH

он

Number of reactions Pathway superclass Key C2 intermediate Key C6 intermediate Calvin cycle sink Key reaction Co-reactant Co-product

2:6glyoxylate C(=O)(O)C(O)C(=O)C(O)C(O[PO3])C(O)C6-ketose 6-phosphate Ketolase (acceptor) C(=O)C(O)C(O[PO3])C(O)





8







OH

Po

9: C6-ketose 6-phosphate

Number of reactions Pathway superclass Key C2 intermediate Key C6 intermediate Calvin cycle sink Key reaction Co-reactant Co-product

2:6 glyoxylate C(=O)(O)C(=O)C(O)C(O)C(O[PO3])C(O)C6-ketose 6-phosphate Ketolase (donor) C(=O)C(O)C(O[PO3])C(O)





8: C7-aldose 7-phosphate

Po

9: C7-ketose 7-phosphate

OH

ОН

Number of reactions Pathway superclass Key C2 intermediate Key C7 intermediate Calvin cycle sink Key reaction Co-reactant Co-product

8 2:7glyoxylate C(=O)(O)C(O)C(O)C(=O)C(O)C(O[PO3])C(O)C7-ketose 7-phosphate Carbonyl aldolase (acceptor) C(O)C(=O)C(O)C(O[PO3])C(O)





7:

8



8: C7-aldose 7-phosphate

0

Po



9: C7-ketose 7-phosphate

Number of reactions Pathway superclass Key C2 intermediate Key C7 intermediate Calvin cycle sink Key reaction Co-reactant Co-product

2:7glyoxylate C(=O)(O)C(O)C(N)C(O)C(O)C(O)C(O[PO3])C7-ketose 7-phosphate Amine aldolase (acceptor) C(N)C(O)C(O)C(O)C(O[PO3])





7:







OH

ОН

0

Number of reactions Pathway superclass Key C2 intermediate Key C7 intermediate Calvin cycle sink Key reaction Co-reactant Co-product

8 2:7glyoxylate C(=O)(O)C(O)C(=O)C(O)C(O)C(O[PO3])C(O)C7-ketose 7-phosphate Ketolase (acceptor) C(=O)C(O)C(O)C(O[PO3])C(O)



7:

8: C7-aldose 7-phosphate

9: C7-ketose 7-phosphate

Number of reactions Pathway superclass Key C2 intermediate Key C7 intermediate Calvin cycle sink Key reaction Co-reactant Co-product 8 2:7 glyoxylate C(=O)(O)C(=O)C(O)C(O)C(O)C(O[PO3])C(O)C7-ketose 7-phosphate Ketolase (donor) C(=O)C(O)C(O)C(O[PO3])C(O)

# 4.5 Glycine pathways

#### Pathway 136



Number of reactions Pathway superclass Key C2 intermediate Key C5 intermediate Calvin cycle sink Key reaction Co-reactant Co-product

2:5 glycine C(=O)(O)C(N)C(O)C(O)C(O[PO3]) C5-aldose 5-phosphate Amine aldolase (donor) GAP





2: glycolate



1: glycolate 2-phosphate







3: glyoxylate





8





9: C5-ketose 5-phosphate

Number of reactions Pathway superclass Key C2 intermediate Key C5 intermediate Calvin cycle sink Key reaction Co-reactant Co-product

2:5 glycine C(=O)(O)C(N)C(O)C(O)C(O[PO3]) C5-ketose 5-phosphate Amine aldolase (donor) GAP







1: glycolate 2-phosphate

















5:



9: C6-ketose 6-phosphate

Number of reactions Pathway superclass Key C2 intermediate Key C6 intermediate Calvin cycle sink Key reaction Co-reactant Co-product 8 2:6 glycine C(=O)(O)C(N)C(O)C(O)C(O)C(O[PO3]) C6-ketose 6-phosphate Amine aldolase (donor) C4-aldose 4-phosphate



- Number of reactions8Pathway superclass2:7Key C2 intermediateglycinKey C7 intermediateC(=CCalvin cycle sinkC7-keKey reactionAminCo-reactantC5-alCo-productC5-al
  - 2:7 glycine C(=O)(O)C(N)C(O)C(O)C(O)C(O)C(O[PO3]) C7-ketose 7-phosphate Amine aldolase (donor) C5-aldose 5-phosphate

# 4.6 Aminoethanol pathways

# Pathway 140



7: C5-ketose 5-phosphate

Number of reactions6Pathway superclass2:5Key C2 intermediateaminoethanolKey C5 intermediateC(O[PO3])C(O)C(O)C(N)C(O)Calvin cycle sinkC5-ketose 5-phosphateKey reactionAmine aldolase (donor)Co-reactantGAPCo-product



Number of reactions		
Pathway superclass		
Key C2 intermediate		
Key C6 intermediate		
Calvin cycle sink		
Key reaction		
Co-reactant		
Co-product		

6

2:6 aminoethanol C(O[PO3])C(O)C(O)C(O)C(N)C(O) C6-ketose 6-phosphate Amine aldolase (donor) C4-aldose 4-phosphate



7: C7-ketose 7-phosphate

Number of reactions	6
Pathway superclass	2:7
Key C2 intermediate	aminoethanol
Key C7 intermediate	C(O[PO3])C(O)C(O)C(O)C(O)C(N)C(O)
Calvin cycle sink	C7-ketose 7-phosphate
Key reaction	Amine aldolase (donor)
Co-reactant	C5-aldose 5-phosphate
Co-product	



Number of reactions Pathway superclass Key C2 intermediate Key C5 intermediate Calvin cycle sink Key reaction Co-reactant Co-product 7 2:5 aminoethanol C(O)C(N)C(O)C(O[PO3])C(O)C5-ketose 5-phosphate Amine aldolase (donor) C(=O)C(O[PO3])C(O)



Number of reactions Pathway superclass Key C2 intermediate Key C5 intermediate Calvin cycle sink Key reaction Co-reactant Co-product 7

2:5 aminoethanol C(O[PO3])C(O)C(O)C(N)C(O) C5-ketose 1,5-bisphosphate Amine aldolase (donor) GAP



8: C6-ketose 6-phosphate

Number of reactions Pathway superclass Key C2 intermediate Key C6 intermediate Calvin cycle sink Key reaction Co-reactant Co-product

7

2:6aminoethanol C(O)C(N)C(O)C(O)C(O[PO3])C(O)C6-ketose 6-phosphate Amine aldolase (donor) C(=O)C(O)C(O[PO3])C(O)



Number of reactions Pathway superclass Key C2 intermediate Key C6 intermediate Calvin cycle sink Key reaction Co-reactant Co-product

2:6 aminoethanol C(O[PO3])C(O)C(O)C(O)C(N)C(O) C6-ketose 1,6-bisphosphate Amine aldolase (donor) C4-aldose 4-phosphate



Number of reactions Pathway superclass Key C2 intermediate Key C7 intermediate Calvin cycle sink Key reaction Co-reactant Co-product 7 2:7 aminoethanol C(O)C(N)C(O)C(O)C(O)C(O[PO3])C(O)C7-ketose 7-phosphate Amine aldolase (donor) C(=O)C(O)C(O)C(O[PO3])C(O)



Number of reactions Pathway superclass Key C2 intermediate Key C7 intermediate Calvin cycle sink Key reaction Co-reactant Co-product 7 2:7 aminoethanol C(O[PO3])C(O)C(O)C(O)C(O)C(N)C(O) C7-ketose 1,7-bisphosphate Amine aldolase (donor) C5-aldose 5-phosphate



Number of reactions Pathway superclass Key C2 intermediate Key C4 intermediate Calvin cycle sink Key reaction Co-reactant Co-product

2:4aminoethanol C(O)C(N)C(O)C(O)C4-aldose 4-phosphate Amine aldolase (donor) glycolaldehyde


9: C5-ketose 1,5-bisphosphate

Number of reactions Pathway superclass Key C2 intermediate Key C5 intermediate Calvin cycle sink Key reaction Co-reactant

Co-product

7:

8 2:5aminoethanol C(O)C(N)C(O)C(O[PO3])C(O)C5-ketose 1,5-bisphosphate Amine aldolase (donor) C(=O)C(O[PO3])C(O)



Ро 0

9: C5-aldose 5-phosphate



8



Number of reactions Pathway superclass Key C2 intermediate Key C5 intermediate Calvin cycle sink Key reaction Co-reactant Co-product

2:5aminoe than olC(O)C(N)C(O)C(O[PO3])C(O)C5-aldose 5-phosphate Amine aldolase (donor) C(=O)C(O[PO3])C(O)



Number of reactions Pathway superclass Key C2 intermediate Key C6 intermediate Calvin cycle sink Key reaction Co-reactant Co-product 8

2:6 aminoethanol C(O)C(N)C(O)C(O)C(O[PO3])C(O)C6-ketose 1,6-bisphosphate Amine aldolase (donor) C(=O)C(O)C(O[PO3])C(O)



Number of reactions Pathway superclass Key C2 intermediate Key C7 intermediate Calvin cycle sink Key reaction Co-reactant Co-product 8

2:7 aminoethanol C(O)C(N)C(O)C(O)C(O)C(O[PO3])C(O)C7-ketose 1,7-bisphosphate Amine aldolase (donor) C(=O)C(O)C(O)C(O[PO3])C(O)

# 4.7 Aminoacetaldehyde pathways

### Pathway 154



Number of reactions Pathway superclass Key C2 intermediate Key C5 intermediate Calvin cycle sink Key reaction Co-reactant Co-product 8 2:5 aminoacetaldehyde C(N)C(O)C(O)C(=O)C(O[PO3]) C5-aldose 5-phosphate Carbonyl aldolase (acceptor) DHAP



8:

Number of reactions Pathway superclass Key C2 intermediate Key C5 intermediate Calvin cycle sink Key reaction Co-reactant

Co-product

7:

8

2:5 aminoacetaldehyde C(=O)C(N)C(O)C(O)C(O[PO3])C5-ketose 5-phosphate Amine aldolase (donor) GAP 9: C5-ketose 5-phosphate



Number of reactions Pathway superclass Key C2 intermediate Key C5 intermediate Calvin cycle sink Key reaction Co-reactant Co-product 8

2:5 aminoacetaldehyde C(N)C(O)C(=O)C(O)C(O[PO3]) C5-aldose 5-phosphate Ketolase (acceptor) GAP



Number of reactions Pathway superclass Key C2 intermediate Key C5 intermediate Calvin cycle sink Key reaction Co-reactant Co-product 8

2:5 aminoacetaldehyde C(N)C(=O)C(O)C(O)C(O[PO3]) C5-aldose 5-phosphate Ketolase (donor) GAP



8:

9: C6-ketose 6-phosphate





Number of reactions Pathway superclass Key C2 intermediate Key C6 intermediate Calvin cycle sink Key reaction Co-reactant Co-product

Supplementary Material



Number of reactions	8
Pathway superclass	2:7
Key C2 intermediate	aminoacetaldehy
Key C7 intermediate	C(=O)C(N)C(O)
Calvin cycle sink	C7-ketose 7-phos
Key reaction	Amine aldolase (
Co-reactant	C5-aldose 5-phos
Co-product	

7 minoacetaldehyde (=O)C(N)C(O)C(O)C(O)C(O)C(O[PO3]) 7-ketose 7-phosphate mine aldolase (donor) 5-aldose 5-phosphate

### 5 References

- R. Kebeish, M. Niessen, K. Thiruveedhi, R. Bari, H. J. Hirsch, R. Rosenkranz, N. Stabler, B. Schonfeld, F. Kreuzaler, and C. Peterhansel. Chloroplastic photorespiratory bypass increases photosynthesis and biomass production in Arabidopsis thaliana. *Nat. Biotechnol.*, 25(5):593–599, May 2007.
- [2] G. D. Farquhar, S. von Caemmerer, and J. A. Berry. A biochemical model of photosynthetic CO2 assimilation in leaves of C 3 species. *Planta*, 149(1):78–90, Jun 1980.
- [3] S. von Caemmerer. Steady-state models of photosynthesis. Plant Cell Environ., 36(9):1617–1630, Sep 2013.
- [4] G. D. Farquhar and S. Wong. An empirical model of stomatal conductance. Functional Plant Biology, 11(3):191-210, 1984.
- [5] S. Lefebvre, T. Lawson, M. Fryer, O. V. Zakhleniuk, J. C. Lloyd, and C. A. Raines. Increased sedoheptulose-1,7-bisphosphatase activity in transgenic tobacco plants stimulates photosynthesis and growth from an early stage in development. *Plant Physiology*, 138(1):451–460, 2005.
- [6] E. Noor, A. Flamholz, W. Liebermeister, A. Bar-Even, and R. Milo. A note on the kinetics of enzyme action: a decomposition that highlights thermodynamic effects. *FEBS Lett.*, 587(17):2772– 2777, Sep 2013.
- [7] E. Latzko and M. Gibbs. Measurement of the intermediates of the photosynthetic carbon reduction cycle, using enzymatic methods. *Meth. Enzymol.*, 24:261–268, 1972.
- [8] A. Peterkofsky and E. Racker. The reductive pentose phosphate cycle. III. Enzyme activities in cell-free extracts of photosynthetic organisms. *Plant Physiol.*, 36(4):409–414, Jul 1961.
- [9] A. Bar-Even, E. Noor, N. E. Lewis, and R. Milo. Design and analysis of synthetic carbon fixation pathways. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 107(19):8889–8894, 2010.
- [10] F. L. Smith and H. A. H. Avoid common pitfalls when using henry's law. Chemical Engineering Progress, pages 33–39, Sept 2007.
- [11] D. T. Hanson, S. S. Stutz, and J. S. Boyer. Why small fluxes matter: the case and approaches for improving measurements of photosynthesis and (photo)respiration. J. Exp. Bot., 67(10):3027– 3039, May 2016.
- [12] H. N. Po and N. M. Senozan. Henderson-Hasselbalch Equation: Its History and Limitations. Journal of Chemical Education, 78:1499, November 2001.
- [13] R. Roy, L. Roy, K. Vogel, C. Porter-Moore, T. Pearson, C. Good, F. Millero, and D. Campbell. The dissociation constants of carbonic acid in seawater at salinities 5 to 45 and temperatures 0 to 45°c. *Marine Chemistry*, 44(2-4):249–267, 1993.
- [14] F. J. Millero. Thermodynamics of the carbon dioxide system in the oceans. Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta, 59(4):661 – 677, 1995.
- [15] B. Alberts, A. Johnson, J. Lewis, M. Raff, K. Roberts, and P. Walter. Molecular Biology of the Cell, 4th edition. Garland Science, New York, 2002.
- [16] R. A. Alberty, A. Cornish-Bowden, R. N. Goldberg, G. G. Hammes, K. Tipton, and H. V. Westerhoff. Recommendations for terminology and databases for biochemical thermodynamics. *Biophys. Chem.*, 155(2-3):89–103, May 2011.

- [17] S. von Caemmerer. Biochemical models of leaf photosynthesis. Csiro publishing, 2000.
- [18] X. Yin, M. Van Oijen, and A. H. C. M. Schapendonk. Extension of a biochemical model for the generalized stoichiometry of electron transport limited c3 photosynthesis. *Plant, Cell & Environment*, 27(10):1211–1222, 2004.
- [19] S. von Caemmerer and W. P. Quick. Rubisco: Physiology in Vivo, pages 85–113. Springer Netherlands, Dordrecht, 2000.
- [20] L. Taiz and E. Zeiger. *Photosynthesis: Physiological and ecological considerations.* 2002.
- [21] Q. T. Ho, P. Verboven, X. Yin, P. C. Struik, and B. M. Nicolai. A microscale model for combined CO(2) diffusion and photosynthesis in leaves. *PLoS ONE*, 7(11):e48376, 2012.
- [22] A. Chang, M. Scheer, A. Grote, I. Schomburg, and D. Schomburg. BRENDA, AMENDA and FRENDA the enzyme information system: new content and tools in 2009. Nucleic Acids Res., 37(Database issue):D588–592, Jan 2009.
- [23] A. Bar-Even, E. Noor, Y. Savir, W. Liebermeister, D. Davidi, D. S. Tawfik, and R. Milo. The moderately efficient enzyme: evolutionary and physicochemical trends shaping enzyme parameters. *Biochemistry*, 50(21):4402–4410, May 2011.
- [24] A. Flamholz, E. Noor, A. Bar-Even, and R. Milo. eQuilibrator-the biochemical thermodynamics calculator. *Nucleic Acids Res.*, 40(Database issue):D770–775, Jan 2012.
- [25] G. A. Sprenger, U. Schorken, G. Sprenger, and H. Sahm. Transaldolase B of Escherichia coli K-12: cloning of its gene, talB, and characterization of the enzyme from recombinant strains. J. Bacteriol., 177(20):5930–5936, Oct 1995.
- [26] G. A. Sprenger, U. Schorken, G. Sprenger, and H. Sahm. Transketolase A of Escherichia coli K12. Purification and properties of the enzyme from recombinant strains. *Eur. J. Biochem.*, 230(2):525–532, Jun 1995.
- [27] L. A. Kleczkowski, D. D. Randall, and W. L. Zahler. The substrate specificity, kinetics, and mechanism of glycerate-3-kinase from spinach leaves. Archives of Biochemistry and Biophysics, 236(1):185 – 194, 1985.
- [28] M. Schurmann and G. A. Sprenger. Fructose-6-phosphate aldolase is a novel class I aldolase from Escherichia coli and is related to a novel group of bacterial transaldolases. J. Biol. Chem., 276(14):11055–11061, Apr 2001.
- [29] M. Stitt, W. Wirtz, and H. W. Heldt. Metabolite levels during induction in the chloroplast and extrachloroplast compartments of spinach protoplasts. *Biochim. Biophys. Acta*, 593(1):85–102, Nov 1980.
- [30] C. P. Xin, D. Tholen, V. Devloo, and X. G. Zhu. The benefits of photorespiratory bypasses: how can they work? *Plant Physiol.*, 167(2):574–585, Feb 2015.
- [31] P. Bais, S. M. Moon, K. He, R. Leitao, K. Dreher, T. Walk, Y. Sucaet, L. Barkan, G. Wohlgemuth, M. R. Roth, E. S. Wurtele, P. Dixon, O. Fiehn, B. M. Lange, V. Shulaev, L. W. Sumner, R. Welti, B. J. Nikolau, S. Y. Rhee, and J. A. Dickerson. Plantmetabolomics.org: A web portal for plant metabolomics experiments. *Plant Physiology*, 152(4):1807–1816, 2010.
- [32] A. G. Miller and D. T. Canvin. Glycolaldehyde Inhibits CO(2) Fixation in the Cyanobacterium Synechococcus UTEX 625 without Inhibiting the Accumulation of Inorganic Carbon or the Associated Quenching of Chlorophyll a Fluorescence. *Plant Physiol.*, 91(3):1044–1049, Nov 1989.

- [33] R. C. Sicher. Glycolaldehyde Inhibition of Photosynthetic Carbon Assimilation by Isolated Chloroplasts and Protoplasts, pages 413–416. Springer Netherlands, Dordrecht, 1984.
- [34] L. E. Anderson. Chloroplast and cytoplasmic enzymes. II. Pea leaf triose phosphate isomerases. Biochim. Biophys. Acta, 235(1):237-244, Apr 1971.
- [35] F. Flugel, S. Timm, S. Arrivault, A. Florian, M. Stitt, A. R. Fernie, and H. Bauwe. The Photorespiratory Metabolite 2-Phosphoglycolate Regulates Photosynthesis and Starch Accumulation in Arabidopsis. *Plant Cell*, 29(10):2537–2551, Oct 2017.
- [36] P. G. Roughan. Stromal concentrations of coenzyme A and its esters are insufficient to account for rates of chloroplast fatty acid synthesis: evidence for substrate channelling within the chloroplast fatty acid synthese. *Biochem. J.*, 327 (Pt 1):267–273, Oct 1997.
- [37] G. E. Edwards and D. A. Walker. Influence of glycerate on photosynthesis by wheat chloroplasts. Arch. Biochem. Biophys., 231(1):124–135, May 1984.