Replication initiation in *E. coli* is regulated via an origin-density sensor generating adder correlations

Mareike Berger\(^1\) and Pieter Rein ten Wolde\(^1\)

\(^1\)Biochemical Networks Group, Department of Living Matter, AMOLF, 1098 XG Amsterdam, The Netherlands

All living cells need to coordinate DNA replication with growth and division to generate cell cycles that are stable in time. The bacterium *Escherichia coli* initiates replication at a volume per origin that on average is independent of the growth rate. It also adds an on average constant volume per origin between successive initiation events, independent of the initiation size. Yet, a molecular model that can explain these observations has been lacking. Here, we develop a mathematical model of DNA replication initiation in *E. coli* that is consistent with a wealth of experimental data. We first show that the previously proposed initiator titration model, which is based on the accumulation of the initiator protein DnaA on chromosomal initiation sites, is not consistent with the experimental data. We then present a model that is based on an ultra-sensitive switch between an inactive form of DnaA and an active form that induces replication initiation. Our model shows that at low growth rates the switch is predominantly controlled by activation of DnaA via lipids and deactivation via the chromosomal site datA, while at high growth rates DARS2 and RIDA become essential. Crucially, in our mean-field model DNA replication is initiated at a constant volume per origin, qualifying our model as a sizer. Yet, we show that in a stochastic version of the same model the inevitable fluctuations in the components that control the DnaA activation switch naturally give rise to the experimentally observed adder correlations.

I. INTRODUCTION

To maintain stable cell cycles over many generations, living cells must coordinate DNA replication with growth and cell division. Intriguingly, in nutrient-rich environments, the model organism *Escherichia coli* can even divide faster than the time it takes to replicate its entire chromosome \[^1\]-\[^4\]. This apparent paradox was resolved by the model of Cooper and Helmstetter in which new rounds of replication are initiated before the previous round has finished \[^5\] (Fig. 1A). Combining the finding that the average cell volume increases exponentially as a function of the growth rate \(\lambda\) \[^6\] with the observation that the cell divides an approximately constant cell cycling time \(\tau_{cc}\) after initiation of replication \[^5\] led Donachie to the prediction that replication is initiated at a constant volume per origin \(v^*\) \[^7\]. Initiating replication at a constant origin density ensures that DNA replication is initiated once per cell cycle per origin, which is a necessary condition for maintaining stable cell cycles at all growth rates (Fig. 1A). The growth-rate independence of the initiation volume per origin \(v^*\) was recently confirmed at the population level for a broad range of growth rates and under extensive growth inhibition with high precision \[^4\]. Yet, what molecular mechanism controls replication initiation and how it gives rise to a constant initiation volume remains despite extensive studies poorly understood \[^8\]-\[^12\].

To obtain insight into the mechanisms that control DNA replication and cell division, fluctuations in cell size have been studied \[^13\]-\[^14\]. These experiments revealed that cells obey an adder principle, which states that cells add an on average constant volume independent of the birth volume during each cell cycle. It has been proposed that cell division control is tightly coupled to the control over replication initiation \[^8\]-\[^15\]-\[^16\], via a sizer on replication initiation and a timer for cell division. Yet, recent experiments revealed the existence of two adders, one on cell division and the other on replication initiation, and that these two processes are more loosely coupled than hitherto believed \[^17\]-\[^22\]. While these phenomenological observations are vital because they constrain any model on the molecular mechanism for initiation and cell division control, no such molecular models have yet been presented that are consistent with the experimental data. Here, we present a mathematical model of the biochemical network that controls replication initiation. We show how this model can reconcile the observed adder correlations in the initiation volume at the single-cell level \[^17\]-\[^18\] with the constant initiation volume independent of the growth rate at the population level.

So far, two distinct classes of models for replication initiation control have been proposed. In the here called initiator accumulation models \[^15\]-\[^16\]-\[^23\]-\[^24\], an initiator protein accumulates during the cell cycle proportional to the cell volume, and replication is initiated when a threshold amount per origin has accumulated. These models give rise to a constant initiation volume per origin at all growth rates, when both the total concentration and the threshold number of the initiator are independent of the growth rate. As a fixed amount of initiators needs to be accumulated per replication cycle, models of this class are often seen as a mechanistic implementation of an adder \[^14\]-\[^15\]-\[^25\]. Many variations of this idea with different degrees of details have been proposed \[^15\]-\[^24\]-\[^26\]. In 1972, Maaloe and Somoayrac proposed a feedback control system that can ensure such a constant initiator concentration at all growth rates \[^24\]. Later, Hansen et al. \[^25\]-\[^27\] identified the initiator protein as the protein DnaA, which can be titrated away from the...
origin by DnaA boxes, high-affinity binding sites on the chromosome. This constant number of titration sites per chromosome sets the critical threshold number of initiator proteins required for initiating replication.

In this manuscript, we consider two mechanistic implementations of the initiator accumulation model (Fig. 1C). Our Regulated-Initiator-Titration (RIT) model combines the control system of Maaløe and Sørensen [24], which consists of an auto-regulated protein, the regulator, that represses the expression of the initiator, with the titration-based initiation threshold proposed by Hansen et al. [25, 27]. We show that this RIT model indeed can give rise to stable cell cycles and a constant initiation volume per origin independent of the growth rate. In E. coli, the initiator protein DnaA is however negatively auto-regulated and there is no evidence for a separate regulator and initiator protein [30]. Following Hansen et al. [25, 27], we therefore consider a variant of the RIT-model in which the initiator is auto-regulated, the Auto-regulated Initiator-Titration (AIT) model. Our AIT model, however, takes into account that titration affects both DnaA auto-regulation and replication initiation, and as a result, cannot give rise to stable cell cycles. We thus argue that there is to the best of our

FIG. 1: We present two distinct models to elucidate the molecular mechanism by which E. coli initiates replication on an average constant volume per origin. (A) The volume $V(t)$, the number of origins $n_{ori}(t)$ and the origin density $\rho_{ori}(t)$ as a function of time. Initiating replication at a constant origin density $\rho^*$ (dashed red line) and division a constant time $\tau_c$ later (blue arrows) ensures that the cell initiates replication once per division cycle and that it maintains cell size homeostasis at slow (light blue regime) and fast (dark blue regime) growth rates. (B) Schematic representation of an E. coli chromosome: Replication starts at the origin (oriC, yellow circle) and proceeds via two replication forks to the terminus (ter, grey bar). Replication is initiated by the ATP-bound form of the initiator protein DnaA. DnaA is activated via the acidic phospholipids in the cell membrane and via the two chromosomal sites DARS1 and DARS2, and deactivated via the chromosomal site datA and via regulatory inactivation of DnaA (RIDA), a process coupled to active DNA replication. DnaA also has high affinity for titration sites (grey circles) located on the DNA. (C) Scheme of the RIT model: Both the initiator (red circles) and the regulator (green triangles) are repressed by the regulator proteins in the cytosol with the respective dissociation constants $K_D^{ori}$ and $K_D^*$, respectively. Scheme of the AIT model: In E. coli, the initiator DnaA (red circles) is negatively auto-regulated with the dissociation constant $K_D^{ori}$, and can bind both to the oriC and the titration sites with dissociation constants $K_D^{ori}$ and $K_D^*$, respectively. (D) Scheme of the initiator switch models: In the LD model, ATP-DnaA is mainly activated via the acidic phospholipids and deactivated via the site datA. In the LDDR model, replication forks overlap and RIDA is the main deactivator in combination with the activators DARS1 and DARS2.
knowledge at the moment no mechanistic version of the initiator accumulation model that is consistent with the experimental data on the biochemical network regulating replication initiation in *E. coli*.

The second class of models is based on a switch of the initiator protein DnaA between an active and an inactive form (Fig. 1D). In *E. coli*, DnaA forms a tight complex with ATP or ADP, but only ATP-DnaA can initiate replication by forming a complex with the chromosomal replication origin (oriC) [31][33]. While the total DnaA concentration is maintained approximately constant at different growth rates via negative auto-regulation [34], the cellular level of ATP–DnaA oscillates over the course of the cell cycle, with a peak at the time of replication initiation [35]. It has been suggested that the oscillations in the fraction of ATP-DnaA in the cell are the key for understanding how replication is regulated in *E. coli*, but a quantitative description that is consistent with experiments is currently lacking [11][12][36][39]. Intriguingly, the level of ATP-DnaA is strictly regulated by multiple systems in the cell. DnaA is activated via acidic phospholipids in the cell membrane [41] and via two chromosomal regions called DnaA-Reactivation Sequence 1 (DARS1) and DARS2 [35][32], and deactivated via the chromosomal site datA in a process called datA-dependent DnaA-ATP Hydrolysis (DDAH) [13] and via a mechanism coupled to active DNA replication, called Regulatory Inactivation of DnaA (RIDA) [31][35][44] (Fig. 1B). Deleting or modifying any of these systems can lead to untimely initiation, asynchrony of initiation and an initiation volume that is not only changed quantitatively, but importantly, also no longer is independent of the growth rate [12][43][45][49]. All systems thus seem essential, raising the question not only why *E. coli* has evolved such an intricate set of mechanisms, but also how these conspire to generate a constant initiation volume independent of the growth rate.

To dissect how these multiple mechanisms give rise to a stable cell cycle, we first study the Lipid-DatA (LD) model (Fig. 1D). It consists of only the acidic lipids and datA, which, we argue, are the primary activator and deactivator in the low growth-rate regime of non-overlapping replication forks. The LD model, with a constant rate of activation and a rate of deactivation that depends on the origin density, gives rise to stable cell cycles with a constant initiation volume independent of the growth rate.

Yet, at higher growth rates these two reactions alone, based on the experimentally estimated rates of activation and deactivation, respectively, are not sufficient to generate large amplitude oscillations in the concentration of ATP-DnaA. Indeed, simulations of our Lipid-DatA-DARS1/2-RIDA (LDDR) model show that in this regime, other mechanisms of (de)activation via DARS2 and RIDA, respectively, become essential. Conversely, our modeling demonstrates that the latter mechanisms alone are not sufficient to generate stable oscillations in any growth-rate regime. We thus argue that *E. coli* has evolved an elaborate set of mechanisms to create stable oscillations in the ATP-DnaA fraction across the full range of growth conditions. Lastly, our modelling indicates that the constant initiation volume independent of the growth rate is not a robust property of the system, but rather one that relies on a careful tuning of activation and deactivation rates of the respective activation-deactivation systems.

Finally, in our mean-field switch models, DNA replication is initiated at a threshold origin density and mechanistically they should arguably be qualified as a sizer. Yet, we show that a stochastic version of the LD model naturally gives rise to the experimentally observed adder correlations in the initiation volume [17][18]. Fluctuations in the components that control the DnaA activation switch (lipids, HdA, Fis, IHF) are transmitted from mother to daughter cells and this generates mother-daughter correlations in the initiation volume that can explain the observed adder correlations [17]. Our work underscores that care should be taken in inferring molecular mechanisms from phenomenological observations.

### Models and Results

**The RIT model can give rise to stable cell cycles and a constant initiation volume per origin**

In the initiator accumulation models [15][16][23][27], an initiator protein accumulates proportional to the volume of the cell and initiates replication at a fixed number of initiator proteins $N_p$ per number of origin $n_{ori}$. After initiation, the initiator is inactivated such that it needs to accumulate again before the next initiation event. The initiator accumulation model gives rise to a constant initiation volume per origin under two conditions: (1) the total concentration of the initiator $[p]_T = N_p/V = c_1$ is constant in time and at all growth rates and (2) replication is initiated when the number of accumulated initiator proteins per origin $n_p = N_p/n_{ori}$ equals a constant critical number of initiator proteins per origin $n_p^\alpha = N_p^\alpha/n_{ori} = c_2$. Combining these two conditions yields a constant initiation volume per number of origin $v^\alpha = V^\alpha/n_{ori} = n_p^\alpha/[p]_T$. As we will show below, our RIT model meets these two conditions, but the AIT model, which is based on the *E. coli* cell-cycle network, does not.

Figure 2A shows the key ingredients of the RIT model. It consists of an initiator protein $p$ that is regulated by a negatively auto-regulated protein $r$, such that for both the regulator and the initiator, the change in copy number $N_x$ ($x = \{p, r\}$) is given by

\[
\frac{dN_x}{dt} = \frac{\alpha_x g}{1 + \left( \frac{|x|}{K_{\alpha x}} \right)^{n_x}}
\]

(1)

using a standard model of gene expression with basal production rate $\alpha_x$, gene number $g$, dissociation constant of the promoter $K_{\alpha x}^*$, Hill coefficient $n_x$ and concentration of
the regulator protein \( [r] = N^f_r/V \approx [r]_T \) in the cytoplasm which is approximately equal to the total regulator concentration in the cell \([r]_T\) (SI section S1B). The model also includes a number \( N_s \) of high-affinity titration sites that are located close to the origin \(25, 27\), such that both in the overlapping and non-overlapping growth-rate regime, the number of titration sites per origin, \( n_s = N_s/n_{ori}\), is constant (Fig. S2 shows scenario with homogeneous distribution of titration sites). The volume \( V(t) \) of the cell grows exponentially, \( V(t) = V_0 e^{\lambda t} \), where the growth rate \( \lambda = \ln(2)/\tau_d \), with cell-doubling time \( \tau_d \), is a parameter of the model. The free concentration of the inhibitor \( [p] \) depends on the total concentration of not only the initiator, \( [p]_T \), but also the titration sites, \([s]_T\) (SI section S1B). When \([p]\) equals the dissociation constant for the inhibitor binding to the origin, \( K^{ori}_D \), a new round of replication is initiated. Based on the general growth law, the cell divides a constant cycling time \( \tau_c \) after initiation of replication \(3, 4\). This choice is convenient, as it directly couples cell division to replication, thus eliminating the need for implementing an additional mechanism for cell division. Yet, this choice does not affect our results, as we discuss later. At cell division, the volume, the number of regulator and initiator proteins and the number of titration sites are halved.

The RIT model generates stable cell cycles and ensures an almost constant initiation volume at all growth rates (Fig. 2A and B). As proposed theoretically \(24\) and verified experimentally \(30\), the concentration of a protein \( p \) that is regulated by a negatively auto-regulated protein \( r \) remains approximately constant at different growth rates, thus fulfilling the first condition of the inhibitor accumulation model (Fig. S1). As a result, the total number of initiator proteins \( N_p(t) \) increases proportional to the cell volume \( V(t) \) (Fig. 2A). Because the dissociation constant of the inhibitor protein for the titration sites \( K^{s}_D \) is smaller than that for the origin \( K^{ori}_D \), the concentration of initiator proteins in the cytoplasm remains below the critical free concentration \( K^{ori}_D \) as long as there are still unoccupied titration sites (Fig. 2A, lowest panel). Yet, when the total number of proteins \( N_p \) exceeds the total number of titration sites \( N_s \), the concentration of free proteins \( [p]\) rapidly increases until the critical free concentration \( K^{ori}_D \) is reached and replication is initiated. In the scenario considered here where all the titration sites are located at the origin (Fig. S2 for general case), the number of titration sites doubles at the moment of initiation and the concentration of free initiator proteins drops far below the critical inhibitor threshold (Fig. 2A, lowest graph). Meanwhile, the volume continues to rise and the cell divides a time \( \tau_c \) after replication initiation. In fact, in this mean-field description cell division does not change the concentrations of the components and it therefore does not affect the replication cycle. Importantly, this mechanism can correct for perturbations in cell division (Fig. S3), such that this mechanism results in stable cell cycles with a constant initiation volume per number of origin (Fig. 2A and B). However, in \( E. coli \) the regulator and the initiator are embedded in one and the same protein. As we will show next, this dramatically changes the stability of this system.

The RIT model is not compatible with the biochemical network of \( E. coli \)

In \( E. coli \), the initiator protein DnaA is negatively auto-regulated by both forms of DnaA, whereby the auto-repression via ATP-DnaA is stronger \(30\). For now, we assume that the DnaA is only present in one form and is negatively auto-regulated (Fig. 1C). In this Auto-regulated-Initiator Titration (AIT) model, the change in the number of initiator proteins is given by

\[
\frac{dN_p}{dt} = \frac{\alpha_p q}{1 + \left( \frac{[p]}{K^{r}_p} \right)^{n_p}}
\]

Contrary to the RIT model, the degree of repression now depends on the concentration of the initiator protein in the cytosol \([p]\), which cannot be approximated by the total initiator concentration \([p]_T\) (SI section S1C). The dissociation constant of the promoter \( K^{P}_D \) must be higher than that of the origin \( K^{ori}_D \), in order to be able to attain the critical initiator concentration in the cytosol. Together with the condition on the relative affinities of the titration sites and the origin region, the dissociation constants must therefore obey \( K^{P}_D > K^{ori}_D > K^{D}_D \).

In the AIT model, the cell cycles are not stable anymore and we observe severe over-initiation leading to smaller and smaller cells (Fig. 2C). Consider again, for clarity, the scenario in which the titration sites are located close to the origin. Right after replication initiation, there is then an abundance of titration sites, which sequester the initiator proteins, lowering their cytoplasmic concentration and weakening the auto-repression. The production rate is therefore close to its maximal value \( \alpha_p \) (see equation 2) and the total initiator concentration rises (Fig. 2C, third graph). The production rate remains high until the titration sites have been saturated and the cytoplasmic concentration rises. Importantly, however, before the latter concentration reaches its fixed point set by \( K^{P}_D \), the concentration for triggering the next round of replication, \( K^{ori}_D < K^{P}_D \), is reached. The production rate is therefore effectively given by its maximum value \( \alpha_p \) and is hence constant, independent of the volume. Since the production rate determines how rapidly the titration sites are filled up, and because the time \( \tau_c \) from initiation until division is constant, the cell division time is essentially constant. The system has become a timer, which can no longer correct for perturbations \(10\). Any fluctuation that makes the division time different from the doubling time \( \tau_d = \ln(2)/\lambda \) will, even in a perfect timer, make the system unstable (like in Fig. 2C). We note that if division were controlled by a separate mechanism that ensures that the division time...
FIG. 2: While the originally presented RIT model can give rise to stable cell cycles and an approximately constant initiation volume per origin (A, B), the AIT model of E. coli fails to produce stable cell cycles (C). (A, C) The volume $V(t)$, the number of initiator proteins $N_p(t)$ and titration sites $N_s(t)$, the total concentration of initiator proteins $[p]^T(t)$ together with the dissociation constant of the regulator $K_d^p$ (dashed red line), and the concentration of initiator proteins in the cytoplasm $[p](t)$ as a function of time (in units of the doubling time of the cell $\tau_0$). (A) When the number of initiator proteins per origin $n_p(t)$ exceeds the number of titration sites per origin $n^*_s$ (yellow dashed line), the free concentration $[p](t)$ rapidly rises to reach the threshold concentration $K_D^{ori}$ (blue dashed line) for initiating a new round of replication. The initiation volume per origin $v^*$ (green dashed line) in the RIT model is constant in time. (B) The initiation volume per origin $v^*$ as a function of the growth rate, for different combinations of the Hill coefficients of the regulator and the initiator promoter, $n_t$ and $n_p$, respectively. Note that neither steep Hill functions (red line) or a careful choice of Hill coefficients (blue lines) give rise to an initiation volume that is almost independent of the growth rate. (C) In the AIT model, the concentration threshold $K_D^{ori}$ is necessarily lower than the fixed point of the auto-regulation, $K_D^{ori} < K_D^{ori}$. As a result, proteins are synthesized at the maximum rate, decoupling replication from the volume of the cell. The AIT model can therefore not ensure stable cell cycles. Shown is the scenario where the division time is shorter than the doubling time $\tau_0$, causing the volume to shrink. (see Table S1 for all parameters)

equals the cell-doubling time $[17]$, the chromosome density would increase instead (Fig. S12). As both cell size homeostasis and a constant DNA density are fundamental requirements of any cell, we conclude that the AIT model cannot explain how E. coli regulates replication initiation.

An ultra-sensitive switch between ATP- and ADP-DnaA via acidic phospholipids and the locus datA gives rise to a constant initiation volume per origin

In the second class of models, not the total number of DnaA is the key variable that controls replication initiation, but the concentration or fraction of DnaA that is bound to ATP. While DnaA has a high affinity for both ATP and ADP, only ATP-DnaA can initiate replication at the origin $[31,33]$. The switch between these two states is controlled by several mechanisms, which, we will argue, play distinct roles in different growth-rate regimes.

We first focus on the regime of slow growth in which the replication forks are non-overlapping. RIDA, a mechanism promoting ATP hydrolysis in a replication coupled manner, becomes active upon replication initiation, but, since there are no overlapping forks, is inactive before replication initiation $[31]$. The chromosomal locus datA can hydrolyze ATP-DnaA via DDAH and is crucial for repressing untimely initiation events (Fig. 1B) $[43]$. The two chromosomal DNA regions DARS1 and DARS2 can regenerate ATP-DnaA from ADP-DnaA $[31,47]$. The activating site DARS2 is reported to be only active at high growth rates and the activity of DARS1 was reported to be ten times weaker than DARS2 in vitro $[25]$. In addition to DARS, acidic phospholipids in the cell membrane promote dissociation of both ADP and ATP from DnaA very effectively $[41]$, and DnaA can be reactivated by exchange of the bound nucleotide in vitro in the presence of ATP $[51,52]$. Reduction of the acidic phospholipids in vivo can inhibit initiation at oriC $[48,53]$, which supports the idea that lipids can re-activate DnaA by promoting the exchange of bound ADP for ATP. Moreover, as we show below, activation by DARS1/2 is not sufficient, while lipid-mediated activation of DnaA is essential to generate stable cell cycles. In summary, our modelling in combination with experiments indicates that at slow growth, the dominant DnaA cycle setting the initiation volume consists of activation by the phospholipids and deactivation via DDAH. This cycle forms the basis of the Lipid-DatA (LD) model (SI section S2B).

Because the total DnaA concentration is likely to be constant because of negative auto-regulation, we will focus on the fraction $f = [D_{ATP}]/[D_{T}]$ of DnaA that is bound to ATP $[30]$. Exploiting that DnaA is predominantly bound to either ATP or ADP $[31]$, the change of
the active fraction $f$ in the LD model is given by

$$\frac{df}{dt} = \frac{d[D]_{\text{ATP}}}{dt} \frac{1}{[D]_T} = \alpha_1 f - \beta_{\text{datA}} [n_{\text{ori}}] \frac{f}{K_{D,\text{datA}} + f} + \lambda (1 - f)$$

(3)

with the constant, re-normalized activation and deactivation rates $\alpha_1 = \alpha_1/[D]_T$ and $\beta_{\text{datA}} = \beta_{\text{datA}}/[D]_T$ and the Michaelis-Menten constants $K_{D,\text{datA}} = K_{D,\text{datA}}/[D]_T$ and $K_{D,\text{datA}} = K_{D,\text{datA}}/[D]_T$. Note that because $\text{datA}$ is located close to the origin, we have used here that their concentrations are equal. We further assume that the concentration of the acidic phospholipids $[\ell]$ is maintained approximately constant over time and at all growth rates. This could be achieved for example if the proteins producing acidic phospholipids are part of the Q-sector [43]. The last term describes the effect of protein synthesis (Fig. S4). Since ATP is tenfold more abundant than ADP, new DnaA will predominantly bind ATP [31]. This term is however small at low growth rates ($\lambda \ll \alpha_1, \beta_{\text{datA}}$).

Our switch model gives rise to stable cell cycles and an initiation volume that to a good approximation is independent of the growth rate. The crux of the model is that while the activation rate is independent of the volume of the cell, the deactivation rate decreases with the volume because it is proportional to the density of oriC (Fig. 3 A). The ATP-DnaA fraction $f(t)$ therefore increases with increasing volume $V(t)$ as the origin density decreases (Fig. 3 B). When the critical initiator fraction $f^* = [D]_{\text{ATP}}/[D]_T$ is reached, replication is initiated. As soon as the origin and thus the site $\text{datA}$ have been replicated, the maximum of the deactivation rate doubles, and the active initiator fraction $f$ decreases strongly, preventing re-initiation. As the cell continues to grow, the active initiator fraction rises again. This simple mechanism directly senses the origin density and ensures stable cell cycles (Fig. 3 B). In the quasi-equilibrium regime where activation and deactivation are both much faster than cell growth, we can show that the initiation volume is growth-rate independent (SI section S2 B (Fig. 3 C)).

At high (de)activation rates, the amplitude of the oscillations $\Delta f = f^* - f_{\text{min}}$ is very large (Fig. 3 D). At smaller and more biologically realistic rates ($\beta_{\text{datA}} = 10 \text{ min}^{-1}$ [43] (see section S2 A), the amplitude of the oscillations becomes very small especially at high growth rates (Fig. 3 D); this continues to hold, even when the activation-deactivation system is deeper in the zero-order regime (Fig. S5). Such small amplitudes do not agree with the experiments [35] and are likely to be harmful as even small fluctuations due to noise in the active fraction could result in untimely initiation of replication.

FIG. 3: The LD model of an ultra-sensitive switch between ATP-DnaA and ADP-DnaA gives rise to stable cell cycles and a constant initiation volume per origin at all growth rates. (A) The constant activation rate (red curve) and the origin density-dependent deactivation rate (blue curve) as a function of the active fraction of the initiator protein $f$ at different moments of the cell cycle. The steady-state active fractions are given by the intersection of the activation and deactivation rates (colorful dots) and when $f$ equals the critical initiator fraction $f^*$, replication is initiated. A doubling of the number of origins leads to a decrease of the active fraction $f$. (B) The volume of the cell $V(t)$, the number of origins $n_{\text{ori}}(t)$ and the fraction of ATP-DnaA $f(t)$ from equation (4) as a function of time (in units of the doubling time $\tau_1$). Replication is initiated at a critical initiator fraction $f^*$ (red dashed line) and the system gives rise to a constant initiation volume per origin $v^*$ over time (green dashed line). (C) The initiation volume per origin $v^*$ as a function of the growth rate at different magnitudes of the (de)activation rates ($\alpha_1 = 4.6 \times \beta_{\text{datA}}$) remains approximately constant. The solid black line is the steady state prediction (Eq. S33). (D) The amplitude $\Delta f$ of the oscillations in the active fraction $f$ as a function of the growth rate for the same parameters as in (C). The amplitude of the oscillations $\Delta f$ becomes small for biologically realistic values of the (de)activation rates (blue dashed curve). (see Table S2 for all parameters)

LDDR model with all known activators and deactivators allows for larger amplitude oscillations even at high growth rates

Because at biologically realistic activation and deactivation rates the LD model fails to generate large amplitude-oscillations in the fraction of ATP-DnaA at high growth rates, the question arises how the cell cycle is regulated in this regime. Interestingly, in the fast growth regime $\lambda > \ln(2)/T_C \approx 1.04/h$, where the doubling time
The LDDR model gives rise to stable cell cycles at all growth rates. It can also yield the same initiation volume for all growth rates, but to this end we need to make a specific parameter choice (SI section S2C). The fact that the (de)activation of DnaA by DARS2 and RIDA respectively cancel out in setting a constant initiation volume raises the question what their role here is. Our model suggests that the temporal dependence of their activity is essential (Fig. 4B): right after a new round of replication, the deactivation rate via RIDA is raised but the activation rate via DARS2 is not. This acts to enhance the amplitude of the oscillations. Indeed, in contrast to the LD model based on lipid-mediated activation and datA mediated deactivation only, the LDDR model gives rise to large amplitude oscillations at all growth rates, even for realistic parameter values (Fig. 4D, see Fig. S6 for time traces). Time-varying activation and deactivation rates in combination with specific positions on the chromosome can thus explain how the cell obtains large amplitude oscillations in the fraction of active DnaA at all growth rates. (C) The initiation volume per origin (black line) and its standard deviation (grey area) compared to the experimentally measured initiation volume (green line) and in the LD model (red line). The results are shown for low growth-rate regime of non-overlapping replication forks. (B) The cell cycle time dependent rates of datA, DARS2 and RIDA as a function of the same cell cycle as in (A). (C) The initiation volume per origin $v^*$ as a function of the growth rate $\lambda$ in the LDDR (green line) and in the LD model (red line). (D) The amplitude of the oscillations in the active fraction $\lambda f = f^* - f_{\text{min}}$ at high growth rates becomes very small in the LD model (red line) while it remains large in the LDDR model (green line). (see Table S2 and section S2A for all parameters)
Lipid activation is vital for oriC-density sensing

The finding that the DARS2-RIDA system is necessary for generating the experimentally observed large amplitude oscillations at high growth rates raises the question whether it is also sufficient, and the LD system thus not essential. Eliminating activation and deactivation mechanisms from the full LDDR model only maintains a stable system as long as the lipids with constant activity remain part of the model (Fig. S7). When instead all activation and deactivation mechanisms are connected to the chromosome, as in a system combining DARS1/2 activation with datA/RIDA deactivation, both the activation and deactivation rates have the same functional dependence on the volume such that the system cannot sense the origin density anymore. The active DnaA fraction then oscillates with a constant period, giving rise to an unstable timer (Fig. S7). The lipids thus make the volume dependence of activation and deactivation rates different, which is at the heart of the oriC density sensor (Eq. 1 and 5).

A stochastic version of the switch model can recover the experimentally observed adder correlations in the initiation volume per origin

At the mean-field level, our switch model is a sizer: replication is initiated when the origin density reaches a critical threshold. Yet, recent experiments suggest that replication initiation obeys an adder principle [17, 18]. Do these experiments rule out our model?

While our mean-field model is deterministic, these experiments are based on observing correlations in fluctuations, between the added initiation volume and the initiation volume [17, 18]. We therefore systematically studied the effect of fluctuations in the individual components of our model. Interestingly, we found that fluctuations in the components that control the threshold of the DnaA activation switch naturally give rise to the observed adder correlations.

To illustrate this, we consider fluctuations in the lipid concentration, which we model as

\[
\frac{d[l]}{dt} = \alpha - \lambda [l] + \xi(t),
\]

where \(\alpha\) is the production rate, the second term describes the effect of dilution set by the growth rate \(\lambda\) and \(\xi(t)\) models the noise resulting from protein production and partitioning upon cell division (SI section S2 D). Fig. 5 explains, for clarity (Fig. S8), our findings using the LD model, but Fig. S9 shows that the principal result also holds for the full LDDR model: the added initiation volume between consecutive initiation events \(\Delta v_n^* = 2v_{n+1}^* - v_n^*\) is indeed independent of the volume at initiation \(v_n^*\), in agreement with experiments [17, 18].

The concentrations of cellular components will fluctuate inevitably, and unless the components are degraded actively or produced with negative feedback control, the fluctuations will persist over several generations, regressing to the mean on a timescale set by the growth rate (Fig. 5 B). The components that control the threshold of the DnaA activation switch are no exception to this rule. Moreover, their concentration fluctuations will give rise to fluctuations in the initiation volume \(v^*\) (Fig. 5 C) that, to a good approximation, relax on the same timescale (Fig. 5 D). If this timescale is set by the growth rate, then adder correlations naturally arise (Fig. 5 A) [17]. Interestingly, the initiation volume also depends on the total DnaA concentration (Fig. S8). However, DnaA negatively regulates its own expression [30], which means that its concentration fluctuations decay faster than the growth rate, giving rise to size correlations (Fig. S9). Yet, concentration fluctuations of switch components that relax with the growth rate, be they lipids or proteins that modulate the activity of datA, RIDA, and DARS1/2 like IHF and Hda [12, 25, 35, 43], will give rise to the observed adder correlations (Fig. S10).

Discussion

To understand how E. coli coordinates replication initiation with cell growth, we have presented two detailed mechanistic models that are based on our current understanding of the biochemical network of E. coli. The first model, the RIT model, is a direct implementation of the often discussed initiator accumulation model, in which an initiator protein needs to accumulate to a threshold number to initiate replication [4, 17, 24, 27, 34]. It consists of two modules: (1) an auto-regulated regulator; (2) the initiator, whose total concentration is kept constant by the regulator, and whose copy number threshold for initiation is set by the number of titration sites. At first sight, E. coli seems to have implemented this model: The initiator protein DnaA has a high affinity for titration sites on the DNA and is negatively auto-regulated, thus combining the two modules in one protein. We show however in the AIT model that the two modules need to remain separate and that combining them in one protein results in a feedback loop with unstable cell cycles.

We instead present a new push-pull type of model in which DnaA toggles between an active ATP-bound and inactive ADP-bound form. Conceptually, this switch model is different from the accumulation model: Replication is triggered at a critical concentration or active fraction and not at a critical number of accumulated initiator proteins. In addition, the number of active initiators is not proportional to the volume anymore and increases non-linearly. In the switch model, the concentration of ATP-DnaA is set by the balance between DnaA activation and deactivation. Because the (de)activation rates depend on the origin density, the critical initiator concentration maps onto a critical origin density for replication initiation. This switch system is thus a bona fide origin-density sensor.
FIG. 5: Fluctuations in the switch components can give rise to the experimentally observed adder correlations in the initiation volume per origin $v^*$, illustrated using the LD model with lipid concentration fluctuations (Eq. 6). (A) The added volume per origin between successive initiation events, $\Delta v^*_n = 2v^*_{n+1} - v^*_n$, is independent of the initiation volume $v^*_n$ per origin and on average equal to the average initiation volume, $\langle\Delta v^*\rangle = (v^*)$, as expected for an initiation volume adder. (B) Lipid-concentration fluctuations $l(t) \equiv [l(t)]$ regress to the mean on a timescale $\tau_d = \ln(2)/\lambda$ set by the growth rate $\lambda$. (C) The initiation volume depends on lipid concentration (Eq. S.33 and Fig. S8). (D) Because DnaA (de)activation is fast compared to the growth rate, and the mapping between lipid concentration and initiation volume is roughly linear, the initiation volume relaxes on the same timescale $\tau_d$ as the lipid concentration, giving rise to adder correlations. In (A) the dark blue line shows the mean of the binned data and the error bars represent the standard error of the mean (SEM) per bin. The number of data points $N$ and the Pearson correlation coefficient $R$ are indicated. (see Table S2 for all parameters)

In recent years, single-cell tracking data have revealed that not only E. coli but also other evolutionary divergent organisms like Bacillus subtilis [13], Caulobacter crescentus [13], the archaean Halobacterium salinarum [57], and even budding yeast [58], obey a division adder principle. Our study gives a new perspective on the question whether a cell cycle is controlled via a sizer or adder. Clearly, at the mean-field level, our model should be characterised as a sizer: the mechanism is based on sensing the origin density. Yet, the inevitable fluctuations in the components that control the density threshold for replication give rise to adder correlations. This idea is general and likely applies to other organisms that obey the adder principle: adder behavior may result from size sensing. Our prediction could be tested by measuring the critical active DnaA concentration for replication initiation and studying how its fluctuations relax. Since ATP binding induces a conformational switch of DnaA [59], developing a FRET-based ATP-DnaA sensor may be feasible.

While our models are built on a wealth of data, they all make the simplifying assumption that the cell divides a constant time $\tau_{cc}$ after replication initiation, independent of the growth rate. Experiments indicate, however, that this is an oversimplification [8, 17, 18, 20, 22, 60] and that cell division is more loosely coupled to replication initiation [17, 18]. Importantly, the results of our mean-field models are robust to the assumption of a constant $\tau_{cc}$, because cell division does not change the densities of the components. Moreover, while this assumption will affect the correlations between the cell volume at birth and the initiation volume, it does not change the correlations between the initiation volume and the volume added until the next initiation event, supporting the idea that these adder correlations arise from fluctuations in the threshold of the DnaA activation switch (Fig. S12).

Our modelling predicts that the initiation volume is controlled by two distinct systems, one that sets the initiation volume at low growth rates and the other that controls it at high growth rates. Many experiments support this prediction. When the deactivation site datA is removed, the initiation volume per origin becomes smaller at low growth rates, while at high growth rates there is almost no effect of deleting datA [61]. Conversely, the effect of disabling RIDA is most pronounced at high growth rates: rapidly growing cells ($\tau_d = 26$ min) lacking RIDA over-initiated replication twofold [40], while at intermediate growth rates ($\tau_d = 35$ min) cells lacking RIDA re-initiated only rarely [47]. Moreover, in cells that lack Fis, and that are thus unable to activate ATP-DnaA via DARS2, the initiation volume increases with the growth rate predominantly at high growth rates [54]. Our switch model can quantitatively explain these observations. At low growth rates, RIDA is inactive at the moment of initiation [34, 55]. DARS2 is not very potent [56], and the initiation volume is predominantly set by the activation of DnaA via the phospholipids and its deactivation via DDAH. In contrast, at high growth rates, the replication forks overlap and RIDA, which is a more potent deactivator than DDAH, controls the initiation volume, together with the lipids and DARS2.

An open question remains why E. coli has evolved two different systems. It is clear that the deactivation site datA is essential: RIDA, a mechanism coupled to active replication, cannot be the only deactivator, as it is not active at the moment of initiation at low growth rates. The converse question is, however, less obvious: Why is datA not sufficient and RIDA necessary? In principle, a switch based on activating lipids and deactivating datA would be sufficient to control the initiation volume at all growth rates. Yet, to ensure high amplitude oscillations in the active DnaA fraction at high growth rates, the activation and deactivation rates would have to be higher than observed (Fig. 5D). Such larger (de)activation rates would require higher turnover rates of ATP, which may...
not be achievable when the growth rate is low. Our model thus suggests that E. coli has evolved a slow system to control the initiation volume at low growth rates, the lipids-datA system, and then switches on a faster, more energy-consuming system at higher growth rates, based on RIDA and DARS2.

The observation that E. coli has evolved two systems to control the initiation volume raises the puzzling question of how a constant initiation volume is achieved at all growth rates. Our modelling suggests that the latter is not a robust property that arises from the topology of the underlying biochemical network. Instead, it suggests that the (de)activation strengths of these two systems have been carefully tuned to ensure a constant initiation volume. While the experimental data supports this prediction of our model - deleting datA, RIDA, or DARS2 does not only change the magnitude of the initiation volume, but, importantly, also makes it dependent on the growth rate [22, 43, 56, 61] - the question does arise what the benefit of such a constant initiation volume is. This deserves further investigation.

Intriguingly, the relative positions of datA and DARS2 with respect to the origin and the terminus are conserved in various genomes of different sizes and strains [62]. This suggests that the relative positions play an important role in cell-cycle regulation. Our model predicts that the deactivation site datA needs to be located closely to the origin such that its density becomes proportional to the origin, in agreement with experiments [43]. Also the position of DARS2 is critically important in our model. The reason is that in the high growth-rate regime of overlapping replication forks, DARS2 not only serves to balance the strong deactivation by RIDA to yield a constant initiation volume but also needs to generate oscillations in concert with RIDA. Because the activities of both DARS2 and RIDA are proportional to the origin density, in contrast to those of the lipid-datA system, DARS2 can only play this dual role if its position meets two constraints: On the one hand, the activity of DARS2 should rise as late as possible in order to push the active initiator fraction down right after initiation. On the other hand, to achieve a constant initiation volume independent of the growth rate, the activity of DARS2 must be high before the next initiation event to counteract RIDA; the shortest period until replication is set by the highest doubling time of E. coli, τd ≈ 18 min. The position of DARS2 in the middle of the chromosome (τd2 ≈ 16 min) therefore naturally results from our model. Clearly, this prediction could be tested by moving the locus of the DARS2 gene.

An open question remains why E. coli does not follow the much simpler initiator accumulation model and regulates initiation of replication instead via a complex, energy-consuming switch. Single-cell measurements have shown that E. coli initiates replication very accurately at a fixed volume per origin [4]. The maximal precision of an ultra-sensitive switch between an active and an inactive form could be much higher than a mechanism based on the accumulation of proteins. The role of the titration sites for DnaA in the switch model remains to be elucidated. They could act as a buffer against fluctuations in the total protein concentration and thus increase the precision of the switch mechanism [63]. Alternatively, they could provide an additional mechanism to prevent unwanted re-initiation events by transiently lowering the ATP-DnaA concentration in the cytoplasm after initiation (Fig. S11). Also SeqA likely serves to prevent premature initiation, by blocking the origin and the DnaA promoter for a refractory period after replication initiation [64–66]. These ideas warrant further investigations in a stochastic version of the switch model.

These findings open an exciting avenue not only for understanding how E. coli regulates its cell cycle, but also for the creation of a synthetic cell. When building a synthetic cell from bottom-up, a molecular, mechanistic understanding of phenomenological observations is crucial. The cell cycle of a synthetic cell needs to be regulated such that cell size homeostasis and a constant chromosome density are maintained. Implementing proposed mechanistic models in a synthetic cell is a major challenge and will likely guide the way for a deeper, mechanistic understanding of cellular functions.
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Supplemental Material:
Replication initiation in *E. coli* is regulated via an origin-density sensor generating adder correlations

Overview. Two classes of mechanistic models for the regulation of replication initiation in *E. coli* have been proposed in the literature: Initiator accumulation models \([15, 16, 23–26]\) and initiator switch models \([11, 12, 36–40]\). We propose mechanistic models out of each class and test whether they are consistent with experiments. This Supporting Information is structured into three parts: In the first part, we present and analyze two models of the initiator accumulation class (section S1). First, we give an overview of the gene expression model we are using throughout this work and we analyse the growth rate dependence of differently expressed proteins (section S1A). Then we present the Regulated-Initiator-Titration (RIT) model, which is based on the accumulation of an initiator protein up to a threshold number (section S1B). Finally, we show that the Auto-regulated Initiator Titration (AIT) model, a variation of the RIT model that is inspired by the biochemical network of *E. coli*, does not ensure stable cell cycles (section S1C). In the second part of this Supporting Information, we present two initiator switch models based on a switch between an active and an inactive form of the initiator protein DnaA (section S2): The Lipid-DatA (LD) model is based on an origin density-dependent ultra-sensitivity switch of DnaA (section S2B). The Lipid-DatA- DARS1/2-RIDA (LDDR) model includes all known activators and deactivators in *E. coli* and generates high amplitude oscillations at realistic activation and deactivation rates (section S2C). In section S2D we elucidate the origin of adder and sizer correlations using the LD model, and we also show that the same correlations are observed in the full LDDR model. In section S2E we discuss the role of titration sites in the switch model. In the last part of this Supporting Information, we show that our results remain robust when cell division is controlled independently from replication via a separate mechanism (section S3).

S1. INITIATOR ACCUMULATION MODELS

In the initiator accumulation models, an initiator protein accumulates over the course of the cell cycle and replication is initiated when a threshold amount per origin is attained. As shown in the main part of this paper, these models give rise to a constant initiation volume per origin at all growth rates, when both the total concentration and the threshold number of the initiator are independent of the growth rate. We first investigate what gene expression networks can ensure that the total protein concentration is constant at all growth rates (section S1A). Then we present the RIT model and show that it can give rise to stable cell cycles (section S1B). Finally, we show that the AIT model, which is inspired by the biochemical network of *E. coli*, does not ensure stable cell cycles (section S1C). All parameters used in the AIT and RIT model in the main part of the paper and in the SI can be found in Table S1.

A. Growth-rate dependence of protein concentrations for different gene regulatory networks

Because the volumetric mass density \(\rho_m = M/V\) is approximately constant at all nutrient conditions \([67, 68]\), concentrations and proteome sectors can be converted into each other using a conversion factor \([69]\) and we therefore only consider concentrations of proteins in this work. How a protein concentration varies with the growth rate depends on many factors. We first investigate the most simple case of a constitutively expressed protein (section S1A1). Then we present the growth rate dependence of a negatively auto-regulated protein (section S1A2) and finally, we investigate the effect of regulating a protein via a regulator protein (section S1A3).

1. Constitutively expressed proteins

Using a standard model of gene expression, the change in the total mRNA concentration \([m]_T\) and the total protein concentration \([p]_T\) of a protein \(p\) in a cell can be expressed as

\[
\frac{dm}_T}{dt} = \alpha_m [g] - \beta_m [m]_T \\
\frac{dp}_T}{dt} = \alpha_p [m]_T - \lambda [p]_T
\]

(S1)

where \(\alpha_m\) is the transcription rate, \([g]\) is the concentration of the gene, \(\beta_m\) is the degradation rate of the mRNA, \(\alpha_p\) is the translation rate of proteins and \(\lambda\) is the protein dilution rate due to the growth of the cell (we neglect
active protein degradation). In bacteria, the dynamics of the mRNA production and degradation are typically fast compared to the doubling time of the cell \( \alpha_m, \beta_m > \lambda \). Therefore, dilution of the mRNA content in the cell due to cell growth and division can be neglected. Assuming that the mRNA is in a quasi-steady-state reduces this set of two coupled differential equations to one for the protein concentration:

\[
\frac{d[p]_T}{dt} = \tilde{\alpha} [g] - \lambda [p]_T
\]  

with the combined parameter

\[
\tilde{\alpha} = \frac{\alpha_p \alpha_m}{\beta_m}.
\]  

All parameters can depend non-trivially on the growth rate, as they are a complex combination of many processes in the cell. Klumpp et al. \[50\] have studied experimentally how these parameters depend on the growth rate: The transcription rate \( \alpha_m \) increases with the growth rate at low growth rates and saturates at high growth rates. The mRNA degradation rate \( \beta_m \) and the translation rate \( \alpha_p \) are approximately constant at different growth rates. In the following, we neglect the small dependence of the combined protein production rate \( \tilde{\alpha} \) on the growth rate and keep this parameter constant. The gene concentration per cell is approximately independent of the growth rate \[50\]. The protein concentration at steady state is thus given by

\[
[p]_T^*(\lambda) = \frac{\alpha_p [m]_T^*}{\lambda} = \frac{\alpha_p \alpha_m [g]}{\beta_m \lambda} \propto \frac{1}{\lambda}.
\]  

As the mRNA concentration \([m]_T^*\) and the translation rate \(\alpha_p\) are approximately independent of the growth rate, the protein concentration of an unregulated protein is inversely proportional to the growth rate (Fig. S1 C). This theoretical prediction agrees well with experiments on the protein concentration of constitutively expressed proteins at different growth rates \[50\]. As the concentration of an unregulated protein varies strongly with the growth rate, an initiator accumulation model with a constant initiator threshold and a constitutively expressed initiator protein cannot ensure a constant initiation volume at all growth rates.

2. Negatively auto-regulated proteins

We now investigate how the concentration of a negatively-auto regulated protein depends on the growth rate of the cell. The promoter of the mRNA can be inhibited by the binding of the protein to its own promoter (Fig. S1 A). The transcription rate of the mRNA is therefore a function of the protein concentration. This function can be derived theoretically in the case of cooperative binding \[71\] or it can be obtained experimentally by measuring the transcription rate of the gene at different concentrations of the auto-repressing protein. The production rate \(\alpha_m\) of the mRNA as a function of the total protein concentration \([p]_T\) in the cell is given by

\[
\alpha_m([p]_T) = \frac{\alpha_0}{1 + \left(\frac{[p]_T}{K_D}\right)^n}
\]  

with the Hill coefficient \(n\), the Michaelis-Menten constant of binding to the promoter \(K_D^p\) and the maximal production rate \(\alpha_0\). For now, we assume that the protein \(p\) is distributed homogeneously in the cell and that all proteins contribute to the negative auto-regulation. When the protein concentration \([p]_T\) is much lower than the binding affinity \(K_D^p\), the gene is expressed at the basal rate \(\alpha_0\), while at much higher concentrations the transcription rate reduces to zero; the Hill coefficient \(n\) controls the steepness of this switch. Using the same steady-state assumption of the mRNA concentration as in the previous section, we find the following expression for the change of the protein concentration:

\[
\frac{d[p]_T}{dt} = \frac{\tilde{\alpha} [g]}{1 + \left(\frac{[p]_T}{K_D^p}\right)^n} - \lambda [p]_T
\]  

with the combined parameter \(\tilde{\alpha}\) as defined in \(S4\). Negative auto-regulation therefore actively monitors the protein concentration \([p]_T\) and maintains it relatively constant as a function of the growth rate at a steady-state concentration of \([p]_T^*\) set by the dissociation constant of the promoter \(K_D^p\).
FIG. S1: The concentration of negatively auto-regulated proteins is almost entirely independent of the growth rate and varies little over the course of the cell cycle (A) Scheme of a negatively auto-regulated protein \( p \). The protein present at concentration \([p]_T\) in the cell inhibits its own expression. (B) Scheme of an initiator protein \( p \) that is repressed by a negatively auto-regulated regulator protein \( r \) with concentration \([r]_T\). (C) The average protein concentration over the cell cycle of a constitutively expressed gene (light blue) and of negatively regulated proteins with different Hill coefficients of the regulator \( n_r \) and the initiator \( n_p \) as a function of the growth rate \( \lambda \), according to Eqs. S3 and S9 respectively. All concentrations are normalized with the dissociation constant \( K_D^K_0 \) of the regulator protein. While the concentration of negatively regulated proteins is almost independent of the growth rate, a constitutively expressed protein varies strongly with the growth rate. (D) The volume \( V(t) \), the number of origins \( n_{ori}(t) \) and the total concentration of a negatively regulated protein \([p]_T\) (red curve) according to Eqs. S13 and S14 together with the steady-state solution \([p]_T^{ss} \) (dark blue curve) according to equation S15 as a function of time. The total protein concentration (red curve) is nearly constant over the course of the cell cycle.

3. Initiator protein regulated by a negatively auto-regulated regulator

The RIT model discussed in section S1B is based on a genetic network motif that keeps the total concentration of initiators constant independent of the growth rate, plus titration sites that set the critical number of initiator proteins that need to be accumulated for replication initiation. This genetic network motif is based on a scheme first proposed by Somoaryarc and Maaloe [24], namely a system where the expression of the initiator protein \( p \) is negatively regulated by a regulator protein \( r \), and the regulator protein itself is negatively auto-regulated (Fig. S1B). While in section S1B we discuss how we model the titration sites and the accumulation of the initiator protein, here we briefly discuss the growth rate dependence of the total initiator concentration. We show that in this network the steady-state concentration of the initiator protein is proportional to the steady-state concentration of the regulator protein. Therefore, both the regulator and the initiator concentration are almost independent of the growth rate.

Such a system of a negatively auto-regulated protein \( r \) and a regulated initiator protein \( p \) is described by the following set of equations:

\[
\frac{d[r]_T}{dt} = \alpha_r \left[ g_r \right] \theta_r \left([r]_T\right) - \lambda [r]_T = \frac{\alpha_r \left[ g_r \right]}{1 + \left([r]_T/K_D^K_0\right)^{n_r}} - \lambda [r]_T \tag{S8}
\]

\[
\frac{d[p]}{dt} = \alpha_p \left[ g_p \right] \theta_p \left([r]_T\right) - \lambda [p] = \frac{\alpha_p \left[ g_p \right]}{1 + \left([r]_T/K_D^K_0\right)^{n_p}} - \lambda [p] \tag{S9}
\]

with the availability \( \theta_r([r]_T) = 1/(1+([r]_T/K_D^K_0)^{n_r}) \) and \( \theta_p([r]_T) = 1/(1+([r]_T/K_D^K_0)^{n_p}) \) of the promoter of the regulator.
and the initiator, respectively. As the two proteins can be expressed on different operons, they can have different basal expression rates \( \alpha_r \) and \( \alpha_p \), different gene dosages \( [g_r] \) and \( [g_p] \), different dissociation constants \( K_D^r \) and \( K_D^p \), and different Hill coefficients \( n_r \) and \( n_p \), respectively. In the simplified case where \( n_r = n_p = n \) and \( K_D^r = K_D^p = K_D \), the availability of the two promoters is equal \( \theta_r ([r]^*_T) = \theta_p ([r]^*_T) = \theta ([r]^*_T) \). By assuming a steady state of the regulator protein \( r \), the availability of the promoter is given by

\[
\theta ([r]^*_T) = \frac{\lambda [r]^*_T}{\alpha_r [g_r]}. \tag{S10}
\]

Plugging this into equation \( \text{S9} \) we find that the production rate of the regulated initiator protein \( p \) is proportional to the concentration of the regulator protein \( r \) times the growth rate:

\[
\frac{d[p]^*_T}{dt} = \frac{\alpha_p [g_p] \lambda [r]^*_T}{\alpha_r [g_r]} - \lambda [p]^*_T \tag{S11}
\]

Applying the steady-state assumption for the regulated protein \( p \), we see that the growth rate \( \lambda \) dependence drops out and the steady-state initiator protein concentration is proportional to the regulator concentration:

\[
[p]^*_T = \frac{\alpha_p [g_p] \lambda [r]^*_T}{\alpha_r [g_r]} \tag{S12}
\]

If the steady-state concentration of the regulator protein is almost independent of the growth rate, the total initiator protein concentration should also be almost independent of the growth rate. Contrary to the strong growth rate dependence of a constitutively expressed protein, proteins that are regulated by a negatively auto-regulated protein vary only slightly with the growth rate. By choosing the Hill coefficients of the regulator and initiator protein carefully, one can find combinations where the growth rate dependence of the regulated initiator protein is reduced even more (Fig. S1 C). For a Hill coefficient of the regulator protein \( n_r = 2 \) and a Hill coefficient of the initiator protein \( n_p = 3 \), the variation is comparable to the extreme case of a Hill coefficient of \( n_r = n_p = 10 \) (Fig. S1 C). That auto-repression exhibits almost entire growth rate-independence has also been demonstrated experimentally for the lacZ protein [50]. A protein that is regulated by a negatively auto-regulated protein is thus a good candidate for the initiator protein in an initiator accumulation model.

### B. The RIT model

In this section, we present the RIT model, a detailed mechanistic implementation of the initiator accumulation model. As explained in the main part of the paper, the initiator accumulation model gives rise to a constant initiation volume per origin under two conditions: (1) the total concentration of the initiator protein \( [p]^*_T = N_p/V = c_1 \) is constant in time and at all growth conditions and (2) replication is initiated when the number of accumulated initiator proteins per origin \( n_p = N_p/n_{ori} \) equals a constant critical number of initiator proteins per origin \( n^*_p = N^*_p/n_{ori} = c_2 \). In the RIT model, both of these conditions are fulfilled: The total initiator concentration is maintained approximately constant over the course of the cell cycle (section S1B.1) and a fixed number of titration sites per chromosome sets the critical number of initiators \( n^*_p \) that need to be accumulated in order to initiate replication (section S1B.2). While in the main part of the paper the titration sites were all located at the origin, we here present the scenario of a homogeneous titration site distribution on the DNA (section S1B.3). Then we investigate the stability of the RIT model in the presence of perturbations (section S1B.4). All parameters used in the RIT model in the main part of the paper and in the SI can be found in Table S1.

#### 1. Concentration of initiator protein is approximately constant over the course of the cell cycle

In the RIT model, the initiator is regulated by a negatively auto-regulated regulator protein as described in section S1A.3 (see also Fig. S1B). Here, we show that this results in a total initiator concentration that is relatively constant over the course of the cell cycle. As explained in the main text, in the RIT model we explicitly model the exponentially growing cell with the growth rate \( \lambda \):

\[
\frac{dV}{dt} = \lambda V \tag{S13}
\]
For both the regulator $r$ and the initiator protein $p$, the change in copy number $N_x (x = \{p, r\})$ is given by

$$\frac{dN_x}{dt} = \frac{\alpha_x g}{1 + \left(\frac{\nu_x}{\kappa_x^{\nu_x}}\right)^{n_x}}$$

with the basal production rate $\alpha_x$, the gene number $g$, the dissociation constant $K_D$ and the Hill coefficient $n_x$. The protein concentration $\langle x \rangle(t)$ is then given by the ratio of the number of proteins $N_x(t)$ divided by the volume $V(t)$ (Fig. S1 D). We assume here that all regulator proteins contribute to negative auto-regulation (see also section S1.C.2). In the RIT model, replication is initiated when a fixed amount of initiators set by the number of titration sites per chromosome has been accumulated (see next section S1.B.2) and the cell divides an on average constant cycling time $\tau_{cc}$ after replication initiation [34] (for separate division control see section S3). We assume that both the regulator and the initiator gene are located very closely to the origin such that at the moment of replication initiation the gene number doubles instantaneously. The temporal evolution of the initiator protein concentration, given by equations S13 and S14 can then be compared to the evolution as predicted by the steady solutions of equations S12 and S10 which assume that both the production and decay term are fast on the timescale of the cell cycle. The only non-imaginary steady-state solution of equations S12 and S10 at a Hill coefficient $n_r = 2$ is given by

$$[p]_T = \frac{K_D \alpha_p}{\alpha_r} \left( \frac{(9 \delta^2 + \sqrt{3} \sqrt{4 \delta^6 + 27 \delta^4})^{1/3}}{2^{1/3} \beta^{2/3} \delta} \right) - \frac{(3/5 \delta)^{1/3}}{(9 \delta^2 + \sqrt{3} \sqrt{4 \delta^6 + 27 \delta^4})^{1/3}}$$

with the dimensionless parameter

$$\delta = \frac{K_D \lambda}{\tilde{\alpha}} \left[ \frac{\tilde{g}}{\tilde{g}} \right].$$

where we used $n_r = n_p = 2$ and $K_D = K_D^0 = K_D$. The steady-state initiator protein concentration given by equation S13 (Fig. S1 D, third panel in blue) oscillates over the course of the cell cycle due to the varying gene number. When the gene number doubles at a critical volume per origin $\nu^*$, the steady-state concentration jumps to a higher value and decays again as the gene is diluted to cell growth. As expected, the temporal evolution of the protein concentration according to equation S13 and S14 also increases as soon as the gene has been duplicated (Fig. S1 D, red line). It lags however behind the steady-state solution of equations S12 and S10 i.e. equation S15 and varies only weakly over the course of the cell cycle (Fig. S1 D). This is because the relaxation time of the system is dominated by the growth rate and the change in the fixed point is of the same order of magnitude.

2. **The titration sites**

In this section, we present how the titration sites can ensure that a fixed amount of initiator proteins needs to be accumulated per number of origin between consecutive replication initiation events. We discuss why the quasi-equilibrium assumption is an appropriate approximation and calculate the concentration of free initiator proteins as a function of the total initiator protein concentration $[p]_T$ and of the total titration site concentration $[s]_T$ in the cell.

**Binding and unbinding rates of DnaA binding to the titration sites are fast.** In the main text, we assumed that the binding and unbinding of the initiator proteins to the titration sites is well described by a quasi-steady-state. Here we show that the binding and unbinding dynamics are relatively fast compared to the doubling time of the cell, such that this assumption is well justified. It seems reasonable to assume that DnaA finds its target sites in a way that is similar to that of other transcription factors, such as the lac repressor whose binding dynamics has been well characterized [22]. These transcription factors move by facilitated diffusion, i.e. combining 3D with 1D diffusion along the DNA. Elf et al. [22] have measured that the effective diffusion constant of transcription factors in *E. coli* is of the order of $D_{\text{off}} = 0.4 \mu m^2/s$. Assuming the binding rate is diffusion-limited, the binding rate is given by an estimated cross section in the order of $\sigma \approx 10^{-2} \mu m$ [73], the binding rate therefore becomes $k_{\text{on}} \approx 0.05 \mu m^3/s$. The time for a transcription factor to bind to its target site is given by one over the concentration of the transcription factor $[c]$ times the binding rate: $\tau_{\text{on}} = ([c] \times k_{\text{on}})^{-1}$. With a typical volume of an *E. coli* cell of $V = 1 \mu m^3$, the search time of one transcription factor for finding its target site on the DNA should then be $\tau_{\text{on}} = k_{\text{on}}^{-1} \times V = 20 s$. This estimate compares well to the measured value of $\tau_{\text{on}} = 65 - 360 s$ by Elf et al. [22]. The dissociation constant of DnaA binding to the DNA boxes on the DNA is in the range of $K_D = 1 - 50 nM$ [29]. Using $K_D = k_{\text{off}}/k_{\text{on}}$ allows us to estimate $k_{\text{off}} = K_D^0 \times k_{\text{on}} \approx 0.015 - 0.8 \times 10^{-1}$. With an average concentration of the initiator protein DnaA in *E. coli* of $[D]_T \approx 400 \mu m^{-3}$ [34], the correlation time for binding and unbinding
TABLE S1: Parameters used in the RIT and AIT model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>name</th>
<th>value (RIT)</th>
<th>value (AIT)</th>
<th>Motivation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$a_r$ [h$^{-1}$]</td>
<td>production rate regulator</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$a_p$ [h$^{-1}$]</td>
<td>production rate initiator</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>[27]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$K_D^R$ [$\mu m^{-3}$]</td>
<td>dissociation constant regulator</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$K_D^n$ [$\mu m^{-3}$]</td>
<td>dissociation constant initiator</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>[31]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$n_e$</td>
<td>Hill coefficient regulator</td>
<td>10 in Fig. 2A, S2, S3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$n_p$</td>
<td>Hill coefficient initiator</td>
<td>10 in Fig. 2A, S2, S3</td>
<td>10 in Fig. 2C</td>
<td>[30]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$n_s$</td>
<td>number of titration sites per chromosome</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>[75]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$K_D^{ori}$ [$\mu m^{-3}$]</td>
<td>dissociation constant origin</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>[29]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$K_D^{s}$ [$\mu m^{-3}$]</td>
<td>dissociation constant titration sites</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>[29]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$T_C$ [h]</td>
<td>C-period</td>
<td>2/3</td>
<td>2/3</td>
<td>[5]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$T_D$ [h]</td>
<td>D-period</td>
<td>1/3</td>
<td>1/3</td>
<td>[5]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\lambda$ [h$^{-1}$]</td>
<td>growth rate</td>
<td>0.35-1.73</td>
<td>0.35-1.73</td>
<td>[3, 4]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.35 in Fig. 2A, S3</td>
<td>0.46 in Fig. 2C</td>
<td>[8]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* One molecule per cubic micrometer corresponds to approximately one nM (1 $\mu m^{-3}$ = 1.67 nM).

Then becomes $\tau = 1/(k_{on} [D]_T + k_{off}) \approx 0.16$ s. This is much faster than the timescale at which the volume changes, set by the growth rate. Recent FRAP experiments combined with single molecule tracking experiments show that DnaA rapidly moves between chromosomal binding sites and has a residence time of less than a second [74]. Thus, the quasi-equilibrium approximation of the initiator binding to the titration sites we made is well justified.

**Concentration of free initiator proteins in the quasi-equilibrium assumption.** As binding and unbinding dynamics of the initiator protein to the titration sites are relatively fast, we can assume for simplicity a quasi-equilibrium state of the concentration of free initiator proteins $[p] = K_D^n [sp]/[s]$ with the dissociation constant $K_D^n$. At every given total titration site concentration $[s]_T = [s] + [sp]$ and total initiator protein concentration $[p]_T = [p] + [ps]$, the average free initiator protein concentration $[p]$ is given by the quadratic equation

$$[p]/([s]_T, [p]_T) = [p]_T - K_D^n [s]_T + [p]_T \frac{2}{2} + \sqrt{(K_D^n + [s]_T + [p]_T)^2 - 4 [s]_T [p]_T}$$

(S17)

We use this expression in the main text to calculate at every given total titration site concentration and total initiator concentration in a cell the concentration of initiators freely diffusing in the cytoplasm.

3. **Effect of a homogeneous titration site distribution**

In the main part of the paper, we assumed out of simplicity that all titration sites are located at the origin. Here, we investigate how a homogeneous titration site distribution on the chromosome affects the stability of the cell cycles and the constancy of the initiation volume per origin. In the scenario of the main text, where all titration sites are located at the origin, the total number of binding sites $N_s$ doubles immediately after initiation of replication (Fig. S2A). With the immediate doubling of all titration sites, the concentration of free initiator proteins drops instantly after initiation of replication, thus preventing re-initiating. Only when again enough new initiator proteins have been produced, a new round of replication can be initiated. This mechanism gives rise to stable cell cycles at both low and high growth rates (Fig. S2A and B) and the initiation volume per origin $v^*$ is almost independent of the growth rate of the cell (Fig. S2E).

In *E. coli*, the initiator protein DnaA has a high affinity to specific sequences on the DNA, so called DnaA boxes [74]. In total, 308 DnaA boxes of the stringent definition (5'- TT $^A/T$ TNCACA) are found on the *E. coli* genome [75]. These DnaA boxes are however widely distributed throughout the *E. coli* chromosome [28] [75]. We approximate this observation by assuming a homogeneous distribution of the titration sites along the chromosome. The number of titration sites $N_s(t)$ is therefore in this scenario not directly proportional to the number of origins but increases...
All titration sites located at the origin:

Homogeneous distribution of titration sites on the chromosome:

FIG. S2: A homogeneous titration site distribution on the chromosome in the RIT model causes re-initiation events at high growth rates (A), (B), (C) and (D): The volume \( V(t) \), the number of initiator proteins \( N_p(t) \) (black line) and titration sites \( N_s(t) \) (yellow line), the total concentration of initiator proteins \( [p]\_T(t) \) together with the dissociation constant of the regulator \( K_d^c \) (dotted red line), and the concentration of initiator proteins in the cytoplasm \( [p]\_c(t) \) as a function of time (in units of the doubling time of the cell \( \tau_d \)). When the number of initiator proteins per origin \( n^* \) (yellow dashed line), the free concentration \( [p]\_c(t) \) rapidly rises to reach the threshold concentration \( K_d^c \) (blue dashed line) for initiating a new round of replication. The blue arrows indicate that the cell divides a constant cycling time \( \tau_{cc} \) after replication initiation. During the blocked period \( \tau_b \) (red shaded area), no new round of replication can be initiated. (A, B) If all titration sites are located at the origin, the free initiator concentration \( [p]\_c(t) \) decreases immediately after replication is initiated, independent of whether the doubling time of the cell \( \tau_d \) is smaller (A) or larger (B) than the time \( T_C \) to replicate the entire chromosome. (C) When the titration sites are distributed homogeneously along the chromosome, the free initiator concentration decreases during the entire replication time \( T_C \) at low growth rates. As the time to produce new titration sites is still faster than the time to synthesize new initiator proteins, we obtain regular stable cell cycles in this regime. (D) When the doubling time is however smaller than the time to replicate the entire chromosome, \( \tau_d < T_C \), newly replicated titration sites are being filled faster with new proteins than they are replicated. After a short blocked period \( \tau_b \), replication is re-initiated. As a result, each long (sub)cycle is followed by a very short one, together forming the cell cycle. Moreover, replication is not initiated at a constant volume per origin anymore, but oscillates over time. (E) The average initiation volume per origin \( v^* \) as a function of the growth rate remains approximately constant both for a homogeneous and an inhomogeneous titration site distribution. At a homogeneous titration site distribution at high growth rates \( \lambda > \ln 2/T_C \), the re-initiation events cause however an oscillation of the initiation volume per origin \( v^* \) between a maximal and a minimal value indicated by the shaded green area. Re-initiation events are a consequence of a homogeneous distribution of equally strong binding sites on the chromosome. If the binding sites at the origin are however much stronger than at the rest of the chromosome, a homogeneous distribution can recover the regular stable cell cycles obtained for an inhomogeneous titration site distribution.
linearly from the moment of initiation of replication \( t_i \) until the end of replication \( t_f \):

\[
N_s(t) = \begin{cases} 
N_0 & \text{for } t < t_i \\
N_0 + N_0 \frac{t - t_i}{T_C} & \text{for } t_i \leq t < t_i + T_C \\
2N_0 & \text{for } t \geq t_i + T_C
\end{cases}
\]  

(S18)

with the C-period \( T_C \approx 40 \text{ min} \) being the time to replicate the entire chromosome. In the main part of the paper we used the experimental observation that the cell divides an approximately constant cycling time \( \tau_c \) after replication has been initiated [4]. This cycling time can be split into two times \( \tau_c = T_C + T_D \), the C-period and the D-period: During the C-period, the DNA is being replicated and during the D-period the chromosomes are being separated and the cell divides [3–5]. As now the titration sites are not all located at the origin, we need to include the effect that during the C-period not all new titration sites have been replicated yet. The total number of binding sites before initiation \( N_0 \) will only be doubled, when the entire chromosome has been replicated, thus after the end of the C-period \( T_C \).

In the low growth regime, the time to replicate the entire chromosome \( T_C \) is shorter than the time to double the volume of the cell \( \tau_d \). The time it takes to double the number of titration sites upon replication initiation is therefore shorter than the time to double the number of initiation proteins. This results in a gradual decrease of the free initiator concentration upon replication initiation (Fig. S2C, lowest panel). In favorable growth conditions, the doubling time of \( E. coli \) can however be shorter than the time it takes to replicate the entire chromosome \( T_C \). As a result, the rate at which new titration sites are formed upon the first replication initiation event (marked by the dashed vertical lines) is therefore lower than the rate at which initiator proteins are produced; the number of titration sites (yellow line) rises slower than the number of initiators (black line). This means that after the first replication initiation event, the free initiator concentration continues to rise (lower row). To prevent immediate re-initiation, we introduce a refractory or ‘eclipse’ period of \( \tau_e \approx 10 \text{ min} \) after replication initiation during which replication initiation is blocked (red shaded area), mimicking the effect of SeqA [11, 64–66]. When this eclipse period is over, a new round of replication is initiated, which triples the rate at which new titration sites are formed. Now the rate of titration-site formation is higher than the rate at which new initiator proteins are produced, causing the concentration of free initiator to go down. At some point, the first round of replication is finished, causing a small decrease in the rate at which new titration sites are formed and some time later also the next round is finished, causing the number of titration sites to become constant. Then the time \( \tau_c \) after the first initiation event is reached and the cell divides. After this division event it grows briefly and then it divides again, a time \( \tau_c \) after the second initiation event in the previous cycle. A given cell cycle thus consists of a long and a short cycle, such that the average division time (time from birth to death) equals the doubling time \( \ln(2) \). This regime of overlapping replication forks is shorter than the time \( T_C \) to replicate the chromosome. Because in the long (sub) cycle two initiation events are triggered in rapid succession, the initiation volume per origin flip-flops between a high and a low initiation volume per origin. This is indicated by the shaded green area in Figure S2E. The time traces of the volume and the oscillations in the initiation volume with a homogeneous titration site distribution are inconsistent with experimental time traces and the observation that the initiation volume per origin is constant over a broad range of growth rates [4] (Fig. S2E). This suggests that replication initiation is not controlled by a titration-based mechanism. Naturally, if the affinity of the titration sites located at the origin is higher than the affinity of titration sites at the rest of the chromosome, we can recover the behavior of the inhomogeneous titration site distribution. Interestingly, it had been proposed that the site \( datA \) which is located close to the origin has a very high affinity and can titrate large numbers of proteins, of up to 60-370 [76, 77]. These numbers had been inferred indirectly, from experiments that analyzed the de-repression of dnaA or mioC transcription upon introduction of plasmids containing \( datA \) sequences [43]. It remained however unclear by which mechanism \( datA \) would be able to absorb so many DnaA molecules. The discovery that the site \( datA \) can deactivate the initiator protein ATP-DnaA by promoting ATP hydrolysis provides a more likely explanation for this indirect observation [43].

4. Stability of the RIT model in the presence of noise during cell division

In this section, we test the stability of the RIT model with the titration sites close to the origin in the presence of noise occurring at cell division in the following two scenarios:

1. During cell division, proteins of the mother cell are partitioned stochastically between the two daughter cells: If proteins are partitioned randomly between the daughter cells, the probability of finding \( k \) out of the total number of proteins \( N_M \) in a daughter cell with volume \( V_D \) is given by the binomial distribution

\[
P_k(N_M, p) = \binom{N_M}{k} (1-p)^{N_M-k} p^k
\]  

(S19)
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where \( p = V_D/V_M \) and \( p = 0.5 \) in the case of a cell dividing perfectly in the middle. At every division event, a random number of \( k \) proteins is picked from this binomial distribution.

2. An error in finding the exact middle of the cell can lead to differently sized daughter cells. The volume of the daughter cell at birth, \( V_D \) is thus not exactly half of the mother cell volume before division \( V_M \):

\[
V_D = V_M/2 + \delta V
\]

We assume the error in the division volume \( \delta V \) to be a stochastic, normal distributed variable with mean \( \mu = 0 \) and a standard deviation of \( \sigma = 0.05 \). In this scenario, the regulator and initiator proteins are distributed perfectly in the two daughter cells such that the total initiator concentration in the daughter at birth equals the total concentration in the mother cell before cell division:

\[
[p]_T^D = [p]_T^M
\]

We show that the RIT model gives rise to stable cell cycles in both scenarios. For clarity, we first impose a perturbation at cell division and analyse how the system regresses deterministically back to the mean. In a second step, we introduce random perturbations at every cell division event. By investigating the resulting correlations in the RIT model in these two scenarios (noise due to random protein partitioning and cell division position), we find that even though the RIT is considered a molecular implementation of an adder, sizer-like correlations can arise from an error in the division position.

**Protein partitioning noise.** In the RIT model, two proteins play an important role in regulating initiation of replication: The regulator and the initiator protein. In the following, we investigate first how the system regresses deterministically back to the mean after a single partitioning error of the initiator protein at cell division while maintaining a constant regulator protein concentration. Then we argue that a perturbation of the regulator protein results in a similar regression mechanism. Finally, we investigate the resulting correlations in the initiation volume when both the regulator and the initiator protein are randomly partitioned at every cell division event.

**Single partitioning error followed by deterministic regression to the mean.** In the 2nd generation in Figure S3 A, the number of initiator proteins at birth is larger than average due to unequal partitioning of the initiator proteins at cell division. A discrete increase in the initiator number by \( \delta N_0 \) results in a higher total concentration of initiator proteins at the beginning of the 2nd cell cycle. The initiator concentration of the perturbed cell cycle at birth is given by:

\[
[p]_t = \left( \frac{N_p}{V_b} \right) + \delta N_0 \left/ \left( \frac{V_b}{V_b} \right) \right. = [\bar{p}] + \delta N_0 = [\bar{p}] + \delta[p]_0
\]

with the average number of initiator proteins at birth \( \langle N_p \rangle \), the average birth volume \( \langle V_b \rangle \), the average concentration at birth \( [\bar{p}] \) and the initial error in the initiator concentration \( \delta[p]_0 \). Due to the higher total initiator concentration at birth, fewer proteins need to be accumulated in order to fill the fixed number of titration sites. As the total number of initiator proteins is larger than average at birth, both the free concentration and the number of titration sites that are filled are higher (Fig. S3 A, lowest panel). In the RIT model, the regulator protein concentration controls both the expression rate of the regulator and the initiator protein. When the initiator protein number is perturbed after division, but the regulator protein protein concentration remains constant, the production rates of the initiator and regulator proteins are not perturbed. A constant volume change of \( \delta V \) gives rise to a proportional change in the number of initiator proteins \( \delta N = \delta V \bar{p} \). Consequently, a cell that needs to produce fewer proteins to attain the critical initiator number per origin \( \nu^c \), initiates replication at a smaller volume per origin \( \nu^c \) (Fig. S3 A, upper panel, red dots). In the RIT model, the cell divides a fixed time \( \tau_{\sigma} \) after initiation at a smaller volume than average. Over the course of a few cell cycles, the cell converges to its original initiation volume and therefore birth and division size.

Similarly, we can consider the scenario where the initiator concentration is kept constant at division, but the regulator protein number is perturbed (data not shown). If the number of regulator proteins is for example lower than average at birth, the promoter of both the regulator and the initiator protein is less repressed and the production rate of both proteins increases rapidly. In the case of a strong auto-repression, this leads to a rapid increase of the initiator and regulator protein until the regulator protein concentration is again at its average concentration. Due to the transiently higher production rate more initiator proteins than average are now present in the cell and replication is initiated earlier at a smaller volume. Now the higher initiator protein concentration is again being diluted over the course of several cell cycles. The initiation volume therefore regresses back to the average via the same mechanism.
as in the case of perturbing the initiator protein number directly (Fig. S3 A).

**Stochastic protein partitioning at every division cycle.** Now, we randomly partition both the regulator and the initiator protein at every cell division according to the binomial distribution in equation S19. We plot the added volume per origin from one initiation event \( v^*_{n} \) to the next, \( \Delta v^*_n = 2v^*_{n+1} - v^*_{n} \), and find that it is independent of the initiation volume per origin (Fig. S3 B). Furthermore, the initiation volume per origin \( v^* \) is positively correlated with the volume at birth (Fig. S3 C). When proteins are partitioned randomly upon cell division, the RIT model is therefore consistent with the experimentally observed “adder” phenotype for initiation of replication.

**Noise in the division position.** Here, we first investigate how in the RIT model a single error \( \delta V \) in the birth volume decreases deterministically over the course of the cell cycle and over several generations. Then, we present the correlations between the birth volume and the volume of replication initiation from a cell line with this source of noise.

**Single division position error followed by deterministic regression to the mean.** In the 2nd generation, a cell is born with a smaller birth volume, while the concentration of initiator and regulator proteins remains constant (Fig. S3 D). The noise in the division position does almost not perturb the initiation volume per origin in the same generation and is already reduced to zero in the next generation. As the initiator protein concentration remains constant, a cell born with a smaller birth volume contains fewer initiator proteins. When fewer initiator proteins are present in the cell, fewer titration sites are occupied and the free concentration of proteins right after division decreases (See Fig. S3 D, lowest panel). The initiator production rate remains unchanged, as it is controlled by the constant regulator concentration. Therefore, it now takes more time to produce more proteins at a constant rate. In a cell that is born smaller than average, replication is thus initiated later in the cell cycle than average. As a result, the initiation volume per origin is almost constant over time. The RIT model therefore also produces robust cell cycles in the presence of noise in the division position.

**Stochastic division position error at every division cycle.** From many cell cycles with randomly distributed, uncorrelated errors \( \delta V \) in the birth size we obtain the initiation volume per origin \( v^* \) as a function of the birth volume \( V_b \): The volume at birth and the initiation volume per origin are almost not correlated with each other (Fig. S3 E). This phenomenological type of cell size regulation is often called a sizer mechanism [18]. Even though the initiator accumulation model is generally referred to as a molecular implementation of the adder mechanism [14, 16, 17], we find here that this mechanism can also give rise to sizer-like correlations if the only source of noise comes from unequal daughter sizes after cell division.

To conclude, we find that the RIT model is stable under different sources of noise. Interestingly, the phenomenological mechanism, by which the cell returns to its constant initiation volume per origin \( v^* \) after a perturbation at division, depends on the type of noise that is introduced. If the regulator and initiator proteins are partitioned unequally in the two daughter cells, the cell regresses back to its equilibrium deploying the phenomenological adder mechanism. When the cell divides however unequally while maintaining a constant regulator and initiator concentration in both daughter cells, the phenomenological mechanism of cell size homeostasis is found to be a sizer. Thus, a given molecular model can give rise to different types of correlations at the same time (here sizer and adder) depending on which type of noise dominates - protein partitioning noise or volume-division noise. Conversely, in the LD model, we show that a mechanistic mechanism that is typically thought to give rise to a sizer can also give rise to adder correlations. This underscores the point in the Discussion section that care should be taken in inferring molecular mechanisms from phenomenological correlations.

**C. The AIT model**

In this subsection we present a variation of the RIT model that is consistent with the experimental data on the topology of the cell-cycle network of *E. coli*. In the AIT model, the initiator protein is negatively auto-regulated. As in the RIT model, the initiator binds to high-affinity titration sites on the DNA. While the RIT model can give rise to stable cell cycles, the AIT model fails to do so. In this section we first discuss the parameters used in the AIT model. Then we discuss the different initiator production mechanisms in the two models, giving rise to the instability in the AIT model. All parameters used in the AIT model in the main part of the paper and in the SI can be found in Table S1.
FIG. S3: The RIT model gives rise to stable cell cycles in the presence of noise during cell division (A) and (D): The volume $V(t)$, the number of initiator proteins $N_p(t)$ and titration sites $N_s(t)$, the total concentration of initiator proteins $[p](t)$ together with the dissociation constant of the regulator $K^D$ (dotted red line), and the concentration of initiator proteins in the cytoplasm $[p](t)$ as a function of time (in units of the doubling time of the cell $\tau_d$). (A) In the second generation, the total number of initiator proteins at birth is larger than average. This perturbation due to unequal protein partitioning at the moment of cell division results in a smaller initiation volume that regresses back to the average over several generations. (B), (C) and (E): In all scatter plots, the dark blue lines show the mean of the binned data and the error bars represent the standard error of the mean (SEM) per bin. The number of data points $N$ and the Pearson correlation coefficient $R$ are indicated. (B) As expected for an initiation volume adder, the added volume per origin between two initiation events, $\Delta_v^* = v^*_{n+1} - v^*_n$, is independent of the initiation volume per origin $v^*$. (C) The initiation volume per origin $v^*$ is positively correlated with the birth volume of the cell $V_b$ in the presence of noise due to random partitioning of the regulator and initiator protein at cell division. (D) Due to noise in the division position, the second generation of a cell line is born with a smaller birth volume. The error in the birth volume is reduced to zero within one generation by initiating replication at a constant volume per origin $v^*$ independent of the birth volume. (E) As it is typical for a sizer, the initiation volume per origin $v^*$ is independent of the birth volume $V_b$ in the presence of noise due to a randomly generated division position at every cell cycle.
In this section we discuss the experimentally found parameters and compare them to the ones used in the simulations of the AIT model. While the RIT model is a molecular implementation of the initiator accumulation model that gives rise to stable cell cycles, the AIT model is closely modelled according to the biochemical network of *E. coli*. The parameters of the AIT model used both in the main figures and in the Supplementary Information can be found in Table S1.

The protein DnaA in *E. coli* is generally referred to as the initiator protein, as its ATP-bound form is required to bind to the origin for initiating replication [11]. Both forms of the protein DnaA, ATP-DnaA and ADP-DnaA, have strong affinity for an asymmetric 9 bp consensus sequence on the DNA, the DnaA box [11]. In the replication origin region of *E. coli* several DnaA boxes are present, including R1-R4 and M. [75]. In total, 308 DnaA boxes of the stringent definition (5′- TT A / T TCACANA) have been found on the *E. coli* genome [75]. The dissociation constant of DnaA binding to the DnaA boxes on the DNA lies in the range of $K_D^A = 1 - 50$ nM, depending on the flanking sequences [29]. While for some DnaA boxes, the binding was non-specific $K_D^A \geq 200$ nM, the highest affinity was found for the DnaA boxes R1 and R4 in the origin with $K_D^A = 1$ nM. In *E. coli*, the approximately three hundred 9-mer DnaA boxes are randomly distributed on the *E. coli* chromosome [28] [75]. The dnaA gene is regulated by two promoters, dnaAp1 and dnaAp2, with a DnaA box located between them. dnaAp2 is the stronger promoter and contributes 60–80 % of the dnaA transcripts [30]. Both ATP-DnaA and ADP-DnaA bind cooperatively to these two promoters, but the repression via ATP-DnaA is more efficient [30].

In the AIT model we used $n_0 = 300$ titration sites per origin with a dissociation constant of $K_D^A = 1$ nM (Table S1). In the main text, we studied the case where all titration sites are located at the origin. At a concentration of ATP-DnaA of approximately $[D]_{ATP} = 100$ nM, the expression of DnaA was reduced by 50 % [30]. Therefore, we used in the AIT model for the promoter a dissociation constant of $K_D^A = 100$ nM. The dissociation constant of DnaA for the origin was chosen to be $K_D^{ori} = 20$ nM, reflecting the combination of high and intermediate affinity of the titration sites required to be filled by ATP-DnaA in order to initiate replication. Using the experimentally reported topology of the biochemical network, we can however not obtain stable cell cycles with the AIT as explained in the main text of the paper and in the next section.

2. Comparison of the stability in the RIT and the AIT model

Here we discuss the effect of the different production rates of the initiator protein in the RIT and the AIT model on the stability of the system. Crucially, the production rate of the RIT model depends on the cell volume via the total regulator concentration. This gives rise to a feedback mechanism that ensures stable cell cycles. In the AIT model the production rate is effectively constant and cannot correct for variations in the volume. A constant production rate results in the accumulation of the critical number of proteins in a constant time. As this results in a constant cell division time $\tau_{\text{div}}$ that is not coupled with the growth rate of the cell, we obtain unstable cell cycles.

To elucidate the crucial difference between the AIT and the RIT model, we first revisit the latter. In the RIT model, the regulator protein can either be freely diffusing or be bound to the promoter region of the regulator protein $P_i$ or the initiator protein $P_p$. The total concentration of the regulator protein in the cell $[r]_T$ is therefore the sum of free regulator proteins $[r]$, regulator proteins bound to their own promoter $[rP_i]$ and the regulator proteins bound to the promoter of the initiator $[rP_p]$:

$$[r]_T = [r] + [rP_i] + [rP_p] \quad (S23)$$

As the number of proteins that can be bound to the two promoters is small compared to the total amount of proteins, the total regulator protein concentration is well approximated by the free regulator protein concentration

$$[r]_T \approx [r] \quad (S24)$$

This gives rise to the following production rate of the initiator protein:

$$\frac{dN_p}{dt} = \frac{\alpha_p g}{1 + (\frac{[r]}{K_D^p})^{n_p}} \approx \frac{\alpha_p g}{1 + (\frac{[r]_T}{K_D^p})^{n_p}} \quad (S25)$$

As the total regulator concentration $[r]_T$ is maintained constant via negative auto-regulation, it also maintains the total initiator concentration approximately constant over time and at different growth rates. Importantly, if
the volume of the cell is for example larger than average and the concentrations of the initiator and regulator protein are therefore smaller, the production rate increases in order to re-establish a constant concentration (both of the regulator and the initiator protein). This negative feedback mechanism can therefore correct for fluctuations in the volume and in the initiator protein concentration (as demonstrated in more details in the previous section).

In the AIT model, the initiator protein is negatively auto-regulated. The initiator protein can thus bind to its own promoter $P_p$, to the origin $O$ and to the titration sites $t$. The total initiator concentration is therefore given by

$$[p]_T = [p] + [rP_p] + [pO] + [pt]$$  \hspace{1cm} (S27)

As only a few proteins (about 20-30 DnaA proteins) can be bound to the origin region or the promoter $[31]$, the second and the third term can be neglected. The total number of titration sites per chromosome is with approximately 300 sites per chromosome however comparable to the reported number of initiator proteins per cell $N_p = 400 - 2000 [34] [75]$. Therefore, the fraction of initiator proteins bound to titration sites $[pt]$ cannot be neglected and the total initiator protein concentration $[p]_T$ in the AIT model does not equal the initiator concentration in the cytoplasm $[p]$:

$$[p]_T \approx [p] + [pt] \neq [p]$$  \hspace{1cm} (S28)

As only proteins that are in the cytoplasm can bind to the promoter and repress production, the production rate of the initiator protein in the AIT model thus becomes

$$\frac{dN_p}{dt} = \frac{\alpha_p g}{1 + \left(\frac{[p]}{K_p}\right)^n_p}$$  \hspace{1cm} (S29)

As explained in the main text, the dissociation constant of the titration sites $K_p$ should be low, followed by the dissociation constant of the origin $K^\text{ori}_p$, which should itself be smaller than the dissociation constant of the promoter $K^\text{prom}_p$ ($K^\text{ori}_p > K^\text{prom}_p > K_p$). Due to the high affinity of the initiator to the titration sites, the free initiator concentration is very low and always smaller than the dissociation constant of the promoter $([p] \ll K_p)$. The promoter of the initiator protein is therefore repressed only weakly and proteins are produced approximately at the maximal rate:

$$\frac{dN_p}{dt} \approx \alpha_p g$$  \hspace{1cm} (S30)

As the production rate is effectively constant, it is not coupled to the volume of the cell. Replication is initiated when a fixed amount of proteins approximately equal to the number of titration sites has been accumulated. If proteins are produced at a constant rate independent of the cell volume, replication is initiated at a constant period $\tau_{\text{rep}}$, independent of the growth rate of the cell. As in our model, replication initiation triggers cell division a constant cycling time $\tau_c$, after replication initiation, the division time of the cell is set by the replication initiating period of $\tau_{\text{div}} = \tau_{\text{rep}}$. Hence, if the cell division time $\tau_{\text{div}}$ differs from the doubling time $\tau_d = \ln 2/\lambda$ by the smallest amount, cells either blow up or shrink to zero (as shown in Figure 2C in the main text). In section S3 we show that if the division cycle is independent of replication initiation, the origin density does not remain constant in the AIT model. As a constant chromosome density is a fundamental requirement for stable cell cycles, we conclude that the AIT model is not a valid description of the regulation of replication in E. coli.

Finally, it is possible that the production rate in equation S30 itself depends on the volume. As discussed in section S1A, we employ a standard model of gene expression in which the protein production rate is limited by the available mRNA. In an alternative model in which the protein production rate is limited by the number of ribosomes and in which the number of ribosomes is increasing exponentially $[78]$, the protein production rate would become proportional to the volume and the stability of the AIT model could be recovered. While such a volume dependence of the production rate via the ribosomes can not be excluded, the RIT model, which is based on negative auto-regulation, is independent of the type of gene expression model used and thus provides a fundamental mechanism to ensure stable cell cycles.

S2. INITIATOR SWITCH MODELS

The initiator protein DnaA binds strongly to the nucleotides ATP and ADP, but only the ATP-bound form of DnaA can form the initiation complex at the origin $[11]$. The switch between ATP-DnaA and ADP-DnaA is tightly regulated via several activators and deactivators in E. coli $[11]$ and the ATP-DnaA fraction increases before initiation.
of replication and decreases rapidly afterwards [35]. Mutations or deletion of one or several activators and deactivators strongly affects the initiation volume per origin and can even lead to non-functional cells [12] [43] [45] [59]. Based on this experimental evidence, we present and analyse two models in which replication initiation is regulated via a switch of the active form of DnaA. First, we give an overview of the experimental data known about the ATP/ADP-switch of DnaA so far (section S2 A). Then, we present the LD model, a minimal model consisting only of the activating acidic-phospholipids in the cell membrane and the deactivator datA located on the chromosome (section S2 B). We argue that these are the main activator and deactivator at low growth rates. At high growth rates, several additional mechanisms are known to play an important role in regulating replication initiation in E. coli. We include all so far known activators and deactivators in the LDDR model and show that we obtain stable cell cycles with high amplitude oscillations in the ATP-DnaA fraction (section S2 C). We show that the characteristic adder correlations can be obtained in the LD and LDDR model by including noise in the switch components (section S2 D). Finally, we include the titration sites into the LD model and show that the titration sites help to lower the active, free DnaA concentration transiently (section S2 E). We argue that the titration sites act as an additional mechanism to prevent re-initiation. All parameters used in the LD and LDDR model in the main part of the paper and in the SI can be found in Table S2.

A. Experimental findings and parameters of the switch models

Here we give an overview of the experimental findings on the regulation of replication initiation in E. coli and discuss realistic parameter ranges of the parameters of the switch models. As the protein DnaA binds very strongly to both ATP and ADP with a dissociation constant of $K_D = 10 – 100$ nM [11] [79], we assume that DnaA is always bound to either ATP or ADP. In the following we refer to the total DnaA concentration as $[D]_T$, to the ATP-DnaA as $[D]_{ATP}$ and to the ADP-DnaA as $[D]_{ADP}$. The total DnaA concentration $[D]_T = [D]_{ATP} + [D]_{ADP}$ was found to be relatively constant at all growth rates in different E. coli strains [24]. Hansen et al. reported a typical number of 330 molecules in an E. coli cell with the doubling rate $1/\tau_d = 0.58$ h$^{-1}$ [34]. Combining this number with the estimated volume at this doubling rate using the data from Si et al. [4] (for the same E. coli strain K-12) of $V(\tau_d^{-1} = 0.58$ h$^{-1}) \approx 0.7$ μm$^3$, we obtain an estimated concentration of DnaA of $[D]_T \approx 471$ μm$^{-3}$. We use throughout this work a total DnaA concentration of $[D]_T = 400$ μm$^{-3}$ (See Table S2). As discussed in the previous section, the protein DnaA can be bound to the DnaA boxes on the DNA and at the origin or be diffusing in the cytoplasm. In a first step, we neglect the effect of the titration sites on the chromosome and assume that all DnaA proteins are present in the cytosol. In section S2 E we relax this constraint and investigate the effect of a negatively auto-regulated DnaA protein that can also bind to titration sites.

In E. coli, replication is initiated once per cell cycle at the origin region by the binding of ATP-DnaA to two high-affinity DnaA boxes (R1 and R4) and several low-affinity DnaA boxes together with two other proteins, the DnaA-initiator-associating protein DiaA and the integration host factor (IHF) [11]. While ADP-DnaA can bind to the DnaA boxes on the origin, it does not form the cooperative complex required for the initiation of replication. The fraction of ATP-DnaA is maintained at a low level during most of the cell cycle and increases to approximately 80% at the moment of replication initiation [35]. An interesting and strongly debated question is whether replication is initiated at a critical amount, concentration or fraction of ATP-DnaA in the cell [27] [39] [61]. In our LD and LDDR model, replication is initiated when the ATP-DnaA concentration in the cell attains a critical concentration $[D]_{ATP}^\ast$. We exploit that the total concentration of DnaA is maintained approximately constant and take $[D]_T = \text{constant}$ in our model such that a critical initiation concentration $[D]_{ATP}^\ast$ corresponds to a critical fraction $f^\ast = [D]_{ATP}^\ast/[D]_T$. Later, we relax this constraint and investigate the effect of fluctuations in the total concentration of DnaA (section S2 D 2). Here we analyse the implications of the difference between initiating replication at a critical fraction versus a critical concentration of active DnaA. In particular, we show that not only the initiator accumulation model but also the switch model can give rise to a dependence of the initiation volume on the total DnaA concentration.

So far, several activators and deactivators of DnaA have been identified and characterized in great detail. Here, we briefly summarize these experimental results, starting with the activators. Regulatory Inactivation of DnaA (RIDA) was the first deactivation mechanism of DnaA that could be identified [55]: The DNA polymerase clamp on newly synthesized DNA forms a complex with ADP and the Hda protein. The resultant ADP-Hda-clamp-DNA complex interacts with ATP-DnaA molecules catalytically and stimulates ATP hydrolysis yielding ADP-DnaA. This system is predominant in the inactivation of DnaA after replication initiation as it strongly represses over-initiation of replication [11]. Importantly, at low growth rates ($\tau_d > T_C$) the replication forks are not overlapping and RIDA is inactive at the moment of replication initiation. RIDA can hydrolyze at least 0.9 molecules of ATP-DnaA per DNA-clamp-Hda complex per minute in vitro [43] [80]. Single-cell experiments have shown that the number of DNA-bound sliding clamps increases during the cell cycle, peaking at more than 25 per replication fork [81]. We therefore use a deactivation rate of $\beta_{\text{RIDA}} = 25$ min$^{-1}$ in the LDDR model (See Table S2). This RIDA deactivation rate is
only non-zero during active replication for \( T_C \) after initiation and is taken to be constant during this time period. Besides RIDA, a chromosomal site named \( datA \) can hydrolyze ATP-DnaA via a process called \( datA \)-dependent DnaA-ATP Hydrolysis (DDAH) \cite{43}. DDAH is temporally regulated over the course of the cell cycle via the protein IHF. The binding of IHF to \( datA \) increases within about 5-10 minutes, peaks at about 15 minutes, and decreases again about 20-30 minutes after initiation of replication \cite{28,43}. In the LD model, we neglect this temporal variation in the deactivation rate and take it to be constant for simplicity. In the LDDR model, we have two activity states of DDAH, a high deactivation rate \( \beta_{datA}^+ \) from the moment of replication initiation onward (\( \tau_{datA}^- = 0 \) h) until 0.2 h after replication initiation (\( \tau_{datA}^+ = 0.2 \) h) and a low deactivation rate \( \beta_{datA}^- \) during the rest of the cell cycle (See Table S2 and Fig. 4A/B of the main text). In vitro, the hydrolysis rate of ATP-DnaA can be at least 1.6 molecules per minute per \( datA \), and in vivo the deactivation strength of DDAH is about 20−30% of that of RIDA \cite{43}. Therefore, we use a deactivation rate of \( \beta_{datA}^- = 10 \) min\(^{-1} \) in the LD and \( \beta_{datA}^+ = 10 \) min\(^{-1} \) in the LDDR model. From the experimental findings on the temporal variation in the IHF binding to \( datA \) \cite{53}, we estimate that the activity of DDAH goes down by a factor of two or three in the low activity state and we use a low deactivation rate of \( \beta_{datA}^- = 5 \) min\(^{-1} \) (See Table S2).

Concerning activation, at least three mechanisms for the production of ATP-DnaA have been characterized: de novo DnaA synthesis; nucleotide dissociation from ADP-DnaA by acidic phospholipids in the cell membrane; and a mechanism involving specific chromosomal DNA sequences termed DARS sites \cite{11}. Acidic lipids such as cardiolipin (CL) and phosphatidylethanolamine (PE), comprising nearly 80% of the phospholipids, is however inert. CL and PG can convert ADP-DnaA to ATP-DnaA and phosphotidylglycerol (PG) can enhance the release of ADP and ATP from DnaA \cite{41}. Phosphatidylethanolamine (PE), comprising nearly 80% of the phospholipids, is however inert. CL and PG can convert ADP-DnaA to ATP-DnaA in vitro \cite{11,41,49}. Depletion of cellular acidic lipids in vivo is accompanied by inhibited initiation. This shows that acidic phospholipids are essential in regulating the initiation of replication in \( E. coli \) \cite{53}. The activation rate of the different types of acidic phospholipids has so far not been characterized experimentally. We combine the experimentally characterized deactivation rates of \( datA \) and RIDA with the activation rates of DARS1/2 and the experimentally observed initiation volume per origin \( v^+ \) to infer reasonable activation rates of the lipids of \( \alpha_1[l] = 46 \) min\(^{-1} \) \( \mu \)m\(^{-3} \) in the LD model and \( \alpha_1[l] = 12.5 \) min\(^{-1} \) \( \mu \)m\(^{-3} \) in the LDDR model. Experiments have found two activation sites located on the chromosome of \( E. coli \): DARS1 and DARS2. ADP-DnaA can form oligomers at DARS1 and DARS2, resulting in the dissociation of ADP and the release of nucleotide-free apo-DnaA, which then binds ATP. DARS2 requires the binding of the proteins Fis and IHF. The binding of IHF to DARS2 is cell-cycle regulated: It increases after 10 minutes, peaks after 20 minutes and decreases again 30-40 minutes after initiation of replication \cite{12,38}. We model this observation via step functions that switch from a low to a high activity state at \( \tau_{d2}^- = 0.2 \) h and back to a low activity state at \( \tau_{d2}^+ = 2/3 \) h = \( T_C \) (See Fig. 4A/B of the main text). As we could not find an experimental value for the activation rate of DARS2, but deleting DARS2 had a similarly strong effect as deleting RIDA \cite{12}, we used a high activation rate of \( \alpha_{d2}^- = 33 \) min\(^{-1} \) and an arbitrarily low activation rate of \( \alpha_{d2}^+ = 0.83 \) min\(^{-1} \) in the LDDR model (See Table S2). Concerning the binding of Fis to DARS2, there is no experimental evidence that it is cell-cycle regulated. We therefore do not model Fis explicitly and assume its effect is contained in the values of \( \alpha_{d2}^+ \) and \( \alpha_{d2}^- \), respectively. Experiments do indicate that Fis is only abundant in cells at high growth rates \cite{38,55}, but precisely how the binding of Fis depends on the growth rate of the cell remains to be determined. Since \( \alpha_{d2}^- \) contributes to the initiation volume only in the high-growth rate regime of overlapping replication forks, while \( \alpha_{d2}^+ \) only (weakly) contributes to the initiation volume at low growth rates, see also Eqs. S38 and S39 below, we assume, for simplicity, that the values of \( \alpha_{d1}^+ \) and \( \alpha_{d1}^- \) are independent of the growth rate. The site DARS1 was found to be neither cell-cycle regulated nor growth rate dependent and is approximately ten times weaker than DARS2 in vitro \cite{11,38}. We use a constant activation rate of DARS1 of \( \alpha_{d1} = 1.67 \) min\(^{-1} \) in the LDDR model. As the dissociation constant of the DnaA boxes on the DNA is in the range of \( K_D^0 = 1-50 \) nM and \( datA \), DARS1 and DARS2 are chromosomal binding sites for DnaA, we use a dissociation constant of \( K_D^{e_{DARS}} = K_D^{e_{DARS1}} = K_D^{e_{DARS2}} = K_D = 50 \) \( \mu \)m\(^{-3} \). Less is known about the dissociation constant of RIDA and the acidic phospholipids and in our model we simply use the same dissociation constant of \( K_D^{RIDA} = K_D = K_D = 50 \) \( \mu \)m\(^{-3} \).

### B. The LD model

In order to disentangle the effect of the different activators and deactivators, we first focus on the low growth rate regime in the LD model. As we argued in the main text, the acidic phospholipids together with \( datA \) should be the main players at low growth rates. In this section, we discuss how the LD model gives rise to a constant initiation volume at different growth rates (section S2B1). Then we investigate the effect of protein synthesis in this model (section S2B2). We show that the results presented in the main text also hold for the ultra-sensitivity regime (section S2B3). Details on how we simulate the LD model and propagate equation 4 of the main text are given in section S2B4. All parameters used in the LD model in the main text and in the SI can be found in Table S2.
### TABLE S2: Parameters of the LD/LDDR model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Value (LD)</th>
<th>Value (LDDR)</th>
<th>Motivation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\alpha_1$ [l] $\mu m^{-3}$ h$^{-1}$</td>
<td>activation rate lipids</td>
<td>2755</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>combined with $\beta_{datA}, \beta_{datA}^<em>, \alpha_{d1}, \alpha_{d2}$ to match $v^</em>$ from [4]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\beta_{datA}$ [h$^{-1}$]</td>
<td>deactivation rate $datA$</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>[43]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$K_D^{[L]}$ $\mu m^{-3}$</td>
<td>dissociation constant lipids</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>taken to be equal to $K_D^{datA}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$K_D^{[D]}$ $\mu m^{-3}$</td>
<td>dissociation constant $datA$</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>[29]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\tau_{datA}$ [h] after $t_i$</td>
<td>start high deactivation rate $datA$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>[29]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\beta_{datA}$ [h$^{-1}$]</td>
<td>high deactivation rate $datA$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>[43]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\beta_{datA}$ [h$^{-1}$]</td>
<td>low deactivation rate $datA$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>[43]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$[D]$ $\mu m^{-3}$</td>
<td>total DnaA concentration</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>[33, 34]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$f^*$</td>
<td>critical initiator fraction</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>[35]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\alpha_{d1}$ [h$^{-1}$]</td>
<td>activation rate DARS1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>(\beta_{rida}) to match $v^*$ from [4]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\tau_{d1}$ [h] after $t_i$</td>
<td>replication time DARS1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>[43]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\alpha_{d2}$ [h$^{-1}$]</td>
<td>high activation rate DARS2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1929</td>
<td>combined with $\beta_{rida}$ to match $v^*$ from [4]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\alpha_{d2}$ [h$^{-1}$]</td>
<td>low activation rate DARS2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>set to arbitrary low value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\tau_{d2}$ [h] after $t_i$</td>
<td>replication time DARS2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>[38]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\beta_{rida}$ [h$^{-1}$]</td>
<td>deactivation rate RIDA</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>(\beta_{datA}, \beta_{datA}^<em>, \alpha_{d1}, \alpha_{d2}) to match $v^</em>$ from [4]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\tau_{d2}$ [h] after $t_i$</td>
<td>start high activation rate DARS2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>[38]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\tau_{d2}$ [h] after $t_i$</td>
<td>end high activation rate DARS2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2/3</td>
<td>[38]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\beta_{rida}$ [h$^{-1}$]</td>
<td>deactivation rate RIDA</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2/3</td>
<td>[38]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\tau_{e}$ [h] after $t_i$</td>
<td>refractory period</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>[64–66]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$T_C$ [h]</td>
<td>C-period</td>
<td>2/3</td>
<td>2/3</td>
<td>[5]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$T_D$ [h]</td>
<td>D-period</td>
<td>1/3</td>
<td>1/3</td>
<td>[5]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\alpha$ [h$^{-1}$]</td>
<td>production rate lipids</td>
<td>955</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>set to match CV from [4]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$D_l$</td>
<td>noise strength lipids</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>set to match CV from [4]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\alpha_p$ [h$^{-1}$]</td>
<td>production rate DnaA</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>[43]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$K_P^{[P]}$ $\mu m^{-3}$</td>
<td>dissociation constant DnaA promoter</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>[30, 34]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$n_p$</td>
<td>Hill coefficient DnaA promoter</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>[30]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$D_D$</td>
<td>noise strength DnaA</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>set to match CV from [4]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$D_R$</td>
<td>noise strength RIDA</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>set to match CV from [4]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\lambda$ [h$^{-1}$]</td>
<td>growth rate</td>
<td>0.35-1.73</td>
<td>0.35-1.73</td>
<td>(\beta_{datA}, \beta_{datA}^<em>, \alpha_{d1}, \alpha_{d2}) to match $v^</em>$ from [4]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section S2A provides further motivation for chosen parameter values.

1. **Growth-rate dependence of the initiation volume per origin at high activation and deactivation rates**

As the DnaA protein is not actively degraded and its concentration is approximately constant, the production rate of new DnaA proteins equals the growth rate. If the activation and inactivation rates are much higher than the growth rate and (hence) the production rate of new proteins, then the effect of protein synthesis and dilution on the concentration of active DnaA can be neglected. In this scenario, the change in the concentration of active DnaA is given by an activation term due to the lipids and a deactivation term due to DDAH:

$$\frac{d[D]_{ATP}}{dt} = \alpha_1 [l] \frac{[D]_{ADP}}{K_D^{[L]} + [D]_{ADP}} - \beta_{datA} [n_ori] \frac{[D]_{ATP}}{K_D^{datA} + [D]_{ATP}} \quad \text{(S31)}$$

with the activation and deactivation rates $\alpha_1$ and $\beta_{datA}$ and the Michaelis-Menten constants $K_D^{[L]}$ and $K_D^{datA}$. As the deactivation site $datA$ is located close to the origin, we have used here that their concentrations are equal. Dividing...
equation [S31] by the constant total concentration $[D]_T$ and using $[D]_{ADP} = [D]_T - [D]_{ATP}$ we obtain

$$\frac{df}{dt} = \alpha_1 [I] \frac{1 - f}{K_D^1 + 1 - f} - \beta_{datA} [n_{ori}] \frac{f}{K_D^{datA} + f}$$

(S32)

with the re-normalized activation and deactivation rates $\tilde{\alpha}_1 = \alpha_1/[D]_T$ and $\tilde{\beta}_{datA} = \beta_{datA}/[D]_T$ and the Michaelis-Menten constants $K_D^1 = K_D^1/[D]_T$ and $K_D^{datA} = K_D^{datA}/[D]_T$. If the activation and deactivation rates are high compared to the growth rate, the system is well characterized by the steady state ($\frac{df}{dt} = 0$). The theoretical prediction of the initiation volume per origin $v_{th}^* = 1/\tilde{\alpha}_1$ is obtained by setting equation [S32] to zero:

$$v_{th}^* = \frac{\beta_{datA}}{\alpha_1 [I]} \frac{f^*}{K_D^{datA} + f^*} \frac{K_D^1 + 1 - f^*}{1 - f^*}$$

(S33)

with the critical initiator fraction $f^* = [D]_{ATP}/[D]_T$. All parameters on the right side of equation [S33] could in principle vary with the growth rate $\lambda$ of the cell. The initiation volume per origin $v_{th}^*$ is constant at all growth rates if all terms on the right side are constant or if the growth rate dependencies of the parameters cancel each other out. While the deactivation rate of DDAH is known to be temporally regulated over the course of the cell cycle, no explicit growth rate dependence has been observed so far. A growth-rate dependence of the critical initiation fraction has not been reported but could be possible, as two other proteins, Dia and IHF, are involved in the initiation process [11] [82]. A study of the fraction and concentration of ATP-DnaA at the moment of replication initiation as a function of the cell membrane composition is complex and could depend on the growth rate. Our model predicts however that if all terms on the right side of equation [S33] are growth-rate independent, the for replication initiation relevant phospholipid concentration should be approximately constant in order to obtain a constant initiation volume $v^*$. This prediction could be verified experimentally.

2. The effect of protein synthesis

In this section we investigate the role of protein synthesis in the LD model and analyse its effect on the initiation volume per origin $v^*$. As DnaA binds strongly to both ATP and ADP and the concentration of ATP is approximately ten times higher than the concentration of APD in E. coli [31], we assume that every newly produced protein binds to ATP right after synthesis. Thus, the change in the total number of DnaA proteins due to protein synthesis equals the change in the ATP-DnaA concentration due protein to synthesis:

$$\frac{dN_D^T}{dt} = \alpha \cdot g = \frac{dN_{ATP}^{synth}}{dt}$$

(S34)

where $\alpha$ is the production rate of ATP-DnaA and $g$ is the number of DnaA genes per cell. The change in the total concentration of DnaA is given by

$$\frac{d[D]_T}{dt} = \frac{dN_D^T}{dt} \frac{1}{V} + \frac{d}{dt} \left( \frac{1}{V} \right) N_D^T = \alpha \cdot g \frac{1}{V} - \lambda [D]_T = \alpha [g] - \lambda [D]_T = 0$$

(S35)

and is zero as the total DnaA-concentration is maintained constant. Using equation [S34] and [S35] we obtain the following expression for the change in the ATP-concentration due to protein synthesis:

$$\frac{d[D]_{ATP}^{synth}}{dt} = \frac{dN_{ATP}^{synth}}{dt} \frac{1}{V} - \lambda [D]_{ATP} = \alpha [g] - \lambda [D]_{ATP} = \lambda ([D]_T - [D]_{ATP})$$

(S36)

By dividing equation [S36] by the total concentration $[D]_T$ and combining it with equation [S32] we obtain the change in the active fraction in the main text:

$$\frac{df}{dt} = \tilde{\alpha}_1 [I] \frac{1 - f}{K_D^1 + 1 - f} - \tilde{\beta}_{datA} [n_{ori}] \frac{f}{K_D^{datA} + f} + \lambda (1 - f)$$

(S37)

The additional activation term is proportional to the growth rate and decreases linearly with the ATP-DnaA fraction.
The effect of protein synthesis on the initiation volume per origin $v^*$ depends strongly on the relative magnitude of the activation and deactivation rates and the growth rate. To elucidate the effect of protein synthesis, we compare the initiation volume per origin as a function of the growth rate for different (de)activation rates with (Eq. S37) and without protein synthesis (Eq. S32) (Fig. S4A). At high activation and deactivation rates (Fig. S4A, green lines), the effect of protein synthesis is minimal at all growth rates and the initiation volume per origin of both simulations is very well described by the steady-state prediction without protein synthesis (Eq. S33). In the limit of low activation and deactivation rates (Fig. S4A, red lines), the effect of protein synthesis on the change of the ATP-DnaA concentration becomes as expected more pronounced with increasing growth rate. As protein synthesis increases the fraction of ATP-DnaA in the cell, it tends to lower the initiation volume (Fig. S4A, red lines). We note that the biological value of the deactivation rate of $\beta_{\text{datA}} = 10 \text{ min}^{-1}$ is in the order of magnitude where protein synthesis does affect the initiation volume at high growth rates. The amplitude of the oscillations in the active fraction $\Delta f$ is however only weakly affected by protein synthesis and decreases slightly when synthesis is included in the LD model (Fig. S4B).

3. The LD model in the ultra-sensitivity regime

Figure 3 in the main text shows that for biological (de)activation rates the amplitude of the oscillations in the active fraction becomes very small. Here we ask whether this effect could be alleviated by bringing the system deeper into the ultra-sensitivity regime. The ultra-sensitivity can be increased by increasing the difference in the dissociation constants $K_D^1$ and $K_D^\text{datA}$ with respect to the total DnaA concentration $[D]_T$. In the main Figure 3, the dissociation constants of the activator $K_D^1$ and deactivator $K_D^\text{datA}$ are approximately ten times smaller than the total DnaA concentration $[D]_T = 400 \mu m^3$ (see Table S2). The system is thus already in the ultra-sensitive regime. Here we push the system even deeper in the ultra-sensitivity regime by setting the dissociation constants of both activator and deactivator to $K_D^1 = K_D^\text{datA} = 5 \mu m^{-3}$, almost two orders of magnitude smaller than the total concentration. Figure S5 shows the initiation volume and the amplitude of the oscillations in the active fraction $f$ in this (highly) ultra-sensitive regime. While there is almost no difference in the initiation volume per origin $v^*$, the amplitude of the oscillations at high and intermediate (de)activation rates is slightly higher in this deep ultra-sensitive regime. Importantly, however at low rates ($\beta_{\text{datA}} = 10 \text{ min}^{-1}$) the amplitude of the oscillations drops for high growth rates like in the less ultra-sensitive regime presented in the main section. Therefore, regardless of the degree of ultra-sensitivity, the experimentally reported activation and deactivation rates are too low to explain the experimentally observed high amplitude oscillations in the active initiator fraction [43]. Our modelling predicts that at high growth rates, RIDA and DARS2 become essential to sustain large amplitude oscillations, as we describe in more detail in section S2C on the LDDR model.
FIG. S5: The LD model in the ultra-sensitive regime (A) The initiation volume per origin \( v^* \) as a function of the growth rate at different magnitudes of the activation and deactivation rates \( (\alpha_l = 4.6 \times \beta_{\text{data}}) \) remains approximately constant. The solid black line is the steady-state prediction of equation S33. (B) The amplitude \( \Delta f \) of the oscillations in the active fraction \( f \) as a function of the growth rate for same parameters as in (A). The amplitude of the oscillations \( \Delta f \) becomes small for biologically realistic values of the (de)activation rates, even deep in the ultra-sensitive regime. Here, the dissociation constants \( K_{D_l} = K_{D_{\text{data}}} = 5 \, \mu\text{m}^{-3} \) for lipid-mediated activation of DnaA and \( \text{data} \) mediated deactivation, respectively (see Eq. S37), is 10 times lower than that used for Figure 3 of the main text.

4. Simulation details

To simulate the LD model, we propagate the fraction of active, ATP-bound DnaA according to equation S37, which is identical to equation 4 of the main text. The volume grows exponentially according to \( dV/dt = \lambda V \) and the origin density is given by \( [n_{\text{ori}}] = n_{\text{ori}}/V \). When the fraction \( f \) equals the critical fraction \( f^* \), replication is initiated, and the number of origins \( n_{\text{ori}} \) doubles. The cell then divides a constant time \( \tau_{\text{cc}} \) later. During cell division, the volume and the number of origins are halved.

C. The LDDR model

In the LD model, we argued that at low growth rates the initiation volume per origin is mainly set by the activating lipids and the deactivating site \( \text{data} \). At high growth rates \( (\lambda > \ln(2)/T_C) \), the replication forks are overlapping and RIDA is still active at the moment of replication initiation. Simultaneously, \( DARS2 \) is activated at high growth rates via the protein Fis [38, 56]. Here, we present the LDDR model where we include all activators and deactivators with their characteristic temporal regulation (see Figure 4 A and B in the main text). The parameters of the LDDR model are described in section S2 A above and their values are listed in Table S2. We show that the LDDR model gives rise to stable cell cycles with large amplitude oscillations in the active fraction at all growth rates (section S2 C 1). In order to obtain a constant initiation volume at all growth rates, we however need to make a specific parameter choice (section S2 C 2). The finding that RIDA and \( DARS2 \) are essential for obtaining high amplitude oscillations at high growth rates raises the question whether a system consisting only of \( DARS2 \) and RIDA is not sufficient. We show however, that a model where all activators and deactivators are located on the chromosome (like \( DARS2\)-RIDA or \( \text{data}-DARS1 \)) does not give rise to stable cell cycles (section S2 C 3). In section S2 C 4 we present the simulation details of this model; for completeness, and to facilitate the discussion in the SI, we also present in this section equation 5 of the main text.

1. Large amplitude oscillations in the active fraction over the course of the cell cycle

In the LDDR model, several activators and deactivators are temporally regulated over the course of the cell cycle. Right after replication is initiated, RIDA becomes active and deactivates DnaA with a high deactivation rate. Simultaneously, the deactivation rate of the site \( \text{data} \) rises shortly after initiation due to a doubling of the total number of \( \text{data} \) site per cell and is temporally raised further due to the binding of IHF [43]. These two processes lead to a strong reduction of the active fraction right after initiation even at high growth rates (Fig. S6 B). After a period \( \tau_{\text{d2}} \), the activation rate of the site \( DARS2 \) becomes stronger via binding of IHF and the active fraction begins to rise. While the LD model gives rise to very small amplitudes in the oscillation of the active fraction at high growth rates (Fig.
FIG. S6: The LDDR model ensures high amplitude oscillations in the active fraction even at high growth rates and realistic (de)activation rates. The volume of the cell \( V(t) \), the number of origins \( n_{ori}(t) \) and the fraction of ATP-DnaA \( f(t) \) as a function of time (in units of the doubling time \( \tau_d \)) at a relatively high doubling time of \( \tau_d = 0.43 \text{ h} = 26 \text{ min} \) (\( \lambda = 1.59 \text{ h}^{-1} \)). The dashed red line is the critical initiator fraction \( f^* \) at which replication is initiated. Replication is initiated at a constant volume per origin \( v^* \) over time (green dashed line). (A) In the LD model, the activating lipids and the deactivating site \( datA \) generate only very small oscillations at high growth rates and realistic activation and deactivation rates. (B) Due to the additional temporal modulation of the activation and deactivation rates of \( datA \), RIDA and \( DARS2 \), the amplitude of the oscillations is high even at high growth rates.

2. Constant initiation volume per origin in the LDDR model

The LDDR model yields two different predictions for the initiation volume per origin \( v^* \) in the quasi-equilibrium regime where (de)activation is faster than growth, depending on whether RIDA and \( DARS2 \) are active at the moment of initiation or not. From Eq 5 of the main text (Eq. S42 below), it follows that in the low growth-rate regime (\( \lambda < \ln 2/T_C \)) the replications forks are non-overlapping and the initiation volume \( v^*_{no} \) is given by

\[
v^*_{no} = \frac{\beta_{datA}}{\alpha_l [l]} \frac{f^*}{K_{\beta} + f^*} \frac{\tilde{K}_{\alpha} + 1 - f^*}{1 - f^*} - \frac{\alpha_{d1} + \alpha_{d2}}{\alpha_l [l]}
\]

(S38)

In the high growth regime (\( \lambda > \ln 2/T_C \)), the initiation volume per origin is given by

\[
v^*_{o} = \frac{\beta_{datA} + \beta_{rida}}{\alpha_l [l]} \frac{f^*}{K_{\beta} + f^*} \frac{\tilde{K}_{\alpha} + 1 - f^*}{1 - f^*} - \frac{\alpha_{d1} + \alpha_{d2}^+}{\alpha_l [l]}
\]

(S39)

To obtain the same constant initiation volume at all growth rates, the rate of RIDA and the high activity rate of \( DARS2 \) must be chosen such that they exactly cancel out. By setting \( v^*_{o} = v^*_{no} \) we obtain the following constraint on the high activity rate of \( DARS2 \) as a function of the rate of RIDA:

\[
\alpha_{d2}^+ = \beta_{rida} \frac{f^*}{K_{\beta} + f^*} \frac{\tilde{K}_{\alpha} + 1 - f^*}{1 - f^*} + \alpha_{d2}^-
\]

(S40)

In Figure 4 C in the main text, we chose the high activity rate of \( DARS2 \) \( \alpha_{d2}^+ \) such that equation [S40] is fulfilled. Equation [S40] yields a constant initiation volume per origin when the activation and deactivation rates are much higher than the growth rate of the cell. Figure 4 C shows that equation [S40] indeed gives rise to an approximately constant initiation volume at all growth rates. The minor deviations of the initiation volume from the prediction of equation [S40] stem from the fact that the (de)activation rates are not very much higher than the growth rate: The temporal regulation of \( datA \), \( DARS2 \) and RIDA together with the protein synthesis (the term \( \lambda (1-f) \) in equation 5...
in the main part) then give rise to the mild variation of the initiation volume with the growth rate (see Figure 4 C). The most important result is however that the experimentally observed growth-rate independence of the initiation volume is not a robust property of our model, but relies on a careful choice of the rates. Experiments support, however, this prediction: Specifically, our model agrees with the experimental finding that deleting datA or disabling RIDA or DARS2 not only affects the initiation volume, but, importantly, also makes it dependent on the growth rate [12, 45–47, 56, 61]; moreover, while the effect of deleting datA is most pronounced at lower growth rates [45, 61], disabling RIDA or DARS2 is more severe at higher growth rates [12, 46, 47, 66].

3. A switch model consisting only of activators and deactivators located on the chromosome does not ensure stable cell cycles

The finding that including RIDA and DARS2 in the model is necessary to ensure the experimentally observed large amplitude oscillations at high growth rates raises the question whether it is also sufficient, meaning the LD model, and more in particular lipid synthesis, is not essential. In this section, we show that a combination of an activator and a deactivator that are both located on different positions on the chromosome (like for example a combination of datA-DARS1 or RIDA-DARS2) does not give rise to stable cell cycles. In such a scenario, both the concentration of the activator and the deactivator are proportional to the origin density. For a switch consisting only of datA and DARS1, we obtain the following expression for the change in the active fraction of DnaA:

\[
\frac{df}{dt} = \tilde{\alpha}_{d1} [n_{ori}(t - \tau_{d1})] \frac{1 - f}{K_D + 1 - f} - \tilde{\beta}_{datA} [n_{ori}] \frac{f}{K_D + f}
\]  
(S41)

where the site DARS1 is replicated a time \(\tau_{d1}\) after the origin. The concentration of DARS1 is therefore proportional to the origin density at an earlier time \(t - \tau_{d1}\). A model where both the activator and deactivator are proportional to the (time shifted) origin density does not give rise to stable cell cycles (Fig. S7 B). We can understand this observation by plotting the activation and deactivation rates as a function of the active fraction at different moments of the cell cycle (Fig. S7 A). At quasi-steady-state, the active fraction is constant (setting equation S41 to zero) and the system will therefore settle to a constant fraction \(f\) independent of the volume of the cell. If this fraction \(f\) lies above the critical initiation fraction \(f^*\), replication can be initiated (Fig. S7 A, red dot). Because of its vicinity to the origin, the site datA is replicated right after initiation and reduces the active fraction below the initiation threshold (Fig. S7 A and B, step 1). A constant time \(\tau_{d1}\) after initiation of replication, the site DARS1 is replicated as well (Fig. S7 A and B, step 2). The active DnaA fraction rises again rapidly and when it attains the critical initiation fraction \(f^*\), a new round of replication is initiated. The active DnaA fraction thus oscillates between a high and a low ATP-DnaA state at a period given by the time difference in replicating the sites on the chromosome (datA and DARS1), \(\tau_{d1}\). This gives rise to a constant initiation period \(\tau_{rep} = \tau_{d1}\). A system with a constant replication initiation period \(\tau_{rep}\), which is thus not coupled to the growth or the volume of the cell, cannot give rise to stable cell cycles; even the smallest deviation of \(\tau_{rep}\) from \(\tau_d\) will inevitably grow and make the system unstable (Fig. S7 B, green dots in upper panel). Similarly to the AIT model, the cell volume does therefore not remain stable after a few generations. In summary, a system in which all activators and deactivators are located on the chromosome does not ensure stable cell cycles. This is because the volume dependence of the activation and deactivation rates is then the same, which means that the system cannot sense the origin density. Indeed, to sense the origin density, it is vital that the volume dependence of the activation and deactivation rates is different. The rate of DnaA activation by the lipids does not depend on the origin density in contrast to the other (de)activation rates. The lipids are therefore a vital ingredient of the switch model and cannot be neglected.

4. Simulation details of the LDDR model

Equation 5 of the main text describes the dynamics of the active fraction of ATP-bound DnaA in the LDDR model:

\[
\frac{df}{dt} = (\tilde{\alpha}_1 [l] + \tilde{\alpha}_{d1} [n_{ori}(t - \tau_{d1})] + \tilde{\alpha}_{d2}(t) [n_{ori}(t - \tau_{d2})]) \frac{1 - f}{K_D + 1 - f} - (\tilde{\beta}_{datA}(t) + \tilde{\beta}_{rida}(t)) [n_{ori}] \frac{f}{K_D + f} + \lambda (1 - f)
\]  
(S42)

with the re-normalized activation and deactivation rates \(\tilde{\alpha}_1 = \alpha_1/[D]_T\), \(\tilde{\alpha}_{d1} = \alpha_{d1}/[D]_T\), \(\tilde{\alpha}_{d2} = \alpha_{d2}/[D]_T\), \(\tilde{\beta}_{datA} = \beta_{datA}/[D]_T\) and \(\tilde{\beta}_{rida} = \beta_{rida}/[D]_T\) and the Michaelis-Menten constant \(K_D = K_D/[D]_T\). The parameters are described in section S2. A above and its values are listed in Table S2. Fig. 4A/B of the main text illustrates the time-dependence of the rates. The LDDR model is simulated analogously to the LD model as described in section S2. B.4 but with \(f\) propagated according to equation S42 above.
D. The switch model can give rise to both adder and sizer correlations in the initiation volume

Recent single-cell experiments have shown that the initiation volume per origin exhibits adder correlations \[17, 18\]. In the main text, we have shown that fluctuations in the lipid concentration can give rise to such adder correlations in the initiation volume. In this section, we further analyse the effect of fluctuations in the different components of the switch on the initiation volume. Specifically, we show that fluctuations in the total DnaA concentration give rise to sizer correlations if the initiator DnaA is negatively auto-regulated. The important difference between these two scenarios is the relaxation time of the fluctuations: In the case of the lipids, fluctuations decay with the doubling time of the cell, while negative auto-regulation in the total DnaA concentration reduces fluctuations on much faster time scales. As we show below, when the correlation time of the fluctuations in the switch components is shorter than the cell-doubling time, consecutive cell cycles are almost not correlated with each other and we obtain sizer correlations.

To elucidate how fluctuations in the switch components propagate to fluctuations in the initiation volume, it is illuminating to analyse the simpler LD model—indeed, this is the motivation for using the LD rather than the LDDR model for Fig. 5 of the main text. The reason why the LD model is more instructive is that in this model the mapping \( f(V) \) between the instantaneous fraction \( f(t) \) of active DnaA and the current volume \( V(t) \) can be obtained and understood straightforwardly. In the regime where (de)activation is faster than growth this mapping \( f(V) \) is obtained by solving equation S32 in steady state. As we will show, this mapping \( f(V) \) depends in an intuitive manner on the concentrations and activities of the switch components (Fig. S8), such that it becomes clear how fluctuations in these components propagate to fluctuations in the initiation volume. In contrast, in the LDDR model the mapping between the instantaneous fraction \( f(t) \) and the instantaneous volume \( V(t) \) is non-trivial because the rates of RIDA and DARS2 are temporally regulated over the course of the cell cycle. Importantly, however, while the LDDR model is less illuminating, the principle remains: fluctuations in the switch components will propagate to fluctuations in the threshold for replication initiation. Indeed, below, in section S2D.4 we will show that the full LDDR model exhibits the same adder and sizer correlations as the simpler LD model in response to lipid and DnaA fluctuations, respectively.

Below we first expand on the effect of fluctuations in the lipid concentration as discussed in the main text (section

---

**FIG. S7:** A switch model where all activators and deactivators are located on the chromosome does not give rise to stable cell cycles (A) The activation (red curves) and deactivation rates (blue curve) as a function of the active fraction of the initiator protein \( f \) at different moments of the cell cycle. The steady-state active fractions are given by the intersection of the activation and deactivation rates (colorful dots). As both the activation and the deactivation rate depend on the origin density, the active fraction becomes volume independent. When the active fraction \( f \) equals or is larger than the critical initiation fraction \( f^* \) (vertical dashed red line), replication is initiated. When replication is initiated (step 1), the number of origin doubles. Due to the vicinity of \( datA \) to the origin, the deactivation rate doubles right after replication is initiated and the active fraction is reduced to a constant value below the activation threshold. A fixed time \( \tau_{d1} = 0.35 \text{ h} = 21 \text{ min after replication was initiated, the site DARS1 is doubled which causes again an increase of the active fraction beyond the critical active fraction } f^* \text{ and a new round of replication is initiated again. (B) The volume of the cell } V(t) \text{, the number of origins } n_{ori}(t) \text{ and the fraction of ATP-DnaA } f(t) \text{ as a function of time (in units of the doubling time } \tau_d \text{) at a doubling time of } \tau_d = 0.5 \text{ h} = 30 \text{ min. The dashed red line is the critical initiator fraction } f^* \text{ at which replication is initiated. Replication is initiated at a constant time interval } \tau_{cep} = \tau_{d1} \text{ which, in this example, is smaller than the doubling time of the cell. As a consequence, the volume per origin } v^* \text{ decreases over time and so does the birth volume of the cell.}
Next, we discuss how fluctuations in the total DnaA concentration propagate to fluctuations in the initiation volume. This transmission depends on whether replication initiation is triggered by a critical fraction or concentration of active DnaA. We thus first address the latter question (section S2D.2) before we describe the effect of fluctuations in the total DnaA concentration on correlations in the initiation volume (section S2D.3). Importantly, in section S2D.4 we show that also in the full LDDR model fluctuations in the switch components can give rise to sizer and adder correlations. Finally, in section S2D.5 we demonstrate that not only lipid fluctuations, but also fluctuations in proteins that modulate the activities of datA, DARS1/2 and RIDA can generate adder correlations, supporting the idea that the experimentally observed adder correlations \cite{17, 18} stem from fluctuations in the components of the DnaA switch.

1. Lipid fluctuations give rise to adder correlations in the LD model

In this section, we discuss in more detail the scenario discussed in the main text of a fluctuating acidic phospholipid concentration \([l]\). As we keep, because of negative DnaA auto-regulation, the total initiator concentration \([D]_T\) constant, initiating replication at a constant ATP-DnaA fraction or concentration is equivalent. In the regime where (de)activation is fast compared to the growth rate, the mapping between the instantaneous fraction \(f(t)\) of active DnaA and the current volume \(V(t)\) is obtained by solving equation S32 in steady state. This mapping \(f(V)\) is shown in panels A and B of Fig. S8 for different degrees of ultra-sensitivity, respectively. It shows that the mapping between the active fraction and the volume depends on the lipid concentration. Since replication is initiated when the active fraction \(f\) reaches the critical fraction \(f^*\) for replication initiation, marked by the horizontal dashed line, fluctuations in the lipid concentration lead to fluctuations in the initiation volume \(v^*\). Equation S33 shows how the initiation volume \(v^*\) depends on the lipid concentration \([l]\); \(v^*\) scales inversely proportional with \([l]\), as illustrated in panel C. We note that this scaling does not depend on the degree of ultra-sensitivity of the switch.

Fig. 5A of the main text shows that fluctuations in the lipid concentration lead to adder correlations in the initiation volume \(v^*\). Here, the lipid concentration is modelled via the following Langevin equation:

\[
\frac{dl}{dt} = \alpha - \lambda \langle l \rangle + \xi(t). \tag{S43}
\]

The noise is modelled as Gaussian white noise, \(\langle \xi(t)\xi(t') \rangle = 2D_\xi \delta(t-t')\), with the noise strength \(D_\xi\) chosen to match the measured variance in the initiation volume of CV = 0.1 \cite{4} (see Table S2). The dynamics of the active fraction \(f\) is given by equation 4 of the main text (Eq. S37 above) and the volume and number of origins are simulated as described in section S2B.4. To prevent premature re-initiation due to stochastic fluctuations in \(f\) immediately after replication initiation, we implement a refractory period of \(\tau_0 = 10\) minutes after replication initiation during which replication cannot be re-initiated, mimicking the effect of SeqA \cite{64-66}.

Panel A of Fig. 5 of the main text, reproduced herein Fig. S9A to facilitate the comparison with other models and sources of fluctuations, shows that lipid fluctuations give rise to adder correlations in the added initiation volume between successive initiation events. Figure S9B shows that the initiation volume is positively correlated with the birth volume, as observed in recent experiments \cite{13}.

Panels B-D of Fig. 5 of the main text elucidate how fluctuations in the lipid concentration generate adder correlations in the initiation volume. Panel B shows that lipid concentration fluctuations \(\xi(t)\) regresses to the mean on a timescale given by the cell-doubling time \(\tau_a = \ln(2)/\lambda\). Here, the thin grey lines are time traces from the simulations, while the solid line is the analytical prediction obtained by solving equation S33 subject to an initial concentration fluctuation \(\xi(0)\):

\[
\langle \delta l \rangle_{\xi(0)} \equiv \langle l(t) \rangle_{\xi(0)} - \langle l \rangle \equiv \delta l_0 e^{-\lambda t}, \tag{S44}
\]

\[
\langle \delta l \rangle_{\xi(0)} = \delta l_0 2^{-t/\tau_a}. \tag{S45}
\]

where \(\langle l(t) \rangle_{\xi(0)}\) is the average lipid concentration at time \(t\) given an initial concentration \(\xi(0)\) at time zero and \(\langle l \rangle\) is the average lipid concentration; \(\langle \delta l \rangle_{\xi(0)}\) is thus the average deviation of the lipid concentration from its mean at time \(t\), given an initial concentration fluctuation \(\xi(0)\). Panel C of Fig. 5 shows the mapping \(\nu^*([l])\) between the initiation volume \(v^*\) and the lipid concentration \([l]\), obtained by solving equation S32 in steady state; this panel corresponds to panel C of Fig. S8. Panel D of Fig. 5 of the main text demonstrates how the decay of lipid fluctuations shown in panel B (of Fig. 5) with the mapping \(\nu^*([l])\) shown in panel C (of Fig. 5) causes the initiation volume to regress to
the mean on the timescale of the doubling time \( \tau_d \):

\[
\langle \delta v_n^* | v_0^* \rangle \equiv \langle v_n^* | v_0^* \rangle - \langle v^* \rangle,
\]

\[
\delta v_0^* 2^{-n},
\]

where \( \langle v^* \rangle \) is the average initiation volume, \( v_0^* \) is the initial initiation volume arising from a spontaneous fluctuation, and \( \langle v_n^* | v_0^* \rangle \) is the average initiation volume \( n \) cell cycles later given that initial initiation volume \( v_0^* \). Clearly, fluctuations in the initiation volume relax to the mean via a geometric series, akin to that observed for the volume at birth [14]. Combining \( \langle \delta v_n^* | v_0^* \rangle = \delta v_0^* 2^{-n} \) with the definition of the added initiation volume \( \Delta v^* = 2v_{n+1}^* - v_n^* \) (see Fig. 5 of main text) shows that the average added initiation volume \( \langle \Delta v^* \rangle \),

\[
\langle \Delta v^* \rangle = 2 \left( \langle v^* \rangle + \langle \delta v_{n+1}^* | v_0^* \rangle \right) - \left( \langle v^* \rangle + \langle \delta v_n^* | v_0^* \rangle \right)
\]

\[
= 2 \left( \langle v^* \rangle + \delta v_0^* 2^{-(n+1)} \right) - \left( \langle v^* \rangle + \delta v_0^* 2^{-n} \right),
\]

\[
= \langle v^* \rangle,
\]
equals the average initiation volume \( \langle v^* \rangle \), independent of the initial initiation volume \( v_0^* = \langle v^* \rangle + \delta v_0^* \). Hence, the initiation volume added between successive cell cycles is independent of the initiation volume, and equal to the average initiation volume.

2. **Effect of varying total initiator concentration on the initiation volume in the LD model**

So far, we have assumed that the total initiator concentration is maintained strictly constant via negative auto-regulation. There was thus no difference in initiating replication at a critical active concentration \([D]_{\text{ATP}}^*\) or a critical fraction \( f^* \). When the total concentration of DnaA is however fluctuating, the concentration of active proteins \([D]_{\text{ATP}}\) and the fraction of active proteins \( f = [D]_{\text{ATP}}/[D]_T \) are not directly proportional anymore. This poses a new question: Is replication initiated at a critical ATP-DnaA concentration or at a critical fraction? Both scenarios could be possible and have been discussed in literature [12, 39]. In the following, we will discuss the effect of fluctuations in the total concentration on the initiation volume in both of these cases.

**Fluctuations in the total concentration can affect the initiation volume if replication is initiated at a critical ATP-DnaA concentration** We first consider the case where replication is initiated at a critical ATP-DnaA concentration \([D]_{\text{ATP}}^*\). In the LD model for very high (de)activation rates (see equation S31), the active DnaA concentration can be plotted as a function of the volume of the cell for different total concentrations (Fig. S8 D and E). If the dissociation constants of the activator and deactivator are much smaller than the total concentration, the switch is in the ultra-sensitive regime and becomes very steep (Fig. S8 D). In this case, the critical initiation concentration is attained at approximately the same volume per origin independent of the total concentration, as shown in Figure S8 F. If the dissociation constants of the activator and deactivator are however in the same order of magnitude as the total concentration, the ATP-DnaA concentration rises more gradually and attains the critical initiation concentration at different volumes for different total DnaA concentrations (Fig. S8 E). Consequently, the initiation volume depends now strongly on the total DnaA concentration (Fig. S8 F). To summarize, if replication is triggered at a critical ATP-DnaA concentration \([D]_{\text{ATP}}^*\) and if the switch is not extremely sharp, we predict a dependence of the initiation volume on the total concentration. We note here that this implies that care should be taken in inferring molecular mechanisms from experiments in which the expression of DnaA is modulated [83]. In particular, like the initiator accumulation model, also the switch model would predict that the initiation volume decreases as the total DnaA concentration increases.

**Initiation of replication at a critical ATP-DnaA fraction** Now, we investigate the scenario where replication is initiated at a critical fraction of ATP-DnaA in the cell. In this case, the fraction as a function of the cell volume in the LD model at high (de)activation rates (see Eq. S32) is independent of the total DnaA concentration (Fig. S8 G and H). This finding does also not depend on the steepness of the switch, which is again high if the dissociation constants of the activator and deactivator are much smaller than the total concentration (Fig. S8 G and H). The critical fraction \( f^* \) is attained at an almost perfectly constant volume per origin (Fig. S8 I) at all dissociation constants. The switch mechanism is thus extremely well protected against noise in the total concentration. This finding is especially interesting in view of a recent paper in which the total and also the ATP-DnaA concentration has been increased two-fold and no change in the initiation volume per origin was observed [61]. Previous works have reported similar findings [35, 64]. While the average ATP-DnaA concentration increased, the fraction of ATP-DnaA
over the total DnaA remained constant [61]. This finding is consistent with the scenario of a critical ATP-DnaA fraction. In contrast, Hill et al. [83] observed that over-expressing DnaA from a plasmid caused cells to replicate earlier, which would be consistent with a smaller initiation volume \( v^* \) if the growth rate \( \lambda \) and the cell cycling time \( \tau_{cc} \) remained unchanged. Moreover, Si et al. [17] found that oscillatory perturbation of the total DnaA concentration affected the initiation volume per origin. These results clearly show that DnaA synthesis plays a non-negligible role in regulating the initiation volume. This may suggest that in contrast to what the experiments of [35, 61, 84] indicate, replication initiation is controlled by the ATP-DnaA concentration after all. We emphasise, however, that our model does leave open the possibility that replication initiation is controlled by the fraction of active DnaA, which would reconcile the seemingly contradicting experimental results of Refs. [17, 35, 61, 84]: At high (de)activation rates of the switch and initiation of replication at a critical fraction, we showed that the initiation volume is independent of the total DnaA concentration. The lower however the activation and deactivation rates of the switch, the more does protein synthesis affect the initiation volume (see Figure 3 C in the main text and Figure S4 A). Therefore, in a regime where the (de)activation rates are on the same order of magnitude as the protein synthesis rate, the active fraction of ATP-DnaA and therefore the initiation volume are affected by protein synthesis. In this regime, temporally higher or lower expression of DnaA should affect the initiation volume even when initiation is triggered at a critical fraction of ATP-DnaA in the cell. Furthermore, and perhaps more importantly because of the effect of protein synthesis on the active fraction (Eq. S37), an externally driven strong oscillation in the expression of DnaA proteins would strongly perturb the natural regression of fluctuations in the active fraction of DnaA, thus breaking the adder correlations in the initiation volume per origin. The above considerations show that it is paramount to experimentally determine whether replication initiation is controlled by the fraction or the concentration of active DnaA.

3. Negatively auto-regulated initiator protein gives rise to sizer correlations in the LD model

In this section, we explicitly model the total concentration \( [D]_T \) and investigate the resulting correlations in the initiation volume. As we have seen in the previous section, the effect of fluctuations in the total concentration is especially high, when replication is initiated at a critical ATP-DnaA concentration and when the system is not too far in the ultra-sensitivity regime. We use a relatively large dissociation constant of \( K_D^{data} = K_D = 50 \mu m^{-3} \) in order to obtain a strong dependence of the initiation volume on the total concentration (Figure S8 C). Since the affinities of the two nucleotide binding forms of DnaA to the promoters differ only by a factor of two [30], we here make the simplifying assumption that both forms of DnaA have equal affinity for the promoter. The change in the total number of DnaA proteins \( N_T \) is given by a negatively auto-regulated production term plus a noise term \( \xi_D(t) \) accounting for noise in gene expression

\[
\frac{dN_T}{dt} = \frac{\alpha_p g}{1 + \left(\frac{[D]_T}{K_D}\right)^{n_p}} + \xi_D(t)
\]  

(S52)

The noise is modelled as Gaussian white noise, \( \langle \xi_D(t)\xi_D(t') \rangle = 2D_D \delta(t - t') \), where the noise strength \( D_D \) is tuned to match the measured variance in the initiation volume (see Table S2). The total DnaA concentration is obtained by dividing the total number of DnaA proteins \( N_T(t) \) by the explicitly evolved volume \( V(t) = V_0 \exp \left( t \lambda c \right) \). The change in the number of ATP-DnaA proteins is computed using

\[
\frac{dN_D^{ATP}}{dt} = \frac{dN_T}{dt} + \alpha_l N_l \frac{[D]_{ADP}}{K_D + [D]_{ADP}} - \beta_{data} n_{ori} \frac{[D]_{ATP}}{K_D^{data} + [D]_{ATP}}
\]

\[
= \frac{\alpha_p g}{1 + \left(\frac{[D]_T}{K_D}\right)^{n_p}} + \xi_D(t) + \alpha_l N_l \frac{[D]_{ADP}}{K_D + [D]_{ADP}} - \beta_{data} n_{ori} \frac{[D]_{ATP}}{K_D^{data} + [D]_{ATP}}
\]  

(S53)

and the active initiator concentration is obtained by dividing the number of ATP-DnaA proteins \( N_D^{ATP}(t) \) by the volume \( V(t) \). A new round of replication is initiated when the ATP-DnaA concentration reaches the critical concentration for replication initiation, and the cell then divides a constant time \( \tau_{cc} \) later. During cell division, the volume and the number of DnaA proteins and the number of origins are halved. To prevent premature re-initiation by stochastic DnaA fluctuations immediately after replication initiation, we also implement a refractory or ‘eclipse’ period of \( \tau_r = 10 \) minutes following replication initiation during which replication cannot be re-initiated, mimicking the effect of SeqA [51, 62]. As there are five binding sites for DnaA in the promoter region [30], we choose a Hill coefficient of \( n_p = 5 \) in the simulations. The rate constants are the same as in the original LD model (see Table S2). Figure S9 C/D shows the result. As fluctuations in the total number are reduced via negative auto-regulation within less than one generation, we obtain sizer-like correlations in the initiation volume.
**Effect of fluctuations in the lipid concentration on the initiation volume**

D

For varying lipid and total DnaA concentration on initiation volume in LD model (A), (B) The fraction of active ATP-bound DnaA f as a function of the cell volume per origin v for different lipid concentrations [l], and for two different values of the dissociation constants of the activator and the deactivator of $K_D^p = K_D^D$, respectively. The horizontal dashed line shows the critical fraction $f^*$ for replication initiation. Clearly, fluctuations in the lipid concentration lead to fluctuations in the initiation volume $v^*$, which is the volume per origin v at which the fraction f equals the critical fraction $f^*$. The initiation volume $v^*$ as a function of the lipid concentration is shown in panel C, scaling as $1/[l]$ both in the regime of strong ultra-sensitivity (A) and weak ultra-sensitivity (B). (D, E) The concentration of active ATP-bound DnaA, $[D]_{ATP}$, as a function of the volume per origin v for different values of the total DnaA concentration, both in the regime of strong ultra-sensitivity (D) and weak ultra-sensitivity (E). The horizontal dashed line denotes the critical ATP-DnaA concentration for replication initiation. Fluctuations in the total DnaA concentration generate stronger fluctuations in the initiation volume when the degree of ultra-sensitivity is weaker (panel B). This is highlighted in panel F, which shows the initiation volume as a function of the total DnaA concentration for different values of the dissociation constants. (G, H) The fraction f of active ATP-bound DnaA as a function of the volume per origin v for different total concentrations of DnaA, in the regime of strong (G) and weak (H) ultra-sensitivity. The horizontal dashed line denotes critical fraction $f^*$ for replication initiation. The active fraction f depends only weakly on the total DnaA concentration, almost irrespective of the degree of ultra-sensitivity. As a result, the initiation volume is essentially independent of the total DnaA concentration for nearly all values of the dissociation constant (panel I). Replication initiation is thus well protected against noise in the concentration of DnaA. The curves are obtained by solving equation S32 in steady state. This gives the mapping between the instantaneous concentration $[D]_{ATP}(t)$ or fraction $f(t)$ of active ATP-bound DnaA and the instantaneous volume per origin $v(t)$ when the (de)activation rates are higher than the growth rate.
Adder and sizer fluctuations in the LD model

![Diagram showing ADP-DnaA and ATP-DnaA states with lipid and acidic phospholipids]

**Lipid concentration fluctuations**

- **A**
  - Scatter plot of $\Delta v_n^* \equiv v_{n+1}^* - v_n^*$ vs $v_n^*$, $N = 998$, $R = -0.002$.

- **B**
  - Scatter plot of $v_n^*$ vs $V_{b,n}$, $N = 998$, $R = 0.498$.

**DnaA concentration fluctuations**

- **C**
  - Scatter plot of $\Delta v_n^*$ vs $v_n^*$, $N = 994$, $R = -0.434$.

- **D**
  - Scatter plot of $v_n^*$ vs $V_{b,n}$, $N = 995$, $R = 0.019$.

Adder and sizer fluctuations in the LDDR model

![Diagram showing ADP-DnaA and ATP-DnaA states with datA, RIDA, DARS1, DARS2]

**Lipid concentration fluctuations**

- **E**
  - Scatter plot of $\Delta v_n^*$ vs $v_n^*$, $N = 995$, $R = 0.047$.

**DnaA concentration fluctuations**

- **F**
  - Scatter plot of $v_n^*$ vs $V_{b,n}$, $N = 995$, $R = 0.545$.

- **G**
  - Scatter plot of $\Delta v_n^*$ vs $v_n^*$, $N = 994$, $R = -0.468$.

- **H**
  - Scatter plot of $v_n^*$ vs $V_{b,n}$, $N = 995$, $R = -0.029$.

**FIG. S9:** Lipid and DnaA concentration fluctuations generate adder and sizer correlations, respectively, in both the LD and LDDR model. (A-D) Scatter plot of the added initiation volume between successive initiation events, $\Delta v_n^* \equiv 2v_{n+1}^* - v_n^*$, and the initiation volume $v_n^*$ (A, C) and the initiation volume $v_n^*$ and the volume at birth $V_{b,n}$ (B, D), in the presence of lipid concentration fluctuations (A, B) and DnaA concentration fluctuations (C, D) in the LD model. It is seen that in the presence of lipid fluctuations, $\Delta v_n^*$ is independent of $v_n^*$ (A) while $v_n^*$ is proportional to $V_{b,n}$ (B), as is characteristic for an adder. In contrast, in the presence of DnaA concentration fluctuations $\Delta v_n^*$ is anti-correlated with $v_n^*$, while $v_n^*$ is independent of $V_{b,n}$; both features are characteristic for a sizer. (E-H) Scatter plot of the same data, but for the LDDR model. Also in the LDDR model, lipid fluctuations generate adder correlations in the initiation volume (E, F), while DnaA concentration fluctuations yield sizer correlations. The growth rate in both models is $\lambda = 0.35$ h$^{-1}$, corresponding to non-overlapping replication forks.
4. Sizer and adder correlations in the full LDDR model

The adder or sizer correlations in the initiation volume emerge from the following four ideas: (i) replication is initiated at a critical concentration or critical fraction of active, ATP-bound DnaA; (ii) the mapping between the fraction or concentration of active ATP-bound DnaA and the volume depends on the concentrations and activities of the switch components (Fig. S8); (i) and (ii) together imply that fluctuations in the activities and concentrations of the switch components will lead to fluctuations in the initiation volume (Fig. S8 C,F,J); (iii) fluctuations in the initiation volume regress on roughly the same timescale as those of the switch components, because the mapping between the initiation volume and the activities or concentrations of the switch components is fairly linear, certainly when the fluctuations are small enough, and the rates of activation and deactivation are faster than the growth rate, which they must be generically in order to generate large-amplitude oscillations in the concentration or fraction of active DnaA; (iv) adder correlations emerge when this timescale is set by the growth rate while sizer correlations emerge when this timescale is significantly faster. These ideas are generic and should apply not only to the LD model of Fig. 5 in the main text, but also to the full LDDR model. Here, we show that this is indeed the case.

Lipid fluctuations generate adder correlations in the LDDR model Figure S9 E/F shows the effect of lipid fluctuations in the LDDR model. The model is described by equation S42, but with the lipid fluctuations modelled in the same way as in the stochastic LD model, see equation S43 or equation 6 of the main text. Like the stochastic LD model, the stochastic LDDR model features an eclipse period of $t_e = 10$ minutes following replication initiation during which replication cannot be re-initiated [64–66].

Figure S9 E/F demonstrates that also in the full LDDR model, with parameter values estimated from experimental data (see Table S2 and section S2A), adder correlations in the initiation volume emerge from fluctuations in the lipid concentration. In section S2D.3 below, we argue that this effect is much more generic: any switch component that fluctuates on a timescale set by the growth rate, be it lipids, datA, RIDA, or DARS1/2, will generate adder correlations in the initiation volume.

Negatively auto-regulated initiator protein gives rise to sizer correlations in the LDDR model Figure S9 G/H shows the effect of fluctuations in the total concentration of DnaA. The stochastic production of DnaA is modelled in exactly the same way as in the LD model, see equation S52. Combining this with equation S42 yields the following equation for the dynamics of the number of ATP-bound DnaA molecules:

$$\frac{dN_{ATP}^D}{dt} = \frac{\alpha_p g}{1 + (\frac{K_{ATP}}{[N]_D})^n_p} + \xi_D(t) + (\alpha_1 N_1 + \alpha_d1 t_{ori}(t - \tau_{d1}) + \alpha_d2(t) t_{ori}(t - \tau_{d2})) \frac{[D]_{ADP}}{K_{D_{ADP}} + [D]_{ADP}}$$

$$- (\beta_{datA}(t) + \beta_{rida}(t)) n_{ori} \frac{[D]_{ATP}}{K_{D_{ATP}} + [D]_{ATP}}.$$ (S55)

As in the stochastic LD model of section S2D.3, a new round of replication is initiated when the ATP-DnaA concentration reaches the critical concentration for replication initiation. The cell then divides a constant time $t_{ce}$ later. The volume grows exponentially with growth rate $\lambda$ and upon cell division the volume and copy numbers of DnaA and the number of origins are halved. And as for the other stochastic switch models, this model features an eclipse period of $t_e = 10$ minutes following replication initiation during which replication cannot be re-initiated [64–66].

Figure S9 G and H show that in the full LDDR model, like in the LD model, DnaA copy number fluctuations give rise to sizer correlations. Negative auto-regulation speeds up the regression of the initiation threshold to its mean, turning the system (back) into a sizer.

5. Fluctuations in other switch components

The activities of datA, DARS1/2 and RIDA are all influenced by other proteins. IHF affects the activity of datA [38] and DARS2 [38], while Fis modulates the activity of DARS2 [38]. In addition, the activity of RIDA is influenced by Hda [80]. Fluctuations in these proteins will lead to fluctuations in the respective activation and deactivation rates, just like lipid fluctuations affect the activation rate; in fact, since these proteins are present in (much) lower concentrations than the acidic phospholipids (even though the most potent lipid, cardiolipin, constitutes only a small fraction, 5%, of the total lipid concentration [49]), their fluctuations are likely to be stronger. The fluctuations in the (de)activation rates caused by these proteins will, in turn, generate fluctuations in the concentration or active fraction of ATP-DnaA as a function of the volume, thus causing fluctuations in the initiation size. Because the activation and deactivation rates are typically higher than the growth rate (see section S2A and Fig. S8), fluctuations in the
FIG. S10: RIDA concentration fluctuations generate adder correlations in the LDDR model. Scatter plot of the added initiation volume between successive initiation events, $\Delta v_n^{\ast} \equiv 2v_{n+1}^{\ast} - v_n^{\ast}$, and the initiation volume $v_n^{\ast}$. While the lipids and datA control the initiation volume in the low growth-rate regime, DARS2 and RIDA control the initiation volume in the high growth-rate regime of overlapping replication forks. The figure shows that in this regime RIDA fluctuations generate adder correlations in the initiation volume, as observed experimentally \[17, 18\]. The cell-doubling time is $\tau_d = 0.55 \text{ h} \approx 33 \text{ min}$, corresponding to a growth rate of $\lambda = 1.25 \text{ h}^{-1}$. The correlations in the initiation volume in the low growth regime are shown in Fig. S9. The dark blue line shows the mean of the binned data and the error bars represent the standard error of the mean (SEM) per bin. The number of data points $N$ and the Pearson correlation coefficient $R$ are indicated.

Initiation volume regress on the same timescale as that of the fluctuations in the switch components. If the switch components decay on a timescale set by the growth rate, because the proteins are neither degraded actively nor produced via strong feedback control, then their fluctuations will give rise to fluctuations in the initiation volume that relax on the timescale set by the growth rate. These fluctuations will therefore also generate adder correlations in the initiation volume, just like the lipids do. We thus argue that the idea that fluctuations in the switch components can generate adder correlations is general.

To provide support for this idea, we study how fluctuations in the activity of RIDA in the full LDDR model, as induced by e.g. Hda \[80\], propagate to fluctuations in the initiation volume. The system is modeled in exactly the same way as in the previous section (S2D4), except that now the lipid concentration is constant while the activity of RIDA fluctuates:

\[
\bar{\beta}_{\text{rida}}(t) = \beta_{\text{rida}} + \eta(t),
\]

\[
\frac{d\eta}{dt} = -\lambda \eta + \xi(t).
\]

Here, $\bar{\beta}_{\text{rida}}$ is the mean RIDA activity, while $\xi(t)$ models Gaussian white noise with strength $\langle \xi(t)\xi(t') \rangle = 2D_{\eta}\delta(t-t')$, such that the colored noise $\eta$ describes fluctuations with zero mean that decay on a timescale set by the growth rate $\lambda$.

Figure S10 shows that, as anticipated, fluctuations in the activity of RIDA generate adder correlations in the initiation volume. Adder correlations will emerge from fluctuations in switch components that relax on a timescale given by the growth rate. This is one of the central findings of our study.

E. Effect of including the titration sites in the switch model

In the LD and the LDDR model we argue that replication initiation in \textit{E. coli} is regulated via a switch of the initiator protein DnaA. An open question remains what role the experimentally observed titration sites for DnaA on the chromosome could play in the regulation of replication initiation. Here, we include these titration sites in the LD model and show that they transiently lower the concentration of ATP-DnaA that is available for initiating replication at the origin. The titration sites could therefore act as an additional mechanism to prevent re-initiation.

Both ATP-DnaA and ADP-DnaA have relatively high affinity for the approximately 300 DnaA boxes per chromosome \[75\]. We assume here equal affinity of ATP-DnaA and ADP-DnaA to these titration sites. Exploiting this, we can then use equation S17 to calculate the free concentration of DnaA, $[D]_T,t$, given the total concentration $[s]_T$ and total titration sites $[s]_T$, as described in section S1B2. Only the DnaA proteins that are not bound to the titration sites $[D]_T,t$ can repress the production of new initiator proteins. As before in section S2D3, we make the simplifying assumption that the two nucleotide forms of DnaA have the same affinity for the promoter. The change in
the total number of DnaA proteins $N_D^T$ is therefore given by the production term of equation S29 of the AIT model. In the presence of high-affinity titration sites, we assume that replication is initiated when the free concentration of ATP-DnaA in the cell reaches a critical threshold $[D]_{ATP,f}^T$. Exploiting the equal affinities of the two nucleotide binding states of DnaA for the titration sites, and fast binding and unbinding dynamics (see section S1 B 2), the fraction $g = [D]_{ATP,f}^T/[D]_{T,f}^T$ of the concentration of free ATP-DnaA $[D]_{ATP,f}^T$ over the concentration of free total DnaA $[D]_{T,f}^T$ is equal to the fraction of the total ATP-DnaA concentration over the total DnaA concentration per cell $f = [D]_{ATP}^T/[D]_T^T$. The free ATP-DnaA concentration is therefore given by the concentration of free DnaA $[D]_{T,f}^T$ times the active fraction of DnaA $f$:

$$[D]_{ATP,f}(t) = [D]_{T,f}(t) \times f(t)$$

(S58)

It remains an open question whether all DnaA proteins or only the freely diffusing DnaA can be activated and deactivated via the switch of the LD model. Both scenarios could be envisioned: While it might seem more natural to assume that only free DnaA can be activated or deactivated, also DnaA that is bound to titration sites might be in contact with the acidic phospholipids or with the site datA via supercoiled DNA. Additionally, as RIDA is moving along the entire chromosome during DNA replication, every titration site will be in the proximity of RIDA once and bound DnaA could be inactivated at that moment. Importantly, however, when the affinities of the two nucleotide bound forms of the DnaA to the titration sites are equal and the binding dynamics are fast, the active fraction in the cytoplasm $g$ equals the total active fraction $f$, irrespective of whether the activation and deactivation reactions happen only in the cytoplasm or also on the DNA. This question only affects the magnitude of the activation and deactivation rates: If only the free DnaA can be (de)activated by the components of the switch, activation and deactivation rates become lower because fewer DnaA proteins are available. If the dissociation constants of the activators and deactivators are however lower than the free DnaA concentration, the system remains in the ultra-sensitivity regime and the titration sites affect the magnitude of the (de)activation rates of the switch only weakly. We therefore here assume out of simplicity that all DnaA, no matter whether bound or unbound to titration sites, can be (de)activated by the switch components.

When all titration sites are located at the origin, the number of titration sites per cell doubles at the moment of initiation. The increased number of titration sites causes a drop in the concentration of free initiator proteins right after replication has been initiated (Fig. S11). The lower DnaA concentration in the cytoplasm causes a de-repression of the promoter, the production rate increases and the titration sites are being filled up rapidly by newly synthesized DnaA proteins. When DnaA is strongly negatively auto-regulated with a high basal production rate of DnaA, the free concentration set by negative auto-regulation is recovered quickly (Fig. S11 A, panel two). When the free concentration of DnaA is again constant, the change in the free ATP-DnaA concentration over the total ATP-DnaA fraction which first decreases slowly and then increases again. When the negative auto-regulation is however weaker and the basal production rate is less high, the production of new DnaA proteins takes longer and leads to a decrease of the active free DnaA concentration for a longer time (Fig. S11 B). In this scenario, the titration sites play a supporting role in lowering the ATP-DnaA concentration available for re-initiating at the origin right after initiation.

S3. LOOSENING THE COUPLING BETWEEN REPLICATION INITIATION AND DIVISION

According to experiments at the population level, the time from the initiation of replication until cell division, the cycling time $\tau_{cc}$, is approximately constant [11]. In the main text, we therefore assumed that $\tau_{cc}$ is constant. This allowed us to study the cell cycle entirely from the perspective of the replication cycle. Experiments show, however, that this is an oversimplification [3, 17, 18, 20–22, 60] and that cell division is more loosely coupled to the replication cycle [17, 21, 85]. Of particular interest are two recent single-cell studies, by Si et al. [17] and Witz et al. [18], respectively. Both studies indicate that the cell cycle consists of two adders, a DNA replication adder and a cell-division adder. Both studies also agree on the nature of the replication adder: the data of both studies unequivocally show that the added volume between successive initiation events is independent of the initiation volume, as our model also predicts (Fig. 5, Figs S9 and S10). However, the authors of these two studies come to different conclusions concerning the nature of the division adder [17, 19, 85]. By employing a statistical framework with stochastic simulations, Witz et al. conclude that the second adder concerns the added volume between replication initiation and cell division [18]. Si et al. showed that by inducing oscillatory perturbations in the concentration of DnaA, the adder correlations in the replication initiation volume can be destroyed, while the adder on the level of cell division remains intact; they conclude that the division adder concerns the added volume from birth to division and suggest that cell division is controlled by a separate molecular mechanism [17].

We emphasise that the central question of our manuscript is how replication initiation is regulated—not how cell division is controlled, nor how this is coupled to replication initiation. Naturally, our assumption that the time $\tau_{cc}$
between cell division and replication initiation is constant will affect the correlations between the initiation volume and cell division, since this directly couples division to replication initiation. The pertinent question is, however, whether the adder correlations in the initiation volume remain robust to this assumption. Another important question is whether our result that the AIT model yields unstable cell cycles is sensitive to this assumption that \( \tau_{cc} \) is constant.

To address these questions, we compare the results of our models of the main text in which replication is coupled to cell division via a constant time \( \tau_{cc} \) between these two events, to the predictions of two other models in which replication is coupled to cell division either via the model of Si et al. or that of Witz et al. These two alternative models contain the same molecular, mechanistic description of replication initiation as our models presented in the main text. And like our models, they describe cell division and its coupling to replication initiation phenomenologically. The models differ, however, in the nature and strength of this coupling between cell division and replication. While in our model cell division is tightly coupled to replication initiation, with a constant \( \tau_{cc} \) between these two events, in the other two models the coupling is more loose. The first of these two models is based on that of Si et al. \([17],[19]\), which, following \([55]\), we call the Independent Double Adder (IDA) model. In this model, the cell division cycle is completely independent of the replication cycle. Cells divide when a Gaussian distributed volume \( \Delta_{\text{IDA}} \) with mean \( \mu_{\text{IDA}} = \langle V_d \rangle \) and a standard deviation \( \sigma_{\text{LDA}} \) (with coefficient of variation \( CV_{\text{IDA}} = \sigma_{\text{LDA}}/\mu_{\text{IDA}} = 0.1 \)) has been added to the birth volume, independent of the cell size at birth. As the replication and the division cycle are not coupled in this model, it could happen that a cell attempts to divide before replication has finished. To prevent this biologically unrealistic scenario from happening, we impose in the simulations that replication must be finished before a cell can divide. This scenario however only happens extremely rarely. In the second model, based on that of Witz et al. and called the Replication Double Adder (RDA) model \([15],[55]\), cells divide when a Gaussian distributed volume \( \Delta_{\text{RDA}} \) with mean \( \mu_{\text{RDA}} = (V_d) - \langle v^* \rangle = \langle v^* \rangle (exp(\lambda \tau_{cc}) - 1) \) and a standard deviation \( \sigma \) (with coefficient of variation \( CV_{\text{RDA}} = \sigma_{\text{RDA}}/\mu_{\text{RDA}} = 0.1 \)) has been added since replication initiation, independent of the initiation volume. In this model, the coupling between replication and division is thus of intermediate strength.

---

FIG. S11: Titration sites could prevent re-initiation events by reducing the concentration of free ATP-DnaA right after initiation, illustrated using the LD model (A, B) The volume of the cell \( V(t) \), the free DnaA concentration \([D]_{T, f}(t)\), the fraction of DnaA \( f(t) \) that is bound to ATP (irrespective of whether the DnaA is in the cytoplasm or on the titration sites) and the concentration of free ATP-DnaA \([D]_{\text{ATP}, f}(t)\) as a function of time (in units of the doubling time \( \tau_d = 2 \) h). The blue dashed line is the dissociation constant \( K_D \) of the DnaA to its promoter. The dashed red line is the critical free ATP-DnaA concentration \([D]_{\text{ATP}, f}^*\) at which replication is initiated. Replication is initiated at a constant volume per origin \( v^* \) over time (green dashed line). (A) Right after replication initiation, the number of titration sites is doubled and the free concentration of DnaA drops to zero. When the negative auto-regulation is, for reasons of clarity, very strong (Hill coefficient \( n = 10 \)) and the basal DnaA production rate is high (\( \alpha = 300 \) \( h^{-1} \)), the concentration in the cytoplasm rapidly returns back to its average concentration set by the dissociation constant \( K_D \). The free ATP-DnaA concentration first decreases strongly due to the decrease in the free DnaA concentration. As new ATP-DnaA proteins are however produced rapidly, the free ATP-DnaA concentration rises again after a short time. As the fraction of ATP-DnaA \( f \) first falls before it rises again on a slower time scale (third row, see also Fig. 3 B in the main text), the free ATP-DnaA concentration first decreases and then increases again. (B) When the negative auto-regulation is however weaker (Hill coefficient \( n = 2 \)) and the basal DnaA production rate is lower (\( \alpha = 150 \) \( h^{-1} \)), the free concentration rises more slowly, leading to a long period where the free ATP-DnaA concentration is very low while the active fraction is decreasing due to stronger deactivation than activation of the switch. Therefore, combining titration sites with relatively weak negative auto-regulation can reduce the initiation potential for an extended period after replication initiation.
At the mean-field level, all results on the initiation volume should be independent of the type of division control, as the initiation volume in the accumulation and in the switch model is determined by concentrations of proteins which do not change upon cell division. Indeed, we show below that our result that the AIT model gives rise to unstable cell cycles also holds when division is more loosely coupled to replication initiation, as in the IDA or RDA model (section S3A). Then we show that the adder correlations of the initiation volume obtained in the RIT and the LD model remain unchanged when cell division is controlled by either an independent adder running from cell birth to division, as in the IDA model, or by an adder running from replication initiation to cell division, as in the RDA model (section S3B).

A. The AIT model remains unstable when division is coupled more loosely to replication initiation

When cell division is controlled by a separate adder mechanism, as in the IDA model, the chromosome density in the AIT model does not remain stable (Fig. S12 B). As the promoter of the initiator is effectively not repressed in the AIT model, the production rate is not coupled to the cell volume and is proportional to a constant production rate times the number of DnaA genes in the cell (Eq. S29). If the production rate were perfectly constant (independent of the number of genes), a constant number of proteins would be produced per doubling time of the cell. As the volume is now controlled separately, this would give rise to an on average constant initiator concentration and thus a constant initiation volume per origin. In the standard model of gene expression, the production rate is however proportional to the number of genes and thus to the number of chromosomes. Initiating replication slightly earlier leads to a higher chromosome copy number which results in a higher production rate of initiator proteins. At a higher initiator production rate, the critical initiator threshold is attained earlier and replication is initiated earlier. When the birth volume is maintained approximately constant by a separate division adder, this positive feedback loop results in an increasing chromosome density over several generations (Fig. S12 B). As the production rate of a protein most likely depends on the gene copy number [50], we conclude that the AIT model is unstable even if the division cycle is controlled by a separate mechanism.

Using the RDA model to couple replication and division in the AIT model we find that both the chromosome density and the cell volume do not remain constant in time (Fig. S12 B). The principle mechanism for this instability is very similar to that in the AIT model of the main text, with a constant $\tau_{cc}$. The production rate of the initiator is again essentially constant, which means that when the initiator density at cell birth is higher, initiation is triggered earlier, at a smaller volume $V(t^*)$, the cell divides earlier and hence at a smaller size $V_d$, on average at $V_d = V(t^*) + \mu_{rDA}$, causing the initiator density to go up further. Thus, also when the cell division cycle is coupled to the replication cycle via the RDA model, the AIT model results in unstable cell cycles.

B. The adder correlations in the RIT and LD model remain unchanged when division is coupled more loosely to replication initiation

We re-evaluate all obtained correlations between consecutive cell cycles both in the RIT and the LD model in the case where cell division is controlled according to the IDA or RDA model, as described above. We find that while correlations between the initiation volume and the birth volume are different, as expected, the previously obtained correlations between consecutive initiation volumes per origin remain unchanged, for both models. Specifically, in the RIT model, random partitioning of both the initiator and the regulator protein still give rise to adder correlations in the initiation volume per origin, both in the IDA and RDA model (Figure S12 A). In the LD model, fluctuations in the lipid concentration result again in adder correlations for the initiation volume, both in the IDA and RDA model (Figure S12 C). Finally, also the result that fluctuations in the negatively auto-regulated DnaA give rise to a sizer in the initiation volume per origin remains valid when the division cycle is independent of the replication cycle (data not shown). To verify that our results are fully robust to the choice of division control we also implemented a sizer (instead of an adder) for cell division and found that the correlations in the initiation volume remain unchanged (results not shown). We conclude that our principal finding that fluctuations in switch components can generate adder or sizer correlations in the initiation volume is robust: these correlations depend on the correlation time of the fluctuations in the switch components, but do not depend on the specific type of coupling of the replication cycle to the division cycle.
FIG. S12: The results on the regulation of replication initiation of the RIT, the AIT, and the LD model are robust to a more loose coupling between the division and the replication cycle. (A, C) The added volume per origin between consecutive replication initiation events, $\Delta v_n^* = 2v_{n+1}^* - v_n^*$, as a function of the initiation volume $v_n^*$. The dark blue lines show the mean of the binned data and the error bars represent the standard error of the mean (SEM) per bin. The number of data points $N$ and the Pearson correlation coefficient $R$ are indicated. (A) In the RIT model, random partitioning noise in the initiator and the regulator protein gives rise to adder correlations in the initiation volume even if the division cycle is coupled more loosely to replication initiation: While in the IDA model, cell division is triggered completely independently via a separate division adder, in the RDA model division is triggered when an on average constant volume has been added from replication initiation to cell division (compare to Figure S3 B). (B) For the AIT model, the volume $V(t)$, the number of initiator proteins $N_p(t)$ and titration sites $N_s(t)$, the total concentration of initiator proteins $[p]_T(t)$ together with the dissociation constant of the initiator $K_{pD}$ (dashed red line), and the concentration of initiator proteins in the cytoplasm $[p](t)$ as a function of time (in units of the doubling time of the cell $\tau_d$). In the IDA model, contrary to Figure 2 C in the main text, the birth volume is now controlled via a separate division adder and remains thus approximately constant. As the initiator proteins in the AIT model are produced at a maximal rate that is proportional to the number of genes, a small perturbation of the gene number leads to a change in the production rate of initiator proteins. At a higher production rate, the critical number of initiator proteins per origin is attained earlier and replication is initiated earlier. The further increase of the gene number gives rise to a positive feedback loop that leads to an increase of the chromosome density over time. The AIT model is thus also unstable when division is controlled separately via the IDA model. Also in the RDA model, where division is triggered after an on average constant volume has been added since replication initiation, the chromosome density increases, and the division volume decreases over the course of a few generations. (C) In the LD model in the presence of noise in the lipid concentration (according to equation 6 in the main text), the added volume per origin between successive initiation events remains independent of the initiation volume, both when the division cycle is controlled via the IDA and the RDA model (compare to Figure 5 B in the main text or to Figure S9 A).