Bioactive exometabolites drive maintenance competition in simple bacterial communities

John L. Chodkowski[1] and Ashley Shade[1,2,3*]

[1]Department of Microbiology and Molecular Genetics, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI 48824, USA

[2]Department of Plant, Soil and Microbial Sciences, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI 48824, USA

[3]Program in Ecology, Evolutionary Biology and Behavior, Michigan State University, 10 East Lansing, MI 48824, USA

* Corresponding author and material requests. Email: shadeash@msu.edu; ORCiD: 0000-0002-7189-3067

Competing Interests

The authors declare no competing financial interests.

Abstract

During prolonged resource limitation, bacterial cells can persist in metabolically active states of non-growth. These maintenance periods, such as those experienced in stationary phase, can include upregulation of secondary metabolism and release of exometabolites into the local environment. As resource limitation is common of many environmental microbial habitats, we hypothesized that neighboring bacterial

populations employ exometabolites to compete or cooperate during maintenance, and

that these exometabolite-facilitated interactions can drive community outcomes. Here,

we evaluated the consequences of exometabolite interactions over stationary phase

among three environmental strains: *Burkholderia thailandensis* E264, *Chromobacterium*

subtsugae, and *Pseudomonas syringae* pv.*tomato* DC3000. We assembled them into

synthetic communities that only permitted chemical interactions. We compared the

responses (transcripts) and outputs (exometabolites) of each member with and without

neighbors. We found that transcriptional dynamics were changed with different

neighbors, and that some of these changes were coordinated between members. The

dominant competitor *B. thailandensis* consistently upregulated biosynthetic gene

clusters to produce bioactive exometabolites for both exploitative and interference

competition. These results demonstrate that competition strategies during maintenance

can contribute to community-level outcomes. It also suggests that the traditional

concept of defining competitiveness by growth outcomes may be narrow, and that

maintenance competition could be an alternative measure.

Introduction

Bacteria interact with other bacteria and their environment within complex, multi-

species communities. Bacterial interactions rely on the ability to sense and respond to

both biotic and abiotic stimuli [1, 2]. These stimuli include physical, chemical or

molecular cues, and can alter bacterial behaviors [3, 4], and ultimately, can also alter

community functioning [5, 6]. It is expected that interspecies interactions play an

important role in shaping microbial community dynamics [7]. However, multiple stimuli in

the environment make it difficult to disentangle the separate influences of abiotic versus

biotic stimuli on microbial community dynamics [8]. Therefore, efforts to characterize

and distinguish community responses to biotic stimuli, such as those that facilitate

interspecies interactions, will provide insights into the specific roles that microbial

interactions play in shaping their communities [9].

Interspecies interactions can be facilitated through small molecules [10].

Extracellular small molecules are collectively referred to as exometabolites [11, 12, 13].

Depending on the exometabolite produced, these molecules can mediate interspecies

interactions that range from competitive to cooperative [14]. Of these interaction types,

competition has been shown to have a major influence in structuring microbial

communities [15, 16, 17]. Thus, competitive interactions that are mediated by

exometabolites are also expected to influence to microbial community dynamics. In

addition, different types of exometabolites can be employed by bacteria to gain

advantage in both exploitative (e.g. nutrient scavenging) and interference (direct cell

damage) categories of competition.

Traditionally, competition has been viewed through the lens of resource

acquisition [18]. In previous studies, competitiveness is modeled with respect to yield

given resource consumption and growth [19, 20]. However, competition for *survival* or

maintenance may be just as important as competition for yield, especially during periods

of resource limitation [21, 22]. Competition during maintenance is likely common in

some free-living environments, such as soils, sequencing batch reactors, and the

human gut that experience long periods of nutrient famine punctuated by short periods

of nutrient influx [23, 24, 25, 26]. The stationary phase of a bacterial growth curve falls

within this context of growth cessation, and pulses of nutrients may be transiently

available as cells die and lyse (necromass), while the total population size remains

stagnant. Stationary phase is often coordinated with a metabolic shift to secondary

metabolism [27, 28]. Therefore, an effective "maintenance" competitor may produce

bioactive exometabolites, like antibiotics, which are often produced as a result of

secondary metabolism. In particular, bacteria can activate biosynthetic gene clusters

(BSGCs) to produce bioactive exometabolites [29]. The activation of BSGCs is closely

tied to stress responses, suggesting that bacteria can sense the stress of competition

[30, 31]. While it is known that certain exometabolites can trigger BSGC upregulation

and, more generally alter transcription [32], there is much to understand about the

outcomes of interspecies interactions for BSGCs in multi-member microbial

communities.

Here, we build on our previous research to understand how exometabolite-

mediated interactions among bacterial neighbors contribute to community outcomes in a

simple, three-member community (Table 1). These three members are commonly

associated with terrestrial environments (soils or plants) and were chosen because of

reported [33] and observed interspecies exometabolite interactions in the laboratory.

We used a synthetic community ("SynCom") approach [34] by applying our previously

described transwell system [35], which allowed for evaluation of "community goods"

within a media reservoir that was shared among members. The members' populations

were physically isolated by membrane filters at the bottom of each transwell, but could

interact chemically via the reservoir. In our prior work, we investigated each member's

exometabolites and transcription over stationary phase, and the objective was to

understand monoculture responses (in minimal glucose media) before assembling the

more complex 2- and 3- member communities. We found that each member in

monoculture produced a variety of exometabolites in stationary phase, including

bioactive molecules involved in competition [36]. In this work, we build to 2- and 3-

community memberships to ask: How do members interact via exometabolites in simple

communities during maintenance (stationary phase), and what are the competitive

strategies and outcomes of those interactions? What genetic pathways, molecules, and

members drive the responses? Which outcomes in 3-member community are predicted

by the 2-member communities, and which are "greater than the sum of its parts"?

We found that *B. thailandensis* had a major influence on the transcriptional

responses of both *C. subtsugae* and *P. syringae*, and that this influence could be

attributed to an increase in both interference and exploitative competition strategies.

Furthermore, we observed non-additive transcriptional responses and exometabolite

production, particularly for *B. thailandensis* with respect to BSGCs. These findings show

that diverse competitive strategies can be deployed even when bacterial neighbors are

surviving rather than exponentially growing. Therefore, we suggest that contact-

independent, exometabolite-mediated interference and exploitation are important

competitive strategies in resource-limited environments and support the non-yield

outcome of maintenance.

Materials and Methods

Bacterial strains and culture conditions

We selected three environmental bacterial strains for the SynCom experiments that were originally isolated from various plant/soil habitats and that had prior evidence of exometabolite interactions among them in the laboratory [Table 1; 33, 37-40]. Freezer stocks of *B. thailandensis*, *C. subtsugae*, and *P. syringae* were plated on half-concentration Trypticase soy agar (TSA50) at 27°C for at least 24 h. Members were inoculated in 7 ml of M9–0.2% glucose medium and grown for 16 h at 27°C, 200 rpm. Cultures were then diluted into 50 ml M9-0.2% glucose medium such that exponential growth phase was achieved after 10 h of incubation at 27°C, 200 rpm. Members were diluted in 50 ml M9 glucose medium to target ODs (*B. thailandensis* 0.3 OD, *C. subtsugae*: 0.035 OD, *P. syringae* 0.035 OD). The high initial OD for *B. thailandensis* was necessary such that stationary phase would be achieved by all members within a 2 h window after 24 h incubation in the transwell plate. The glucose concentration in the final dilution varied upon community membership- 0.067% for monocultures, 0.13% for pairwise cocultures, and 0.2% for the 3-member community. For each member, 48 ml of diluted culture was transferred as 4 mL aliquots in 12, 5 mL Falcon tubes to more efficiently prepare replicate transwell plates.

Synthetic community experiments

Transwell plate preparation was performed as previously described [35]. Briefly, we used sterile filter plates with 0.22-µm-pore polyvinylidene difluoride (PVDF) filter bottoms (Millipore MAGVS2210). Prior to use, filter plates were washed three times with

sterile water using a vacuum apparatus (NucleoVac 96 vacuum manifold; Clontech

Laboratories). The filter of well H12 was removed with a sterile pipette tip and tweezer,

and 31 ml of M9 glucose medium was added to the reservoir through well H12. The

glucose concentration in the reservoir varied upon community membership- 0.067% for

monocultures, 0.13% for pairwise cocultures, and 0.2% for the 3-member community.

Glucose concentration was adjusted to plate occupancy (e.g., 3-member communities

had higher number of wells occupied than 2- or 1-member). Our aim was for each

member to achieve stationary phase at similar times across all conditions to compare

transcripts and exometabolites under similar growth trajectories. In other words,

available resources were standardized while keeping the well occupancy for each

member constant. With this design, transcripts and exometabolites in cocultures that

deviated from those in monocultures could be attributed to interspecies interactions and

not complicated by offset in member growth trajectories across the experimental

conditions.

Each well was filled with 130 µL of culture or medium (prepared as described,

above; see methods section: Bacterial strains and culture conditions). For each plate, a

custom R script (RandomArray.R [see script at

https://github.com/ShadeLab/PAPER_Chodkowski_mSystems_2017/blob/master/R_an

alysis/RandomArray.R]) was used to randomize community member placement in the

wells so that each member occupied a total of 31 wells per plate. In total, there were 7

community conditions- 3 monocultures, 3 pairwise cocultures, and the 3-member

community. Each member occupied 31 wells per plate regardless of experimental

condition. Thus, "baseline" exometabolites could be determined in the monocultures,

and then deviations in exometabolite abundance or detection in the cocultures could be

attributed to interspecies interactions. A time course was performed for each replicate.

The time course included an exponential phase time point (12.5 h) and 5 time points

assessed every 5 h over stationary phase (25 h – 45 h). Four biological replicates were

performed for each community condition for a total of 28 experiments. For each

experiment, 6 replicate filter plates were prepared for destructive sampling for a total of

168 transwell plates.

Filter plates were incubated at 27°C with gentle shaking (~0.32 rcf). For each

plate, a custom R script (RandomArray.R [see script at

https://github.com/ShadeLab/PAPER_Chodkowski_mSystems_2017/blob/master/R_an

alysis/RandomArray.R]) was used to randomize wells for each organism assigned to

RNA extraction (16 wells) and flow cytometry (5 wells). The following procedure was

performed for each organism when a transwell plate was destructively sampled: i) wells

containing spent culture assigned to RNA extraction were pooled (~100 µL/well) into a

1.7 mL microcentrifuge tube and flash frozen in liquid nitrogen and stored at -80 until

further processing. ii) 20 µL from wells assigned for flow cytometry were diluted into 180

µL Tris-buffered saline (TBS; 20 mM Tris, 0.8% NaCl [pH 7.4]). In community

memberships where *P. syringae* was arrayed with *B. thailandensis*, *P. syringae* had a

final dilution of 70-fold in TBS. In community memberships where *P. syringae* was

arrayed in monoculture or in coculture with *C. subtsugae*, *P. syringae* had a final dilution

of 900-fold in TBS. Final dilutions for *B. thailandensis* and *C. subtsugae* were 1 300-fold

and 1 540-fold, respectively. Each member was diluted differently to achieve a suitable

events/second range on the flow cytometer for accurate cell counting. Populations were

then stained and analyzed on the flow cytometer for live/dead counting (see

Supplementary Methods). iii) Spent medium (~31 ml) from the shared reservoir was

transferred to 50 mL conical tubes, flash-frozen in liquid nitrogen and stored at −80 °C

prior to metabolite extraction.

RNA-seq

RNA extraction, sequencing, quality control, and count matrix generation was performed

as previously published [36, see Supplementary Methods].

Transcriptomics

Quality filtering and differential gene expression analysis

Count matrices for each member were quality filtered in two steps: genes

containing 0 counts in all samples were removed, and genes with a transcript count of

≤10 in more than 90% of samples were removed. DESeq2 [41] was used to extract size

factor and dispersion estimates. These estimates were used as external input into

ImpulseDE2 for the analysis of differentially regulated genes [42]. ImpulseDE2

determines differential expression by comparing longitudinal count datasets. Case-

control (Cocultures-monoculture control) analyses were analyzed to identify genes with

differences in temporal regulation at an FDR-corrected threshold of 0.01. Genes that

passed the FDR threshold were further filtered for genes that had at least one timepoint

with a log2 fold-change (LFC) >= 1 or <= -1. Thus, we defined differentially expressed

genes (DEGs) as genes that met both the FDR-corrected and LFC thresholds. For each

member, differences in gene regulation between the three coculture conditions was

visualized with Venn diagrams using the VennDiagram package [43].

Differentially expressed genes were first determined by comparing each

coculture condition to the monoculture control and applying a LFC threshold (see

above). We then determined a second set of DEGs by comparing pairwise cocultures to

each other. ImpulseDE2 case-control analyses were performed as follows: *B.*

thailandensis coculture with *C. subtsugae* (case) compared to *B. thailandensis* coculture

with *P. syringae* (control), *C. subtsugae* coculture with *B. thailandensis* (case) compared

to *C. subtsugae* coculture with *P. syringae* (control), and *P. syringae* coculture with *B.*

thailandensis (case) compared to *P. syringae* coculture with *C, subtsugae* (control).

Genes that passed the FDR-corrected threshold of 0.01 based on ImpulseDE2 analysis

and had at least one time point with a LFC of >= 1 or <= -1 represented coculture

specific DEGs. The DEGs determined from monoculture comparisons and coculture

comparisons were then categorically grouped using Clusters of Orthologous Groups

(COG).

COG analysis

Protein fasta files were downloaded from NCBI and uploaded to eggNOG-

mapper v2 (http://eggnog-mapper.embl.de/) to obtain COGs. The DEGs determined

from ImpulseDE2 and LFC thresholds were categorized as upregulated or

downregulated based on temporal expression patterns. DEGs with consistent positive

LFC throughout all stationary phase time points were categorized as upregulated. DEGs

with consistent negative LFC throughout all stationary phase time points were

categorized as downregulated. These DEGs were then assigned to COGs, grouped

based on temporal up/downregulation patterns, and plotted using ggplot2 [44].

Principal coordinates analysis and statistics

We extracted DEGs based on our previously described definition. A variance-

stabilizing transformation was performed on normalized gene matrices using the rlog

function in DESeq2. A distance matrix based on the Bray-Curtis dissimilarity metric was

then calculated on the variance-stabilized gene matrices and principal coordinates

analysis was performed using the R package vegan [45]. Principal coordinates were

plotted using ggplot2. Coordinates of the first two PCoA axes were used to perform

PROTEST analysis using the PROTEST function in vegan. Dissimilarity matrices were

used to perform PERMANOVA and variation partitioning and using the adonis and

varpart functions in vegan, respectively. The RVAideMemoire package [46] was used to

perform a post-hoc pairwise PERMANOVAs.

Biosynthetic gene cluster (BSGC) analysis

NCBI accession numbers were uploaded to antiSMASH 6 beta bacterial version

[47] to identify genes involved in BSGCs using default parameters. Where possible,

literature-based evidence and BSGCs uploaded to MIBiG [48] were used to better

inform antiSMASH predictions. Log2 fold-changes (LFCs) were calculated for all

predicted biosynthetic genes within each predicted cluster by comparing coculture

expression to monoculture expression at each time point. Average LFCs were

calculated from all predicted biosynthetic genes within a predicted BSGC at each time

point. Temporal LFC trends were plotted using ggplot2. An upregulated BSGC was

defined as a BSGC that had at least two consecutive time points in stationary phase

with a LFC > 1.

Network analysis

Unweighted co-expression networks were created from quality filtered and

normalized expression data. Networks were generated for pairwise cocultures

containing *B. thailandensis*. First, data were quality filtered as previously described

(see methods section: *Quality filtering and differential gene expression analysis*). Then,

normalized expression data was extracted from DESeq2. Twenty-three and twenty-

four RNA-seq samples from each member were used for network analysis in the *B.*

thailandensis-C. subtsugae and B. thailandensis-P.syringae cocultures, respectively

(24 samples/member; 6 timepoints, 4 biological replicates). Only 23 samples were

used in the *B. thailandensis-C. subtsugae* network analysis because RNA-seq failed

for *C. subtsugae* at 45 h, biological replicate 2. Interspecies networks were then

inferred from the expression data using the context likelihood of relatedness [49]

algorithm within the R package Minet [50]. Gene matrices for each coculture pair were

concatenated to perform the following analysis. Briefly, the mutual information

coefficient was determined for each gene-pair. To ensure robust detection of co-

expressed genes, a resampling approach was used as previously described [51].

Then, a Z-score was computed on the mutual information matrix. A Z-score threshold

of 4.5 was used to determine an edge in the interspecies network. Interspecies

networks were uploaded into Cytoscape version 3.7.1. for visualization, topological

analysis, and enrichment analysis [52].

Gene annotation and gene ontology (GO) files were obtained for *B.*

thailandensis, *P. syringae,* and *C. subtsugae* for enrichment analyses. For *B.*

thailandensis, annotation and ontology files were downloaded from the Burkholderia

Genome Database (https://www.burkholderia.com). For *P. syringae*, annotation and

ontology files were downloaded from the Pseudomonas Genome Database

(http://www.pseudomonas.com/strain/download). Annotation and ontology files for *C.*

subtsugae were generated using Blast2GO version 5.2.5 [53]. InterProScan [54] with

default parameters were used to complement gene annotations from *C. subtsugae*. GO

terms were assigned using Blast2GO with default parameters. In addition, genes

involved in secondary metabolism were manually curated and added to these files as

individual GO terms. These genes were also used to update the GO term GO**:**0017000

(antibiotic biosynthetic process), composed of a collection of all the biosynthetic genes.

(see methods section: *Biosynthetic gene cluster (BSGC) analysi*s).

Topological analysis was performed as follows: Nodes were filtered from each

coculture network to only select genes from one member. The GLay community cluster

function in Cytoscape was used to determine intra-member modules. Functional

enrichment analysis was then performed on the modules using the BiNGO package [55]

in Cytoscape.

To determine interspecies co-regulation patterns, we filtered network nodes that

contained an interspecies edge. Functional enrichment analysis was performed on the

collection of genes containing interspecies edges for each member using the BiNGO

package in Cytoscape. Genes contained within modules of interest (e.g. modules

containing either thailandamide or malleilactone genes) were selected in Cytoscape for

visualization. The biosynthetic gene cluster organization of thailandamide and

malleilactone were obtained from MIBig and drawn in InkScape.

Protein sequences from an interspecies gene of interest (CLV_2968) within a

network module that also contained thailandamide genes from the *B. thailandensis-C.*

subtsugae network and an interspecies gene of interest (PSPTO_1206) within a

network module that also contained malleilactone genes from the *B. thailandensis-P.*

syringae network were obtained. A protein blast for each protein was run against *B.*

thailandensis protein sequences. *B. thailandensis* locus tags were extracted from the

top blast hit from each run. Normalized transcript counts for these 4 genes of interest

were plotted in R. Time course gene trajectories were determined using a loess

smoothing function.

Non-additive gene expression

The quality filtered and normalized expression matrix from each community

member was used to extract log2 fold-change (LFC) values within DESeq2. LFCs were

calculated by comparing transcript counts from each time point to its respective time

point in the monoculture condition. LFCs were converted to fold-changes (FC). Non-

additive outcomes were determined based on the null expectation that FCs in the 3-

member community should reflect a summation of FCs from the pairwise cocultures.

The thresholds for assigning a gene as non-additive upregulation was as follows:

(TM/MC)/(PWC1/MC+PWC2/MC) >1.5

Where TM are the gene counts in the 3-member community, MC are the gene counts in

the monoculture condition, and PWC1/PWC2 are the gene counts in the pairwise

coculture conditions 1 & 2, respectively. We acknowledge that non-additive gene

expression can manifest in many ways and that this calculation presents an overly

simplified quantification that is intended to begin exploration of the phenomenon. Non-

additive gene expression patterns were determined at each time point and plotted using

ggplot2. Venn diagrams were also created to analyze the patterns of non-additivity

across the time series and between the exponential phase time point and stationary

phase times points. Functional enrichment analysis was performed on the collection of

genes determined to have non-additive upregulation using the BiNGO package in

Cytoscape.

Metabolomics

LCMS, feature detection, and quality control

Standard operating protocols were performed at the Department of Energy Joint

Genome Institute as previously described [36]. MZmine2 [56] was used for feature

detection and peak area integration as previously described [36]. Select exometabolites

were identified in MZmine2 by manual observation of both MS and MS/MS data. We

extracted quantities of these identified exometabolites for ANOVA and Tukey HSD post-

hoc analysis in R. We filtered features in three steps to identify coculture-accumulated

exometabolites. The feature-filtering steps were performed as follows on a per-member

basis: (i) retain features where the maximum peak area abundance occurred in any of

the coculture communities ; (ii) a noise filter, the minimum peak area of a feature from a

replicate at any time point needed to be 3 times the maximum peak area of the same

feature in one of the external control replicates, was applied; (iii) coefficient of variation

(CV) values for each feature calculated between replicates at each time point needed to

be less than 20% across the time series.

Four final feature data sets from polar and nonpolar analyses in both ionization modes

were analyzed in MetaboAnalyst 5.0 [57], as reported in our prior work [36, see

Supplementary Methods].

Principal coordinates analysis and statistics

A distance matrix based on the Bray-Curtis dissimilarity metric was used to

calculate dissimilarities between exometabolite profiles. Principal coordinates analysis

was performed using the R package vegan. Principal coordinates were plotted using

ggplot2. Coordinates of the first two PCoA axes were used to perform Protest analysis

using the protest function in vegan. Dissimilarity matrices were used to perform

PERMANOVA and variation partitioning and using the adonis and varpart functions in

vegan, respectively. The RVAideMemoire package was used to perform a post-hoc

pairwise PERMANOVAs. Monoculture controls were removed to focus on coculture

trends.

Non-additive metabolomics production

We present a simple assessment of additivity and acknowledge that there are

other methods and considerations (see *Discussion*). All reference standard normalized,

filtered features (across both polarities and ionization modes) were combined. Non-

additive outcomes were determined based on the null expectation that fold-changes

(FC) in the 3-member community should reflect a summation of FCs from the pairwise

cocultures. The thresholds for assigning a metabolomic feature as non-additive

production was as follows:

(TM)/(PWC1 + PWC2 + PWC3) > 1.5

Where TM is the peak area abundance in the 3-member community, and

PWC1/PWC2/PWC2 are the peak area abundance in the pairwise coculture conditions

1,2, and 3, respectively. FCs were determined at each time point. A feature was

determined to be produced in the 3-member community in a non-additive manner if it

was above the FC threshold at least 3 times during stationary phase. At each time point,

a Z-scored distribution of FCs was plotted in R. Z-scores were extracted from

exometabolite of interest (thailandamide, pyochelin, and capistruin) to plot as vertical

ablines on the Z-scored distributions. In addition, the non-additive features were

extracted from the dataset to generate a heat map in MetaboAnalyst. Ward's clustering

algorithm was used with Euclidean distances from Z-scored data. Data for each sample

are the averages from independent time point replicates (n = 2 to 4).

To find statistical support for non-additive exometabolite production in the 3-

member community, we created an "expected" time course abundance for identified

exometabolites that had non-additive upregulation (thailandamide, pyochelin, and

capistruin). The "expected" time course abundance was determined by calculating the

summation of peak abundances across pairwise cocultures with *B. thailandensis*. Due

to the issue of replicate independence for each time course, the standard deviation

would vary depending on what replicates were combined. As a conservative approach,

we permuted all possible pairwise coculture combinations and used the replicate

combination that resulted in the highest standard deviation. The time course peak

abundance of thailandamide, pyochelin, and capistruin from pairwise cocultures with *B.*

thailandensis, from the 3-member community, and from the "expected" 3-member

community were plotted in ggplot2. We then ran a repeated measures permutation

ANOVA to compare the time course peak abundance of thailandamide, pyochelin, and

capistruin observed in the 3-member community to the "expected" 3-member

community. A post-hoc pairwise t-test was performed to observe which time points were

statistically significant. We note each iteration of repeated measures ANOVA would

result in different statistical result. This was because the replicate identifiers for the

"expected" time course were arbitrarily assigned. For this reason, we only considered a

test significant if it was consistently below a P threshold of 0.05 across 10 iterations of

the code.

Results

Overview

Our major data types included both transcriptomics and metabolomics, and we

integrate these to interpret SynCom dynamics and interactions. Our longitudinal design

resulted in 288 RNAseq samples across the three members, and 168 community

metabolomics samples analyzed in each of four mass spectral modes (polar/nonpolar,

positive/negative modes = 672 total mass spectral profiles). After quality control, we

were left with 281 RNAseq and 605 total mass spectral profiles for the integrated

analyses

[https://github.com/ShadeLab/Paper_Chodkowski_3member_SynCom_2021/tree/maste

r/SummaryOfSamples]. First, we present results of general responses of transcription

(section 1) and exometabolomics (section 2), separately. Then, we integrate

transcriptomic and metabolomic efforts to determine the upregulation of biosynthetic

gene clusters (BSGCs) and identify exometabolites of interest from mass spectrometry

(section 3). We then present a transcriptomics co-expression network to ask how the

upregulation of BSGCs influenced interspecies interactions through coordinated

longitudinal gene expression (section 4). Lastly, we discuss non-additive outcomes in

both transcriptional responses and exometabolite output (section 5).

1. Stationary phase transcript dynamics of microbial community members

We had four replicate, independent timeseries of each of seven community

memberships (three monocultures plus three cocultures of every pair and the 3-member

community), and here focus on the coculture analyses to gain insights into community

outcomes (Figs. S1 & S2). Differential expressed genes were determined by comparing

time series transcript trajectories applying an FDR and LFC threshold (see methods:

Quality filtering and differential gene expression analysis). First, we compared each

coculture to the monoculture control. A range of 153 to 276 genes were differentially

expressed by each member in coculture, irrespective of the identity of neighbors (Fig.

S3). In addition, each member also had differential gene expression that was unique to

a particular neighbor(s). Summarizing across all cocultures, 1089/5639 (19.3%), coding

sequences (CDSs), 1991/4393 CDSs (45.3%), and 3274/5576 CDSs (58.7%) DEGs

were determined for *B. thailandensis*, *C. subtsugae*, and *P. syringae*, respectively. Both

community membership and time contributed to the transcriptional response of each

member (Fig. 1, Table S1). Together, these data suggest that there are both general

and specific consequences of neighbors for the transcriptional responses of these

bacterial community members.

Temporal trajectories in transcript profiles were generally reproducible across

replicates for each member given a particular community membership (PROTEST

analyses, Table S2). Each member had a distinct transcript profile ($0.480 \le r2 \le 0.778$

by Adonis; P value, 0.001; all pairwise false discovery rate [FDR]-adjusted P values,

≤0.01 except for two community memberships, Table S3). For all ordinations,

community membership had the most explanatory value (Axis 1), followed by time (Axis

2), with the most variation explained by the interaction between time and membership

(Table S1). Membership alone accounted for 60.6% and 77.0% of the variation

explained in *C. subtsugae* and *P. syringae* analyses, respectively and 46.3% in the *B.*

thailandensis analysis (Table S1).

When included in the community, *B. thailandensis* strongly determined the

transcript profiles of the other two members. For example, the inclusion of *B.*

thailandensis in a coculture differentiated transcript profiles for both *C. subtsugae* and

P. syringae (Fig. 1B & 1C). Thus, *B. thailandensis* appears to have had a dominating

influence on the transcriptional response of neighbors, and these responses were

dynamic with respect to time.

We analyzed clusters of orthologous groups of proteins (COGs) to infer the

responses of members to their neighbors. Differentially expressed genes were

categorized as upregulated or downregulated based on temporal patterns and

representation in COGs (Fig. S4). We focused on the largest differences between total

DEGs upregulated and total DEGs downregulated within a COG, which provides

insights into broad biological processes affected by community membership. COGs with

large differences toward upregulation in *B. thailandensis* included cell motility [N],

secondary metabolites biosynthesis, transport, and catabolism [Q], and signal

transduction mechanisms [T] while COGs with large differences toward downregulation

included defense mechanisms [V], energy production and conversion [C], translation,

and ribosomal structure and biogenesis [J]. These results suggest that *B. thailandensis*

responds to neighbors via downregulation of growth and reproduction and upregulation

of secondary metabolism. We therefore hypothesized that *B. thailandensis* was

producing bioactive exometabolites against *C. subtsugae* and *P. syringae* to

competitively inhibit their growth.

Because of the strong transcript response of *C. subtsugae* and *P. syringae* when

neighbored with *B. thailandensis* (Fig. 1B & 1C), we focused on COGs within

community memberships with *B. thailandensis* (Fig. S4B & S4C, rows 2 & 3). The COG

with large differences toward upregulation in both *C. subtsugae* and *P. syringae* were

translation, ribosomal structure and biogenesis [J]. COG groups tending toward

downregulation in *C. subtsugae* and *P. syringae* were signal transduction mechanisms

[T] and secondary metabolites biosynthesis, transport, and catabolism [Q], respectively.

These results suggest that the presence of *B. thailandensis* alters its neighbor's ability

to respond to the environment and inhibits secondary metabolism.

The above analyses focused on DEGs determined by comparing each coculture

to the monoculture control. However, we also wanted to understand differences

between pairwise-coculture memberships to determine if the alterations in transcripts

were attributed to specific memberships (aka interspecies interactions). A total of 436, 1

762, and 2 962 DEGs were determined when comparing the *B. thailandensis* pairwise-

cocultures, the *C. subtsugae* pairwise-cocultures, and the *P. syringae* pairwise-

cocultures, respectively. Categorizing coculture DEGs based COGs and temporal

up/downregulation gene trends shows membership-specific effects (Fig. S5). These

data suggest coculture-specific transcriptional alterations driven by interspecies

interactions. Given the physical separation of members in our SynCom plate system,

these interspecies interactions were very likely exometabolite-mediated.

2. Stationary phase exometabolite dynamics of microbial communities

Because member populations are physically separated in the SynCom transwell

system but allowed to interact chemically, observed transcript responses in different

community memberships are inferred to result from exometabolite interactions. Spent

medium from the shared medium reservoir was collected from each transwell plate and

analyzed using mass spectrometry to detect exometabolites. Our previous manuscript

focused on exometabolite dynamics in monocultures [36]. Here, we focused our

analysis on those exometabolites that had maximum accumulation in a coculture (either

in pairs or in 3-member community). Consistent with the transcript analysis, we found

that both community membership and time explained the exometabolite dynamics, and

that the explanatory value of membership and time was maintained across all polarities

and ionization modes (Fig. 2, Table S4).

Temporal trajectories in exometabolite profiles were generally reproducible

across replicates with some exceptions (PROTEST analyses, Table S5, Supplementary

File 1). Exometabolite profiles were distinct by community membership ($0.475 \leq r2 \leq$

0.662 by Adonis; P value, 0.001; all pairwise false discovery rate [FDR]-adjusted P

values, ≤ 0.01 except for two comparisons, Table S6), and also dynamic over time. As

observed for the member transcript profiles, and the interaction between membership

and time had the highest explanatory value for the exometabolite data (Table S4).

We found that the *C. subtsugae-P. syringae* coculture exometabolite profiles

were consistently the most distinct from the other coculture memberships (Fig. 2),

supporting, again, that the inclusion of *B. thailandensis* was a major driver of

exometabolite dynamics, possibly because it provided the largest or most distinctive

contributions to the community exometabolite pool. Indeed, we observed that a majority

of the most abundant exometabolites were either detected uniquely in the *B.*

thailandensis monoculture or accumulated substantially in its included community

memberships (Fig. S6). Some exometabolites detected in *B. thailandensis*-inclusive

communities were not detected in its monocultures (Fig. S6D), suggesting that the

inclusion of neighbors contributed to the accumulation of these particular

exometabolites (e.g. upregulation of biosynthetic gene clusters or lysis products). *C.*

subtsugae and *P. syringae* contributed less to the 3-member community exometabolite

profile, as exometabolites detected in the *C. subtsugae-P. syringae* coculture were less

abundant and had lower accumulation over time in the 3-member community (Fig.

S6A). Together, these results suggest that *B. thailandensis* can suppress or overwhelm

expected outputs from neighbors.

In summary, we observed both increased accumulation and unique production of

exometabolites in pairwise cocultures and in the 3-member community, with *B.*

thailandensis contributing the most to the shared exometabolite pool as determined by

comparisons with its monoculture exometabolite profile. Related, the transcriptional

responses of *C. subtsugae* and *P. syringae* in the 3-member community is most similar

to their respective transcriptional response when neighbored with *B. thailandensis*

alone, despite the presence of the third neighbor.

3. B. thailandensis increases competition strategies in the presence of neighbors

We observed relatively unchanged viability in *B. thailandensis* (Fig. S7). On the

contrary, we observed a slight reduction (~2.1 log2 fold change) in *C. subtsugae* live cell

counts, and a drastic reduction (~4.7 log2 fold change) in *P. syringae* live cell counts,

when either member was cocultured with *B. thailandensis* (Figs. S8 & S9; monoculture

cell counts vs *B. thailandensis* coculture cells counts). We note that one doubling

occurred in *B. thailandensis* and *P. syringae* monocultures, and in *C. violaceum* in

pairwise coculture with *P. syringae.* We elaborate on this finding as the possibility of a

reductive cell division as described in our previous manuscript [36]. Given this reduction

in viability and that there have been competitive interactions between *B. thailandensis*

and *C. subtsugae* previously reported [33], we hypothesized that *B thailandensis* was

using competition strategies to influence its neighbors via production of bioactive

exometabolites. If true, we would expect transcriptional upregulation in *B. thailandensis*

biosynthetic gene clusters (BSGC) that encode bioactive exometabolites. Indeed, we

found evidence of this when *B. thailandensis* had neighbors (Fig. 3, Table S7)*.* This

suggests that *B. thailandensis* responded to neighbors by upregulating genes involved

in the production of bioactive compounds, likely to gain a competitive advantage.

However, not all BSGCs in *B. thailandensis* were upregulated. Some BSGCs were

unaltered or downregulated (Fig. S10). *C. subtsugae* upregulated only 1 BSGC in

coculture with *B. thailandensis,* while *P. syringae* did not upregulate any BSGC in any

coculture (Figs. S11 & S12). Interestingly, coculturing with *C. subtsugae* and *P.*

syringae resulted in the upregulation of an unidentified beta-lactone and an unidentified

non-ribosomal peptide synthetase (NRPS) in *B. thailandensis*, respectively. Similarly,

coculturing with *B. thailandensis* resulted in the upregulation on an unidentified NRPS-

Type I polyketide synthase in *C. subtsugae*. We also note that two additional

unidentified NRPS passed the LFC threshold of 1 in *C. subtsugae*. However, these

were only upregulated at the exponential phase time point and subsequently

downregulated or below the LFC threshold in all stationary phase time points.

Interspecies interactions led to the upregulation of BSGC in both *B. thailandensis* and

C. subtsugae and three of these BSGC encode potentially novel bioactive

exometabolites.

We were able to identify 6 of the 11 exometabolites from the upregulated *B.*

thailandensis BSGCs and quantify their abundances from mass spectrometry data (Fig.

S13, Supplementary File 2). For any given identified exometabolite, it differentially

accumulated between community memberships containing *B. thailandensis* (Table S8),

particularly when comparing the *B. thailandensis* monoculture compared to each

coculture (Table S9). As expected, these identified exometabolites were not detected in

community memberships that did not include *B. thailandensis*. Bactobolin was the only

identified exometabolite that accumulated in monoculture to equivalent levels of

accumulation in all coculture conditions. Thus, *B. thailandensis* increased competition

strategies with neighbors through the upregulation and production of many bioactive

exometabolites. Of these bioactive exometabolites, three are documented

antimicrobials [58, 59, 60], two are siderophores [61, 62], and one is a biosurfactant

[63]. We conclude that *B. thailandensis* produced bioactive exometabolites to

competitively interact using both interference and exploitative competition strategies

[64]. Given that *B. thailandensis* upregulated competition strategies, and responded

more broadly in producing competition-supportive exometabolites when grown with

neighbors, we hypothesized that these bioactive exometabolites are responsible for the

altered transcriptional responses in *C. subtsugae* and *P. syringae*.

4. Interspecies co-transcriptional networks reveal coordinated gene expression

related to competition

We performed interspecies co-expression network analysis to infer interspecies

interactions. We used temporal profiles from transcriptional responses to generate co-

expression networks for *B. thailandensis-C. subtsugae* and *B. thailandensis-P. syringae*

cocultures, respectively (Table S10). As expected, the majority of nodes network had

intraspecies edges only, with interspecies edges comprising 1.85% and 1.90% of the

total edges in the *B. thailandensis-C. subtsugae* and *B. thailandensis-P. syringae*

networks, respectively. We explored interspecies edges for evidence of interspecies

transcriptional co-regulation.

We performed two analyses (module analysis and GO enrichment) to validate

networks and infer interspecies interactions (Fig. S14). Module analysis validated

networks as intraspecies modules enriched for biological processes (Supplementary

File 3). To infer interspecies interactions, we filtered genes with interspecies edges and

performed enrichment analysis (Supplementary File 4). The top enriched Gene

Ontology (GO) term for *B. thailandensis* when paired with *C. subtsugae* was antibiotic

synthesis of thailandamide, supporting interference competition. Though the top

enriched GO term in *B. thailandensis* when paired with *P. syringae* was bacterial-type

flagellum-dependent cell motility, antibiotic synthesis of malleilactone was also enriched.

Both thailandamide genes from the *B. thailandensis-C. subtsugae* network (Fig. 4) and

malleilactone genes from the *B. thailandensis-P. syringae* network (Fig. S15) formed

near-complete modules within their respective BSGCs.

At least one gene from each of *B. thailandensis's* upregulated BSGCs (Fig. 3)

had an interspecies edge, except for rhamnolipid. The top GO term for both *C.*

subtsugae and *P. syringae* genes that had edges shared *B. thailandensis* was bacterial-

type flagellum-dependent motility. Other notable enriched GO processes were efflux

activity for *C. subtsugae* and signal transduction for *P. syringae*. Specifically, a DNA

starvation/stationary phase gene (CLV04_2968, Fig. 4), *dspA*, was within the network

module that also contained thailandamide genes fromthe *B. thailandensis-C. subtsugae*

network and a TonB-dependent siderophore receptor gene (PSPTO_1206, Fig. S15)

was within the network module that also contained malleilactone genes from the *B.*

thailandensis-P. syringae network (Supplementary File 5). Interestingly, both

CLV04_2968 and PSPTO_1206 were DEGs and downregulated when cocultured with

B. thailandensis (Figs. S16A & S17A, respectively). Additionally, the closest homolog for

dspA in *B. thailandensis* was unaltered (BTH_I1284, Supplementary File 6) when

cocultured with *C. subtsugae* (Fig. S16B) and the closest homolog to the TonB-

dependent receptor in *B. thailandensis* (BTH_I2415, Supplementary File 7) was a DEG

and upregulated when cocultured with *P. syrinage* (Fig. S17B). Taken together, these

co-expression networks revealed interspecies coordinated expression patterns.

5. Distinct member responses when assembled together

Within a complex community, there can be outcomes that are not expected based on

interactions that are observed in simpler situations of member pairs [65, 66, 67]. A

typical predictive approach uses the additivity assumption, where the null expectation is

that a members' outcome in more complex communities is a summation of its outcomes

in simpler communities [68]. Patterns that deviate from the assumption arise from

biological phenomena that are deemed non-additive. Much emphasis has been placed

on predictions on the additive (or non-additive deviation) nature of growth outcomes in

more complex environments [15, 69, 70]. Here, we evaluated non-additive

transcriptional responses. We identified genes with non-additive upregulation in the 3-

member community (Fig. S18, Supplementary File 8, see methods: *Non-additive gene*

expression). For *B. thailandensis*, most of these genes consistently had nonadditive

upregulation throughout stationary phase. Both *P. syringae* and *C. subtsugae* tended to

have transient upregulation of genes at a specific timepoint. For each member, there

was a stark contrast in genes with non-additivity between the exponential phase

timepoint and all stationary phase time points. Notably, the top GO enrichments

included antibiotic biosynthesis for *B. thailandensis*, ATPase-coupled sulfate

transmembrane transporter activity for *C. subtsugae*, and nickel cation binding for *P.*

syringae (Supplementary File 9). Of the BSGCs in *B. thailandensis*, multiple genes

involved in the production of thailandamide, pyochelin, and capistruin had non-additive

upregulation. Since we were able to identify some of these compounds as features

within the mass spectral data, we asked if non-additive transcriptional responses

corresponded to non-additive exometabolite ouput.

Most exometabolite features did not exceed our simple expectations of additivity,

as the average fold change across all time points was ~0.6 (Fig. S19). However, we did

find that 858 exometabolomic features accumulated in the 3-member community in a

non-additive manner (Fig. S20), including thailandamide (Fig. 5) and pyochelin (Fig.

S21), but not capistruin (Fig. S22). At the final stationary phase time point (45 h),

thailandamide accumulated ~4-fold more and pyochelin accumulated ~3-fold more than

the additive expectation. Thailandamide and pyochelin were consistently above 1σ of

the average additive fold change for all coculture filtered exometabolites throughout

stationary phase (Fig. S19, ablines). We combined peak areas from pairwise cocultures

to create an "expected" exometabolite abundance over the time course for

thailandamide, pyochelin, and capistruin (Figs. 5, S21, S22, orange). The experimental

exometabolite abundance over the time course was significantly different from the

"expected" exometabolite abundance for thailandamide, but not for pyochelin and

capistruin (repeated measures ANOVA, Table S11). When comparing each time point

separately for thailandamide, significance was obtained only for the initial time

point(Table S12).

Discussion

Here, we used a synthetic community system to understand how

exometabolomic interactions determine members transcriptional responses and

exometabolite outputs. Our experiment used a bottom-up approach to compare the

seven possible community memberships of three members, and their dynamics in

member transcripts and community exometabolites over stationary phase.Differential

gene expression across community memberships and over time show that the

exometabolites released by a member were sensed and responded to by its neighbors.

Furthermore, members' ouputs in monocultures changed because of coculturing, as

evidenced by differential exometabolite production. The largest transcriptional

alterations in *C. subtsugae* and *P. syringae* occurred when cocultured with *B.*

thailandensis. Global expression patterns in *C. subtsugae* and *P. syringae* when in the

3-member community still resembled expression patterns in pairwise cocultures with *B.*

thailandensis. These transcriptional alterations in *C. subtsugae* and *P. syringae* were

coordinated with increases in *B. thailandensis* competitive strategies (evaluated by

BSGC transcript upregulation and exometabolite abundance) . Numerous transcripts

and exometabolite were non-additive in the 3-member community, suggesting that

predictions of members outcomes in more complex communities will not always be a

simple summation of pairwise outcomes. That interactions within a relatively simple

community altered the transcriptional responses and exometabolite outputs of each

member is important because these kinds of alterations could, in turn, drive changes in

community structure and/or function in an environmental setting. For example, it was

shown that interspecies interactions more strongly influenced the assembly of *C.*

elegans gut communities than host-associated factors [71]. Therefore, mechanistic and

ecological characterization of interspecies interactions will inform as to the principles

that govern emergent properties of microbial communities.

Overall, competitive interactions predominated in this synthetic community. Our

previous study found that, over stationary phase in monocultures, each member

released and accumulated at least one exometabolite documented to be involved in

either interference or exploitative competition [36]. This suggests that entry into

stationary phase primed members for competitive interactions, whether there were

heterospecific neighbors present. We interpret this strategy of preemptive aggression to

be especially advantageous to *B. thailandensis,* as it successfully used competitive

strategies against both *C. subtsugae* and *P. syringae*. *B. thailandensis's* success was

supported by decreased viable *P. syringae* cells when cocultured with *B. thailandensis*.

Though *C. subtsugae* viable cell counts were not as affected directly by the coculture

with *B. thailandensis*, *B. thailandensis*-produced bactobolin [72] was detected in the

shared medium reservoir. Bactobolin is a bacteriostatic antibiotic previously shown to be

bioactive against *C. subtsugae* [33] through ribosome binding [58]. But, *C. subtsugae*

can resist bactobolin through upregulation of an RND-type efflux pump [73]. This finding

also is supported by our data, as all genes coding for the CdeAB-OprM RND-type efflux

system were DEGs and upregulated in *C. subtsugae* cocultures with *B. thailandensis*

(CLV04_2413-CLV04_2415).

When cocultured with *B. thailandensis*, we observed COG groups such as

translation, ribosomal structure and biogenesis [J] had large differences toward

upregulation in both *C. subtsugae* and *P. syringae*. At first glance, this seems at odds

with our interpretation of *B. thailandensis* competitiveness toward *C. subtsugae* and *P.*

syringae. In other words, how is B. thailandensis effectively competing via interference

competition if both *C. subtsugae* and *P. syringae* are upregulating machinery for

growth? There is both theoretical [74] and experimental [75] evidence that show how

cells treated with antibiotics stimulate ribosomal production to maintain a sufficient

number of active ribosomes. As previously mentioned, *B. thailandensis*-produced

bactobolin binds to the ribosome and can inhibit *C. subtsugae* [33, 58]. We also have

evidence that bactobolin inhibits *P. syringae* (data not shown). It could be that

bactobolin is stimulating ribosomal production in *C. subtsugae* and *P. syringae* as a

survival mechanism to maintain protein production by maintaining enough active

ribosomes.

Coculturing can induce secondary metabolism [76, 77, 78] because an

exometabolite produced by one microbe can prompt secondary metabolism in a

neighbor [31]. We found that coculturing led to the upregulation of numerous BSGCs in

B. thailandensis. These exometabolites included bactobolin, malleilactone [61, 79;

siderophore and cytotoxin], malleobactin [80, 81; siderophore], capistruin [82; lasso

peptide], thailandamide [83; polyketide], pyochelin [62; siderophore], rhamnolipids [63;

biosurfactants], and two uncharacterized BSGCs encoding nonribosomal peptide

synthetases. Of these exometabolites, bactobolin, capistruin, and thailandamide have

documented antimicrobial activities through translation inhibition [58], transcription

inhibition [59], and inhibition of fatty acid synthesis [60], respectively. For those

exometabolites we were able to identify with mass spectrometry, their accumulation in

cocultures was correlated with the upregulation of their BSGCs. Furthermore,

up/downregulated patterns across all *B. thailandensis* BSGCs is consistent with ScmR

global regulatory patterns of secondary metabolism [84]. Though we were not able to

pinpoint the exact inducers of BSGCs, exometabolites such as antibiotics [85] and

primary metabolites [86] have been documented to induce secondary metabolism in *B.*

thailandensis. *C. subtsugae* can inhibit *B. thailandensis* [33] but we did not observe *B.*

thailandensis inhibition based on cell counts. However, we did find that in stationary

phase *C. subtsugae*-*B. thailandensis* cocultures, *C. subtsugae* upregulated an

uncharacterized hybrid nonribosomal peptide synthetase-type I polyketide synthase. *P.*

syringae was the least competitive of the three neighbors, as evidenced by a reduction

in live cell counts when cocultured with *B. thailandensis*. Also, *P. syringae* did not

increase competitive strategies when cocultured, as no BSGCs were upregulated

across all coculture conditions. In summary, though all three neighbors had potential to

use competitive strategies and maintained competitive strategies in monoculture [36], *B.*

thailandensis was most successful in cocultures over stationary phase through

increased production of exometabolites involved in interference and exploitative

competition strategies.

Given the upregulation of BSGCs in *B. thailandensis* and the strong

transcriptional responses of *C. subtsugae* and *P. syringae* to the presence of *B.*

thailandensis, we hypothesized that competitive exometabolites were contributing to

their community dynamics. Thus, we used a co-expression network analysis with our

longitudinal transcriptome series to infer interspecies interactions [87]. This use of this

approach was first demonstrated to infer coregulation between a phototroph-heterotroph

commensal pair [88]. Our network confirmed that *B. thailandensis* BSGCs had

coordinated gene expression patterns with both *C. subtsugae* and *P. syringae*.

Interspecies nodes in both networks contained various genes involved in the

aforementioned upregulated *B. thailandensis* BSGCs. In particular, we focused on

interspecies edges within thailandamide nodes for the *B. thailandensis-C. subtsugae*

network and interspecies edges within malleilactone nodes for the *B. thailandensis-P.*

syringae network because these were significantly enriched as interspecies nodes. A *C.*

subtsugae gene of interest, CLV04_2968, was contained within the thailandamide

cluster of interspecies nodes. This gene codes for a DNA starvation/stationary phase

protection protein and had the highest homology to the Dps protein in *Escherichia coli*

across all *C. subtsugae* protein coding genes. Dps mediates tolerance to multiple

stressors and *dps* knockouts are more susceptible to thermal, oxidative, antibiotic, iron

toxicity, osmotic, and starvation stressors [89]. Interestingly, CLV04_2968 was

downregulated when cocultured with *B. thailandensis*, suggesting that *B. thailandensis*

attenuates *C. subtsugae* stress tolerance over stationary phase. While we observed a

slight decrease in viable *C. subtsugae* cells when cocultured with *B. thailandensis*, one

may expect *C. subtsugae* to have increased sensitivity to a subsequent stress [e.g. pH

stress; 90] resulting from CLV04_2968 downregulation in the presence of *B.*

thailandensis.

In the *B. thailandensis-P. syringae* co-expression network, a *P. syringae* gene of

interest, PSPTO_1206, was contained within the malleilactone cluster of interspecies

nodes. PSPTO_1206 is annotated as a TonB-dependent siderophore receptor. A *P.*

syringae iron-acquistion receptor had coordinated expression with a malleilactone,

which has been characterized as a siderophore with antimicrobial properties [61].

Interestingly, this gene was downregulated when in coculture with *B. thailandensis*. In

contrast, the closest TonB-dependent siderophore receptor homolog to PSPTO_1206 in

B. thailandensis, BTH_I2415, was upregulated in coculture conditions with *P. syringae*.

To summarize, co-expression network analysis revealed interspecies coordinated gene

expression patterns Though determining directionality was beyond the scope of this

analysis*,* we observed*B. thailandensis*-increased competition strategies were

coordinated with a potential decrease in competition strategies in *C. subtsugae* via

reduced stress tolerance and in *P. syringae* with reduced iron acquisition ability.

A major goal in microbial ecology is to predict community dynamics for purposes

of modulating and/or maintaining ecosystem function [91, 92]. At its core, microbial

functional properties emerge, in part, from the concerted interactions of multi-species

assemblages. Predictions can be complicated by non-additive phenomena that arise in

more complex communities. For example, non-additive phenomena have been

documented in gene expression [93, 94], growth [69], and fitness [95]. Here, we also

have documented non-additive transcriptional responses and exometabolite outputs in

our system when combinatorial stimuli were present in the 3-member community. *B.*

thailandensis BSGCs displayed non-additive phenomena, as we are able show that the

transcriptional response of certain BSGCs in the 3-member community was greater

than the naive summation of transcriptional response in pairwise memberships.

Furthermore, non-additive transcriptional responses resulted in non-additive

exometabolite accumulation (e.g. thailandamide & pyochelin) with exceptions (e.g.

capistruin). While we realize that our criteria for determining non-additivity was simplistic

and arbitrarily defined, we consider the findings from this study to springboard further

exploration. Future studies can focus on genes of interest with purposes of modeling

transcriptional behaviors [96] to interspecies interactions to investigate non-additive

phenomenon. In addition, we only quantified exometabolite accumulation in the shared

medium reservoir. Differential release and uptake of bioactive molecules within the

community can complicate tracking metabolite dynamics in the system. Thus, analyses

that incorporate both intracellular and extracellular metabolomics can provide a more

complete understanding of altered microbial metabolism and non-additive exometabolite

production under different conditions. Regardless, we documented non-additive

accumulation of secondary metabolites involved in both competition strategies. This

finding may have implications for high-order interactions, meaning, the nature of the

interaction between two members may be altered by the addition of a third member [97].

For example, one member could produce sublethal antibiotics in the presence of an

antibiotic-sensitive member. The addition of a third member could stimulate the

antibiotic producer to increase antibiotic production, altering the nature of the initial

interaction from sublethal to lethal for antibiotic-sensitive member [98]. In other words,

the nature of interactions may be altered depending on surrounding stimuli that can

exacerbate bacterial behaviors not expected by studying the system as simpler parts

[66]. Therefore, characterizing transcriptome and metabolome dynamics in microbial

communities is expected to inform how non-additive phenomena arise and how they

contribute to deviations in predictive models of community outcomes.

One feature of our study is that we adjusted glucose concentration depending on

plate occupancy. Glucose concentration increased as membership increased, but a

member consistently occupied 31 wells across all experimental conditions. One could

argue that resource concentration contributed to differences in transcripts and

exometabolites and not interspecies interactions. However, DEGs were present when

comparing pairwise coculture conditions and these were attributed to differences in

temporal regulation of COG categories (Fig. S5). More specifically, regarding BSGCs,

an unidentified NRPS was upregulated in *B. thailandensis* when cocultured with *P.*

syringae but not when cocultured with *C. subtsugae* (Fig. 3) and, an unidentified NRPS-

Type I polyketide synthase was upregulated in *C. subtsugae* when cocultured with *B.*

thailandensis but not when cocultured with *P. syringae* (Fig. S11). These differences

occurred in experimental conditions where the glucose concentration was the same.

Thus, we are confident that some changes in transcripts and exometabolites are

attributable to membership-specific exometabolite-mediated interspecies interactions.

As resource concentration and exometabolite output are intertwined, subsequent work

could test how initial resources availability determines SynCom outcomes.

Our results indicated that each member continued to maintain competitive

strategies despite stagnant population growth. *B. thailandensis* upregulated various

bioactive exometabolites involved in both interference and exploitative competition

when with neighbors. An effective competitor is often defined as by its ability to

outcompete neighbors via growth advantage that stems from efficient nutrient uptake

and/or biomass conversion rates [99, 100]. We add to this that a competitor can also

have a fitness advantage through effective maintenance, which can similarly employ

interference or exploitative competitive strategies despite no net growth. Maintenance

may ensure survival in some environments that impose a stationary phase lifestyle,

where long periods of nutrient depletion are punctuated with short periods of nutrient

flux. In these scenarios, it warrants to understand how competitive strategies are

deployed in the interim of growth and the extent to which these interactions contribute to

long-term community outcomes. Though population levels remain constant, sub-

populations of growing cells have been observed in stationary phase [101], and

continued production of competitive exometabolites may serve as an advantageous

strategy to hinder growth of competitors. In addition, some antibiotics remain effective in

non-replicating bacteria [102]. The ability for continued maintenance via effective

competition strategies during stationary phase may provide spatiotemporal maintenance

of population levels before growth resumption [103]. Alternatively, both growth and non-

growth strategies may be occurring simultaneously (e.g. as can occur in biofilms). The

heterogeneity of biofilms may provide an environment where a bacterial population

contains both stationary cells in the center of the colony with growing cells at the

periphery of the colony that compete and alter developmental patterns of neighboring

populations [104, 105]. Thus, we expect that insights into the long-term consequences

of competition for microbial community outcomes will be gained by considering

competition in both active growth and maintenance scenarios.

Code availability

Computing code, workflows, and data sets are available at

[https://github.com/ShadeLab/Paper_Chodkowski_3member_SynCom_2021]. R

packages used during computing analyses included DEseq2 [41], ImpulseDE2 [42],

VennDiagram [43], ggplot2 [44], vegan 2.5-4 [45], RVAideMemoire [46], Minet [50],

rtracklayer [106], viridis [107], and helper functions [108, 109, 110, 111].

Data availability

Genomes for *B. thailandensis*, *C. subtsugae*, and *P. syringae* are available at the

National Center for Biotechnology Information (NCBI) under accession

numbers NC_007651 (Chromosome I)/NC_007650 (Chromosome

II), NZ_PKBZ01000001, and NC_004578 (Chromosome)/NC_004633 (Plasmid

A)/NC_004632 (Plasmid B), respectively. An improved annotated draft genome of *C.*

subtsugae is available under NCBI BioProject accession

number PRJNA402426 (GenBank accession number PKBZ00000000). Data for

resequencing efforts for *B. thailandensis* and *P. syringae* are under NCBI BioProject

accession numbers PRJNA402425 and PRJNA402424, respectively. Metabolomics

data and transcriptomics data are also available at the JGI Genome Portal [112] under

JGI proposal identifier 502921. MZmine XML parameter files for all analyses can be

viewed at and downloaded from GitHub (see Dataset 7

at https://github.com/ShadeLab/Paper_Chodkowski_MonocultureExometabolites_2020/t

ree/master/Datasets). Large data files (e.g., MZmine project files) are available upon

request. Supplementary files are also available on GitHub

(https://github.com/ShadeLab/Paper_Chodkowski_3member_SynCom_2021/tree/maste

r/Supplemental_Files).

Acknowledgements

This material is based upon work supported by the National Science Foundation under

grant DEB 1749544 and by Michigan State University. In addition, metabolite analysis

and transcript sequencing were provided by a DOE-JGI Community Science Program

award (proposal identifier 502921). The work conducted by the U.S. Department of

Energy Joint Genome Institute, a DOE Office of Science User Facility, is supported

under contract number DE-AC02-05CH11231. J.L.C. was supported by the Eleanor L.

Gilmore Fellowship from the Department of Microbiology and Molecular Genetics.

We thank Katherine B. Louie and Benjamin P. Bowen for support in mass spectral

analysis.

Competing Interests

904 The authors declare no competing financial interests.

Author contributions

J.L.C. and A.S. conceived of and designed the study. J.L.C. performed the research

and analyses. J.L.C. and A.S. wrote the manuscript.

References

1. Stock, A. M., Robinson, V. L., & Goudreau, P. N. (2000). Two-component signal transduction. Annual Review of Biochemistry, 69, 183–215. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.biochem.69.1.183

2. Browning, D. F., & Busby, S. J. W. (2004). The regulation of bacterial transcription initiation. Nature Reviews Microbiology, 2(1), 57–65. https://doi.org/10.1038/nrmicro787

3. Pietschke, C., Treitz, C., Forêt, S., Schultze, A., Künzel, S., Tholey, A., … Fraune, S. (2017). Host modification of a bacterial quorum-sensing signal induces a phenotypic switch in bacterial symbionts. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, 114(40), E8488–E8497. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1706879114

4. Garren, M., Son, K., Tout, J., Seymour, J. R., & Stocker, R. (2016). Temperature-induced behavioral switches in a bacterial coral pathogen. ISME Journal, 10(6), 1363–1372. https://doi.org/10.1038/ismej.2015.216

5. Kato, S., Haruta, S., Cui, Z. J., Ishii, M., & Igarashi, Y. (2005). Stable coexistence of five bacterial strains as a cellulose-degrading community. Applied and Environmental Microbiology, 71(11), 7099–7106. https://doi.org/10.1128/AEM.71.11.7099-7106.2005

6. Megan Steinweg, J., Dukes, J. S., Paul, E. A., & Wallenstein, M. D. (2013). Microbial responses to multi-factor climate change: Effects on soil enzymes. Frontiers in Microbiology, 4, 146. https://doi.org/10.3389/fmicb.2013.00146

7. Aziz, F. A. A., Suzuki, K., Ohtaki, A., Sagegami, K., Hirai, H., Seno, J., … Futamata, H. (2015). Interspecies interactions are an integral determinant of microbial community dynamics. Frontiers in Microbiology, 6, 1148. https://doi.org/10.3389/fmicb.2015.01148

8. Orr, J. A., Vinebrooke, R. D., Jackson, M. C., Kroeker, K. J., Kordas, R. L., Mantyka-Pringle, C., … Piggott, J. J. (2020). Towards a unified study of multiple stressors: Divisions and common goals across research disciplines. Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences, 287(1926), 20200421. https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2020.0421

9. Little, A. E. F., Robinson, C. J., Peterson, S. B., Raffa, K. F., & Handelsman, J. (2008). Rules of engagement: Interspecies interactions that regulate microbial communities. Annual Review of Microbiology, 62, 375–401. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.micro.030608.101423

948 10. Phelan, V. V, Liu, W.-T., Pogliano, K., & Dorrestein, P. C. (2011). Microbial metabolic exchange-
949 -the chemotype-to-phenotype link. Nature Chemical Biology, 8(1), 26–35.
950 https://doi.org/10.1038/nchembio.739
951
952 11. Kell, D. B., Brown, M., Davey, H. M., Dunn, W. B., Spasic, I., & Oliver, S. G. (2005). Metabolic
953 footprinting and systems biology: The medium is the message. Nature Reviews Microbiology,
954 3(7), 557–565. https://doi.org/10.1038/nrmicro1177
955
956 12. Pinu, F. R., & Villas-Boas, S. G. (2017). Extracellular microbial metabolomics: The state of the
957 art. Metabolites, 7(3), 43. https://doi.org/10.3390/metabo7030043
958
959 13. Silva, L. P., & Northen, T. R. (2015). Exometabolomics and MSI: Deconstructing how cells
960 interact to transform their small molecule environment. Current Opinion in Biotechnology, 34,
961 209–216. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copbio.2015.03.015
962
963 14. Großkopf, T., & Soyer, O. S. (2014). Synthetic microbial communities. Current Opinion in
964 Microbiology, 18(1), 72–77. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mib.2014.02.002
965
966 15. Foster, K. R., & Bell, T. (2012). Competition, not cooperation, dominates interactions among
967 culturable microbial species. Current Biology, 22(19), 1845–1850.
968 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2012.08.005
969
970 16. Coyte, K. Z., Schluter, J., & Foster, K. R. (2015). The ecology of the microbiome: Networks,
971 competition, and stability. Science, 350(6261), 663–666.
972 https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aad2602
973
974 17. Hibbing, M. E., Fuqua, C., Parsek, M. R., & Peterson, S. B. (2010). Bacterial competition:
975 Surviving and thriving in the microbial jungle. Nature Reviews Microbiology, 8(1), 15–25.
976 https://doi.org/10.1038/nrmicro2259
977
978 18. Tilman, D. (1982). Resource Competition and Community Structure. Princeton, NJ, U.S.A.:
979 Princeton University Press.
980
981 19. Stewart, F. M., & Levin, B. R. (1973). Partitioning of Resources and the Outcome of Interspecific
982 Competition: A Model and Some General Considerations. The American Naturalist, 107(954),
983 171–198. https://doi.org/10.1086/282825
984
985 20. Smith, H. L. (2011). Bacterial competition in serial transfer culture. Mathematical Biosciences,
986 229(2), 149–159. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mbs.2010.12.001
987
988 21. Pekkonen, M., Korhonen, J., & Laakso, J. T. (2011). Increased survival during famine improves
989 fitness of bacteria in a pulsed-resource environment. Evolutionary Ecology Research (Vol.
990 13). Evolutionary Ecology, Ltd.
991
992 22. Holt, R. D. (2008). Theoretical perspectives on resource pulses. Ecology, 89(3), 671–681.
993 https://doi.org/10.1890/07-0348.1
994
995 23. Schimel, J. P. (2018). Life in dry soils: Effects of drought on soil microbial communities and
996 processes. Annual Review of Ecology, Evolution, and Systematics, 49, 409–432.
997 https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-ecolsys-110617-062614
998

999   24. Chiesa, S. C., Irvine, R. L., & Manning, J. F. (1985). Feast/famine growth environments and
1000   activated sludge population selection. Biotechnology and Bioengineering, 27(5), 562–568.
1001   https://doi.org/10.1002/bit.260270503
1002
1003   25. Fetissov, S. O. (2017). Role of the gut microbiota in host appetite control: Bacterial growth to
1004   animal feeding behaviour. Nature Reviews Endocrinology, 13(1), 11–25.
1005   https://doi.org/10.1038/nrendo.2016.150
1006
1007   26. Hiltunen, T., Laakso, J., Kaitala, V., Suomalainen, L. R., & Pekkonen, M. (2008). Temporal
1008   variability in detritus resource maintains diversity of bacterial communities. Acta Oecologica,
1009   33(3), 291–299. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.actao.2007.12.002
1010
1011   27. Navarro Llorens, J. M., Tormo, A., & Martínez-García, E. (2010). Stationary phase in gram-
1012   negative bacteria. FEMS Microbiology Reviews, 34(4), 476–495.
1013   https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1574-6976.2010.00213.x
1014
1015   28. Čihák, M., Kameník, Z., Šmídová, K., Bergman, N., Benada, O., Kofronová, O., … Bobek, J.
1016   (2017). Secondary metabolites produced during the germination of Streptomyces coelicolor.
1017   Frontiers in Microbiology, 8, 2495. https://doi.org/10.3389/fmicb.2017.02495
1018
1019   29. Medema, M. H., Kottmann, R., Yilmaz, P., Cummings, M., Biggins, J. B., Blin, K., … Glöckner, F.
1020   O. (2015). Minimum Information about a Biosynthetic Gene cluster. Nature Chemical Biology,
1021   11(9), 625–631. https://doi.org/10.1038/nchembio.1890
1022
1023   30. Cornforth, D. M., & Foster, K. R. (2013). Competition sensing: The social side of bacterial stress
1024   responses. Nature Reviews Microbiology, 11(4), 285–293.
1025   https://doi.org/10.1038/nrmicro2977
1026
1027   31. Okada, B. K., & Seyedsayamdost, M. R. (2017). Antibiotic dialogues: Induction of silent
1028   biosynthetic gene clusters by exogenous small molecules. FEMS Microbiology Reviews,
1029   41(1), 19–33. https://doi.org/10.1093/femsre/fuw035
1030
1031   32. Goh, E. B., Yim, G., Tsui, W., McClure, J. A., Surette, M. G., & Davies, J. (2002). Transcriptional
1032   modulation of bacterial gene expression by subinhibitory concentrations of antibiotics.
1033   Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, 99(26),
1034   17025–17030. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.252607699
1035
1036   33. Chandler, J. R., Heilmann, S., Mittler, J. E., & Greenberg, E. P. (2012). Acyl-homoserine
1037   lactone-dependent eavesdropping promotes competition in a laboratory co-culture model.
1038   ISME Journal, 6(12), 2219–2228. https://doi.org/10.1038/ismej.2012.69
1039
1040   34. De Roy, K., Marzorati, M., Van den Abbeele, P., Van de Wiele, T., & Boon, N. (2014). Synthetic
1041   microbial ecosystems: an exciting tool to understand and apply microbial communities.
1042   Environmental Microbiology, 16(6), 1472–1481. https://doi.org/10.1111/1462-2920.12343
1043
1044   35. Chodkowski, J. L., & Shade, A. (2017). A Synthetic Community System for Probing Microbial
1045   Interactions Driven by Exometabolites. MSystems, 2(6), e00129-17.
1046   https://doi.org/10.1128/msystems.00129-17
1047
1048   36. Chodkowski, J. L., & Shade, A. (2020). Exometabolite Dynamics over Stationary Phase Reveal
1049   Strain-Specific Responses. MSystems, 5(6), e00493-20.
1050   https://doi.org/10.1128/msystems.00493-20
1051

37. Brett, P. J., DeShazer, D., & Woods, D. E. (1998). Burkholderia thailandensis sp. nov., a Burkholderia pseudomallei-like species. International Journal of Systematic Bacteriology, 48 Pt 1(1), 317–320. https://doi.org/10.1099/00207713-48-1-317

38. Wells, J. S., Trejo, W. H., Principe, P. A., Bush, K., Georgopapadakou, N., Bonner, D. P., & Sykes, R. B. (1982). SQ 26,180, a novel monobactam. I Taxonomy, fermentation and biological properties. The Journal of Antibiotics, 35(2), 184–188. https://doi.org/10.7164/ANTIBIOTICS.35.184

39. Buell, C. R., Joardar, V., Lindeberg, M., Selengut, J., Paulsen, I. T., Gwinn, M. L., … Collmer, A. (2003). The complete genome sequence of the Arabidopsis and tomato pathogen Pseudomonas syringae pv. tomato DC3000. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 100(18), 10181–10186. https://doi.org/10.1073/PNAS.1731982100

40. Harrison, A. M., & Soby, S. D. (2020). Reclassification of Chromobacterium violaceum ATCC 31532 and its quorum biosensor mutant CV026 to Chromobacterium subtsugae. *AMB Express*, *10*(1), 202. https://doi.org/10.1186/S13568-020-01140-1

41. Love, M. I., Huber, W., & Anders, S. (2014). Moderated estimation of fold change and dispersion for RNA-seq data with DESeq2. Genome Biology, 15, 550. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13059-014-0550-8

42. Fischer, D. S., Theis, F. J., & Yosef, N. (2018). Impulse model-based differential expression analysis of time course sequencing data. Nucleic Acids Research, 46(20), 119. https://doi.org/10.1093/nar/gky675

43. Chen, H. (2018). VennDiagram: Generate High-Resolution Venn and Euler Plots. R package version 1.6.20.

44. Wickham, H. (2016). ggplot2: Elegant Graphics for Data Analysis. Springer-Verlag New York.

45. Oksanen, J., Blanchet, F. G., Friendly, M., Kindt, R., Legendre, P., McGlinn, D., … Wagner, H. (2019). vegan: Community Ecology Package. R package version 2.5-4.

46. Herve M. (2020). RVAideMemoire: testing and plotting procedures for biostatistics. R Packag version 09-77.

47. Blin, K., Shaw, S., Kloosterman, A. M., Charlop-Powers, Z., van Wezel, G. P., Medema, M. H., & Weber, T. (2021). antiSMASH 6.0: improving cluster detection and comparison capabilities. Nucleic Acids Research, 49(W1), W29–W35. https://doi.org/10.1093/NAR/GKAB335

48. Kautsar, S. A., Blin, K., Shaw, S., Navarro-Muñoz, J. C., Terlouw, B. R., van der Hooft, J. J. J., … Medema, M. H. (2020). MIBiG 2.0: a repository for biosynthetic gene clusters of known function. Nucleic Acids Research, 48(D1), D454–D458. https://doi.org/10.1093/NAR/GKZ882

49. Faith, J. J., Hayete, B., Thaden, J. T., Mogno, I., Wierzbowski, J., Cottarel, G., … Gardner, T. S. (2007). Large-scale mapping and validation of Escherichia coli transcriptional regulation from a compendium of expression profiles. PLoS Biology, 5(1), e8. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.0050008

50. Meyer, P. E., Lafitte, F., & Bontempi, G. (2008). Minet: A r/bioconductor package for inferring large transcriptional networks using mutual information. BMC Bioinformatics, 9(1), 461. https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2105-9-461

1105
1106   51. McClure, R. S., Overall, C. C., Mcdermott, J. E., Hill, E. A., Markillie, L. M., Mccue, L. A., …
1107   Beliaev, A. S. (2016). Network analysis of transcriptomics expands regulatory landscapes in
1108   Synechococcus sp. PCC 7002. Nucleic Acids Research, 44(18), 8810–8825.
1109   https://doi.org/10.1093/nar/gkw737
1110
1111   52. Shannon, P., Markiel, A., Ozier, O., Baliga, N. S., Wang, J. T., Ramage, D., … Ideker, T. (2003).
1112   Cytoscape: A software Environment for integrated models of biomolecular interaction
1113   networks. Genome Research, 13(11), 2498–2504. https://doi.org/10.1101/gr.1239303
1114
1115   53. Götz, S., García-Gómez, J. M., Terol, J., Williams, T. D., Nagaraj, S. H., Nueda, M. J., …
1116   Conesa, A. (2008). High-throughput functional annotation and data mining with the Blast2GO
1117   suite. Nucleic Acids Research, 36(10), 3420–3435. https://doi.org/10.1093/nar/gkn176
1118
1119   54. Zdobnov, E. M., & Apweiler, R. (2001). InterProScan - An integration platform for the signature-
1120   recognition methods in InterPro. Bioinformatics, 17(9), 847–848.
1121   https://doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/17.9.847
1122
1123   55. Maere, S., Heymans, K., & Kuiper, M. (2005). BiNGO: a Cytoscape plugin to assess
1124   overrepresentation of gene ontology categories in biological networks. Bioinformatics
1125   (Oxford, England), 21(16), 3448–3449. https://doi.org/10.1093/BIOINFORMATICS/BTI551
1126
1127   56. Pluskal, T., Castillo, S., Villar-Briones, A., & Orešič, M. (2010). MZmine 2: Modular framework
1128   for processing, visualizing, and analyzing mass spectrometry-based molecular profile data.
1129   BMC Bioinformatics, 11, 395. https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2105-11-395
1130
1131   57. Pang, Z., Chong, J., Zhou, G., de Lima Morais, D. A., Chang, L., Barrette, M., … Xia, J. (2021).
1132   MetaboAnalyst 5.0: narrowing the gap between raw spectra and functional insights. Nucleic
1133   Acids Research, (1), gkab382. https://doi.org/10.1093/nar/gkab382
1134
1135   58. Amunts, A., Fiedorczuk, K., Truong, T. T., Chandler, J., Peter Greenberg, E., & Ramakrishnan,
1136   V. (2015). Bactobolin A binds to a site on the 70S ribosome distinct from previously seen
1137   antibiotics. Journal of Molecular Biology, 427(4), 753–755.
1138   https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmb.2014.12.018
1139
1140   59. Kuznedelov, K., Semenova, E., Knappe, T. A., Mukhamedyarov, D., Srivastava, A., Chatterjee,
1141   S., … Severinov, K. (2011). The antibacterial threaded-lasso peptide capistruin inhibits
1142   bacterial RNA polymerase. Journal of Molecular Biology, 412(5), 842–848.
1143   https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmb.2011.02.060
1144
1145   60. Wozniak, C. E., Lin, Z., Schmidt, E. W., Hughes, K. T., & Liou, T. G. (2018). Thailandamide, a
1146   fatty acid synthesis antibiotic that is coexpressed with a resistant target gene. Antimicrobial
1147   Agents and Chemotherapy, 62(9), e00463-18. https://doi.org/10.1128/AAC.00463-18
1148
1149   61. Biggins, J. B., Ternei, M. A., & Brady, S. F. (2012). Malleilactone, a polyketide synthase-derived
1150   virulence factor encoded by the cryptic secondary metabolome of Burkholderia pseudomallei
1151   group pathogens. Journal of the American Chemical Society, 134(32), 13192–13195.
1152   https://doi.org/10.1021/ja3052156
1153
1154   62. Butt, A. T., & Thomas, M. S. (2017). Iron acquisition mechanisms and their role in the virulence
1155   of Burkholderia species. Frontiers in Cellular and Infection Microbiology, 7, 460.
1156   https://doi.org/10.3389/fcimb.2017.00460
1157

63. Dubeau, D., Déziel, E., Woods, D. E., & Lépine, F. (2009). Burkholderia thailandensis harbors two identical rhl gene clusters responsible for the biosynthesis of rhamnolipids. BMC Microbiology, 9(1), 1–12. https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2180-9-263

64. Ghoul, M., & Mitri, S. (2016). The Ecology and Evolution of Microbial Competition. Trends in Microbiology, 24(10), 833–845. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tim.2016.06.011

65. Sanchez-Gorostiaga, A., Bajić, D., Osborne, M. L., Poyatos, J. F., & Sanchez, A. (2019). High-order interactions distort the functional landscape of microbial consortia. PLoS Biology, 17(12), e3000550. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.3000550

66. Mickalide, H., & Kuehn, S. (2019). Higher-Order Interaction between Species Inhibits Bacterial Invasion of a Phototroph-Predator Microbial Community. Cell Systems, 9(6), 521-533.e10. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cels.2019.11.004

67. D'hoe, K., Vet, S., Faust, K., Moens, F., Falony, G., Gonze, D., … Raes, J. (2018). Integrated culturing, modeling and transcriptomics uncovers complex interactions and emergent behavior in a three-species synthetic gut community. ELife, 7, e37090. https://doi.org/10.7554/eLife.37090

68. Momeni, B., Xie, L., & Shou, W. (2017). Lotka-Volterra pairwise modeling fails to capture diverse pairwise microbial interactions. ELife, 6, e25051. https://doi.org/10.7554/eLife.25051.001

69. Pacheco, A. R., Osborne, M. L., & Segrè, D. (2021). Non-additive microbial community responses to environmental complexity. Nature Communications, 12(1), 1–11. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-021-22426-3

70. Estrela, S., Sanchez-Gorostiaga, A., Vila, J. C. C., & Sanchez, A. (2021). Nutrient dominance governs the assembly of microbial communities in mixed nutrient environments. ELife, 10, e65948. https://doi.org/10.7554/eLife.65948

71. Ortiz, A., Vega, N. M., Ratzke, C., & Gore, J. (2021). Interspecies bacterial competition regulates community assembly in the C. elegans intestine. ISME J, 1–15. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41396-021-00910-4

72. Duerkop, B. A., Varga, J., Chandler, J. R., Peterson, S. B., Herman, J. P., Churchill, M. E. A., … Greenberg, E. P. (2009). Quorum-sensing control of antibiotic synthesis in Burkholderia thailandensis. Journal of Bacteriology, 191(12), 3909–3918. https://doi.org/10.1128/JB.00200-09

73. Evans, K. C., Benomar, S., Camuy-Vélez, L. A., Nasseri, E. B., Wang, X., Neuenswander, B., & Chandler, J. R. (2018). Quorum-sensing control of antibiotic resistance stabilizes cooperation in Chromobacterium *subtsugae*. ISME J, 12(5), 1263–1272. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41396-018-0047-7

74. Maitra, A., & Dill, K. A. (2016). Modeling the Overproduction of Ribosomes when Antibacterial Drugs Act on Cells. Biophysical Journal, 110(3), 743–748. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.BPJ.2015.12.016

75. Dennis, P. P. (1976). Effects of chloramphenicol on the transcriptional activities of ribosomal RNA and ribosomal protein genes in Escherichia coli. Journal of Molecular Biology, 108(3), 535–546. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-2836(76)80135-0

76. Pettit, R. K. (2009). Mixed fermentation for natural product drug discovery. Applied Microbiology and Biotechnology, 83(1), 19–25. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00253-009-1916-9

77. Netzker, T., Fischer, J., Weber, J., Mattern, D. J., König, C. C., Valiante, V., … Brakhage, A. A. (2015). Microbial communication leading to the activation of silent fungal secondary metabolite gene clusters. Frontiers in Microbiology. Frontiers Media S.A. https://doi.org/10.3389/fmicb.2015.00299

78. Zhu, H., Sandiford, S. K., & Van Wezel, G. P. (2014). Triggers and cues that activate antibiotic production by actinomycetes. Journal of Industrial Microbiology and Biotechnology, 41(2), 371–386. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10295-013-1309

79. Truong, T. T., Seyedsayamdost, M., Greenberg, E. P., & Chandler, J. R. (2015). A Burkholderia thailandensis acyl-homoserine lactone-independent orphan LuxR homolog that activates production of the cytotoxin malleilactone. Journal of Bacteriology, 197(21), 3456–3462. https://doi.org/10.1128/JB.00425-15

80. Alice, A. F., López, C. S., Lowe, C. A., Ledesma, M. A., & Crosa, J. H. (2006). Genetic and transcriptional analysis of the siderophore malleobactin biosynthesis and transport genes in the human pathogen Burkholderia pseudomallei K96243. Journal of Bacteriology, 188(4), 1551–1566. https://doi.org/10.1128/JB.188.4.1551-1566.2006

81. Gupta, A., Bedre, R., Thapa, S. S., Sabrin, A., Wang, G., Dassanayake, M., & Grove, A. (2017). Global Awakening of Cryptic Biosynthetic Gene Clusters in Burkholderia thailandensis. ACS Chemical Biology, 12(12), 3012–3021. https://doi.org/10.1021/acschembio.7b00681

82. Knappe, T. A., Linne, U., Zirah, S., Rebuffat, S., Xie, X., & Marahiel, M. A. (2008). Isolation and structural characterization of capistruin, a lasso peptide predicted from the genome sequence of Burkholderia thailandensis E264. Journal of the American Chemical Society, 130(34), 11446–11454. https://doi.org/10.1021/ja802966g

83. Ishida, K., Lincke, T., Behnken, S., & Hertweck, C. (2010). Induced biosynthesis of cryptic polyketide metabolites in a Burkholderia thailandensis quorum sensing mutant. Journal of the American Chemical Society, 132(40), 13966–13968. https://doi.org/10.1021/ja105003g

84. Mao, D., Bushin, L. B., Moon, K., Wu, Y., & Seyedsayamdost, M. R. (2017). Discovery of scmR as a global regulator of secondary metabolism and virulence in Burkholderia thailandensis E264. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, 114(14), E2920–E2928. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1619529114

85. Okada, B. K., Wu, Y., Mao, D., Bushin, L. B., & Seyedsayamdost, M. R. (2016). Mapping the Trimethoprim-Induced Secondary Metabolome of Burkholderia thailandensis. ACS Chemical Biology, 11(8), 2124–2130. https://doi.org/10.1021/acschembio.6b00447

86. Li, A., Mao, D., Yoshimura, A., Rosen, P. C., Martin, W. L., Gallant, É., … Seyedsayamdost, M. R. (2020). Multi-omic analyses provide links between low-dose antibiotic treatment and induction of secondary metabolism in Burkholderia thailandensis. MBio, 11(1), e03210-19. https://doi.org/10.1128/mBio.03210-19

87. McClure, R. S. (2019). Toward a Better Understanding of Species Interactions through Network Biology. MSystems, 4(3), e00114-19. https://doi.org/10.1128/msystems.00114-19

88. McClure, R. S., Overall, C. C., Hill, E. A., Song, H.-S., Charania, M., Bernstein, H. C., … Beliaev, A. S. (2018). Species-specific transcriptomic network inference of interspecies interactions. ISME J, 12(8), 2011–2023. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41396-018-0145-6

89. Karas, V. O., Westerlaken, I., & Meyer, A. S. (2015). The DNA-binding protein from starved cells (Dps) utilizes dual functions to defend cells against multiple stresses. Journal of Bacteriology, 197(19), 3206–3215. https://doi.org/10.1128/JB.00475-15

90. Nair, S., & Finkel, S. E. (2004). Dps protects cells against multiple stresses during stationary phase. Journal of Bacteriology, 186(13), 4192–4198. https://doi.org/10.1128/JB.186.13.4192-4198.2004

91. Antwis, R. E., Griffiths, S. M., Harrison, X. A., Aranega-Bou, P., Arce, A., Bettridge, A. S., … Sutherland, W. J. (2017). Fifty important research questions in microbial ecology. FEMS Microbiology Ecology, 93(5), fix044. https://doi.org/10.1093/femsec/fix044

92. Konopka, A. (2009). What is microbial community ecology. ISME J, 3(11), 1223–1230. https://doi.org/10.1038/ismej.2009.88

93. Cornforth, D. M., Popat, R., McNally, L., Gurney, J., Scott-Phillips, T. C., Ivens, A., … Brown, S. P. (2014). Combinatorial quorum sensing allows bacteria to resolve their social and physical environment. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, 111(11), 4280–4284. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1319175111

94. Bundy, B. M., Collier, L. S., Hoover, T. R., & Neidle, E. L. (2002). Synergistic transcriptional activation by one regulatory protein in response to two metabolites. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, 99(11), 7693–7698. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.102605799

95. Morin, M., Pierce, E. C., & Dutton, R. J. (2018). Changes in the genetic requirements for microbial interactions with increasing community complexity. ELife, 7, e37072. https://doi.org/10.7554/eLife.37072

96. Dukler, N., Gulko, B., Huang, Y. F., & Siepel, A. (2016). Is a super-enhancer greater than the sum of its parts? Nature Genetics, 49(1), 2. https://doi.org/10.1038/NG.3759

97. Billick, I., & Case, T. J. (1994). Higher order interactions in ecological communities: What are they and how can they be detected? Ecology, 75(6), 1529–1543. https://doi.org/10.2307/1939614

98. Bernier, S. P., & Surette, M. G. (2013). Concentration-dependent activity of antibiotics in natural environments. Frontiers in Microbiology, 4, 20. https://doi.org/10.3389/fmicb.2013.00020

99. Miller, T. E., Burns, J. H., Munguia, P., Walters, E. L., Kneitel, J. M., Richards, P. M., … Buckley, H. L. (2005). A critical review of twenty years' use of the resource-ratio theory. American Naturalist, 165(4), 439–448. https://doi.org/10.1086/428681

100. De Jong, H., Casagranda, S., Giordano, N., Cinquemani, E., Ropers, D., Geiselmann, J., & Gouzé, J. L. (2017). Mathematical modelling of microbes: Metabolism, gene expression and growth. Journal of the Royal Society Interface, 14(136), 20170502. https://doi.org/10.1098/rsif.2017.0502

1315   101. Jõers, A., Liske, E., & Tenson, T. (2020). Dividing subpopulation of Escherichia coli in stationary
1316   phase. Research in Microbiology, 171(3–4), 153–157.
1317   https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resmic.2020.02.002
1318
1319   102. McCall, I. C., Shah, N., Govindan, A., Baquero, F., & Levin, B. R. (2019). Antibiotic killing of
1320   diversely generated populations of nonreplicating bacteria. Antimicrobial Agents and
1321   Chemotherapy, 63(7), e02360-18. https://doi.org/10.1128/AAC.02360-18
1322
1323   103. Chesson, P. L. (1983). Coexistence of Competitors in a Stochastic Environment: The Storage
1324   Effect. Lecture Notes in Biomathematics, 52, 188–198. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-
1325   87893-0_25
1326
1327   104. Stewart, P. S., & Franklin, M. J. (2008). Physiological heterogeneity in biofilms. Nature Reviews
1328   Microbiology 2008 6:3, 6(3), 199–210. https://doi.org/10.1038/nrmicro1838
1329
1330   105. Traxler, M. F., Seyedsayamdost, M. R., Clardy, J., & Kolter, R. (2012). Interspecies modulation
1331   of bacterial development through iron competition and siderophore piracy. Molecular
1332   Microbiology, 86(3), 628. https://doi.org/10.1111/MMI.12008
1333
1334   106. Lawrence, M., Gentleman, R., & Carey, V. (2009). rtracklayer: An R package for interfacing with
1335   genome browsers. Bioinformatics, 25(14), 1841–1842.
1336   https://doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/btp328
1337
1338   107. Garnier, S., Ross, N., Rudis, R., Camargo, P. A., Sciaini, M., & Scherer, C. (2021). viridis -
1339   Colorblind-Friendly Color Maps for R, R package, https://sjmgarnier.github.io/viridis/.
1340   https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.4679424
1341
1342   108. Wickham, H. (2007). Reshaping data with the reshape package. Journal of Statistical Software,
1343   21(12), 1–20. https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v021.i12
1344
1345   109. Wickham, H. (2019). stringr: Simple, Consistent Wrappers for Common String Operations. R
1346   package version 1.4.0.
1347
1348   110. Wickham, H., Averick, M., Bryan, J., Chang, W., McGowan, L., François, R., … Yutani, H.
1349   (2019). Welcome to the Tidyverse. Journal of Open Source Software, 4(43), 1686.
1350   https://doi.org/10.21105/joss.01686
1351
1352   111. Wickham, H., François, R., Henry, L., & Müller, K. (2019). dplyr: A Grammar of Data
1353   Manipulation. R package version 0.8.3.
1354
1355   112. Nordberg, H., Cantor, M., Dusheyko, S., Hua, S., Poliakov, A., Shabalov, I., … Dubchak, I.
1356   (2014). The genome portal of the Department of Energy Joint Genome Institute: 2014
1357   updates. Nucleic Acids Research, 42, D26-31. https://doi.org/10.1093/nar/gkt1069

1358

Figure and Table captions

Figure 1. Transcriptional responses are driven by community membership and

time. Shown are principal coordinates analysis (PCoA) plots for *B. thailandensis* (Bt, A),

C. subtsugae (Cs, B), and *P. syringae* (Ps, C). Each point represents a mean transcript

profile for a community member given a particular community membership (neighbor(s)

included, indicated by symbol color) and sampled at a given time point over exponential

and stationary phases (in hours since inoculation, h, indicated by symbol size, n=3 to 4

replicates per timepoint/community membership). The Bray-Curtis distance metric was

used to calculate dissimilarities between transcript profiles. Error bars are 1 standard

deviation around the mean axis scores.

1369

Figure 2. Bacterial community exometabolite profiles differ by community

membership and time. Shown are PCoA plots for exometabolite profiles from the

following mass spectrometry modes: polar positive (A), polar negative (B), nonpolar

positive (C), and nonpolar negative (D). Each point represents the mean exometabolite

profile (relative contributions by peak area) given a particular community membership

(indicated by symbol color) at a particular time point (indicated by symbol shape). The

Bray-Curtis distance metric was used to calculate dissimilarities between exometabolite

profiles. Error bars are 1 standard deviation around the mean axis scores (n= 2 to 4

replicates). Bt is *B. thailandensis*, Cs is *C. subtsugae*, and Ps is *P. syringae*.

1379

Figure 3. *B. thailandensis* upregulates biosynthetic gene clusters (BSGC) in

cocultures. Columns represent community membership where Bt: *B. thailandensis*, Cs:

C. subtsugae, and Ps: *P. syringae* and rows represent BSCC in *B. thailandensis*. Genes

part of a BSGC were curated from antiSMASH predictions and literature-based

evidence. Within each BSGC, log2 fold-changes (LFC) were calculated by comparing

gene counts from a coculture to the monoculture control at each time point. LFC were

then averaged from all biosynthetic genes in the BSGC at each time point. We defined

an upregulated BSGC as a BSGC that had at least two consecutive stationary phase

time points with a LFC > 1 (indicated by the horizontal line). Note that plots for each

BSGC have separate scales for the Y-axis.

1390

Figure 4. *B. thailandensis* genes involved in thailandamide production are

detected as interspecies edges in the *B. thailandensis-C. subtsugae* co-

expression network and biosynthetic genes organize into network modules. A

network module containing the thailandamide BSGC is shown. The network module

nodes are color coded by *B. thailandensis* gene type (BSGC or not) and type of

connections (interspecies or not): thailandamide biosynthetic genes that had

interspecies edges (magenta), thailandamide biosynthetic genes that did not have

interspecies edges (orange), or other genes that were not part of the BSGC (yellow); as

well as genes that were from *C. subtsugae* (blue). The chromosomal organization of the

thailandamide BSGC is shown below the network module. The same colors are applied

to the BSGC operon. The operons also depict genes that were not detected within the

interspecies network, shown in gray. Asterisks indicate core biosynthetic genes in the

BSGCs, as predicted from antiSMASH. The table shows upregulated *B. thailandensis*

BSGCs (Fig. 3) and whether there were interspecies edges detected (check is yes, x is

no).

1406

Figure 5. Thailandamide accumulates in a non-additive manner. The accumulation

of thailandamide was quantified through time (n = 3-4 integrated peak areas per time

point). The bottom and top of the box are the first and third quartiles, respectively, and

the line inside the box is the median. The whiskers extend from their respective hinges

to the largest value (top), and smallest value (bottom) was no further away than 1.5× the

interquartile range. Colors correspond to the community membership for the

B.thailandensis-P. syringae coculture (yellow, BtPs), the B. thailandensis-C, subtsugae

coculture (magenta, BtCs), the "expected" exometabolite abundance in the 3-member

community obtained from additive peak areas from the B.thailandensis-P. syringae and

B.thailandensis-C, subtsugae cocultures (orange, BtCs+BtPs), and the 3-member

community (black, BtCsPs).

1418

1419   **Table 1.** Bacterial members used in the synthetic community (SynCom) system.

1420

Figure 1

Figure 2

Figure 3

	B. thailandensis-C. subtsugae interspecies network	*B. thailandensis-P. syringae* interspecies network
Bactobolin	✓	✓
Beta-lactone	✓	×
Capistruin	✓	✓
Malleilactone	✓	✓
Malleobactin	✓	✓
NRPS-1	×	✓
Pyochelin	✓	✓
Rhamnolipid	×	×
Thailandamide	✓	✓

Table 1. Bacterial members used in the synthetic community (SynCom) system.

Member	*Burkholderia thailandensis E264*	*Chromobacterium subtsugae* ATCC 31532[a]	*Pseudomonas syringae pv. tomato DC3000*
Genome size (Mb)	6.72	4.76	6.54
Family	*Burkholderiaceae*	*Neisseriaceae*	*Pseudomonadaceae*
No. of CDSs[b]	5 639	4 393	5 576
Chromosomes	2	1	1
Plasmids	0	0	2
ATCC	700388	31532	BAA-871
Reference	37	38	39

[a]This member in previous work [35, 36] was referred to as *Chromobacterium violaceum*.

This member has been reclassified [40].

[b]CDSs, Coding sequences.