Machine learning reveals missing edges and putative

interaction mechanisms in microbial ecosystem networks

Demetrius DiMucci[a,b], Mark Kon[a,c], Daniel Segrè[a,b,d, #]

[a] Bioinformatics Graduate Program, Boston University, Boston, Massachusetts, USA

[b] Biological Design Center, Boston University, Boston, Massachusetts, USA

[c] Department of Mathematics and Statistics, Boston University, Boston, Massachusetts,

USA

[d] Department of Biology, Boston University, Boston. Massachusetts, USA

Running Head: Prediction of Pairwise Microbial Interaction Outcomes

[#] Correspondence to Daniel Segrè, dsegre@bu.edu, 617-358-2301

Abstract Word Count: 207 (Abstract)/ 134 (Importance)

Main Text Word Count: 4140

Abstract

Microbes affect each other's growth in multiple, often elusive ways. The ensuing

interdependencies form complex networks, believed to influence taxonomic composition,

as well as community-level functional properties and dynamics. Elucidation of these

networks is often pursued by measuring pairwise interaction in co-culture experiments.

However, combinatorial complexity precludes the exhaustive experimental analysis of

pairwise interactions even for moderately sized microbial communities. Here, we use a

machine-learning random forest approach to address this challenge. In particular, we show

how partial knowledge of a microbial interaction network, combined with trait-level

representations of individual microbial species, can provide accurate inference of missing

edges in the network and putative mechanisms underlying interactions. We applied our

algorithm to two case studies: an experimentally mapped network of interactions between

auxotrophic *E. coli* strains, and a large *in silico* network of metabolic interdependencies

between 100 human gut-associated bacteria. For this last case, 5% of the network is

enough to predict the remaining 95% with 80% accuracy, and mechanistic hypotheses

produced by the algorithm accurately reflect known metabolic exchanges. Our approach,

broadly applicable to any microbial or other ecological network, can drive the discovery

of new interactions and new molecular mechanisms, both for therapeutic interventions

involving natural communities and for the rational design of synthetic consortia.

Importance

Different organisms in a microbial community may drastically affect each other's growth

phenotype, significantly affecting the community dynamics, with important implications

for human and environmental health. Novel culturing methods and decreasing costs of

sequencing will gradually enable high-throughput measurements of pairwise interactions

in systematic co-culturing studies. However, a thorough characterization of all interactions

that occur within a microbial community is greatly limited both by the combinatorial

complexity of possible assortments, and by the limited biological insight that interaction

measurements typically provide without laborious specific follow-ups. Here we show how

a simple and flexible formal representation of microbial pairs can be used for

classification of interactions with machine learning. The approach we propose predicts

with high accuracy the outcome of yet to be performed experiments, and generates

testable hypotheses about the mechanisms of specific interactions.

Introduction

The collective behavior of microbial ecosystems across biomes is an outcome of the many

interactions between members of the community (1). These interactions include exchange

of metabolites, signaling and quorum sensing processes, as well as growth inhibition and

killing. Understanding the interspecific interactions within microbial communities is

essential for understanding the function of natural communities (2) and for the design of

synthetic communities (3).

A powerful, and increasingly employed method for assessing intermicrobial interactions is

the direct measurement of phenotypes of microbial species grown in co-culture (4). A

fundamental challenge in this endeavor is the huge diversity of many natural communities,

which could count up to several hundred strains or species of microbes. Performing

experiments for all possible pairwise interactions constitutes a herculean, and likely

insurmountable task for even a moderately sized community. It is however, conceivable

that new computational approaches could systematically complement existing tools such

as high-throughput sequencing and genome annotation (5–9) to help extract as much

information as possible from interaction datasets, providing both insight on yet-to-be-

measured interactions, and on possible biological mechanisms mediating specific

partnerships.

Here we present a conceptual framework for the mathematical representation of microbial

interactions and subsequent use of supervised learning to build a classifier with high

predictive accuracy. While any algorithm may be used, we obtained our best results with

random forest (10). Random forests are ensembles of many decision trees that individually

are poor classifiers but can be democratically pooled to create a very good classifier.

Random forests have two attributes that we found particularly attractive for our purposes

here. First, they are non-parametric and thus require no *a priori* definition about

underlying relationships between predictive variables. Second, recent methodological

developments in the interpretation of random forests have been made that allow users to

query why a specific example was classified the way that it was through the calculation of

feature contributions (11). Feature contributions can be exploited to develop new

hypotheses about the mechanisms that mediate specific interactions. In order to

demonstrate a proof of principle for the classification of microbial interactions using

organism traits and the utility of feature contributions for developing insight into the

underlying mechanisms, we applied this approach to two communities where all pairwise

experiments had been performed and the mechanisms of interaction identified. The first is

an *in silico* community of 100 metabolic models of human gut associated bacteria and the

second are the experimental results of a study involving 14 amino acid auxotrophic strains

of *Escherichia coli* (*E. coli*). Our results show that the application of random forests and

feature contributions to the study of microbial communities can significantly increase the

capacity to estimate a large number of interactions based on a limited number of

experiments, and has the potential to enable the discovery of new interaction mechanisms.

Results

Representing Pairwise Interactions

Our objective in this study was twofold; first, we sought to predict the qualitative outcome

of unobserved pairwise interactions in a microbial community; second, we wanted to

identify predictive variables that suggest potential mechanisms of interaction. In order to

achieve both of these goals it was important to establish a representation that enables an

algorithm to make good predictions and also be easily parsed for interpretation. Our

approach relies of the availability of a trait-level description available for each organism in

the community under consideration. Trait descriptions are used to construct trait vectors

for each organism. Specific interactions are represented as the concatenation of the

relevant trait vectors (Fig 1). Trait vectors may be constructed from any set of

biologically relevant features such as body size or metabolic requirements; here we used

genome-scale metabolic data for every organism in the *in silico* community case study,

and vectors of biosynthetic capabilities for each *E. coli* strain in the auxotroph community

case study.

Figure 1. A schematic representation of our machine learning approach for inferring
interactions among microbes. A trait vector captures the characteristics of each organism
in the community of interest. The presence or absence of a trait in a given organism is

encoded (as a binary number) in the corresponding element of the trait vector. For every
possible pairwise interaction among community members we construct a composite
vector that is the concatenation of the corresponding trait vectors. The vector of the
organism whose response is being predicted is concatenated to the front of the trait vector
of its interaction partner. For the set of observed interactions each composite vector is
then mapped to the measured response of the interacting species. All observed
interactions are then used to train a model that predicts the outcome of unobserved
interactions. If random forest is used then feature contributions can be calculated on a
case-by-case basis in order to identify which elements of the composite genome
contribute most strongly to the prediction.
134

These trait vectors, together with the known outcome of specific interactions, can be fed

into a machine learning algorithm capable of absorbing existing patterns and extending

predictions to unknown interactions. The approach we use here, a random forests

classifier, is an ensemble of many decision trees that individually ask a series of yes or no

questions about randomly selected subsets of predictive features in order to classify

samples. Single trees tend to be poor classifiers; however, when their decisions are pooled,

the collective predictive power is often impressive. In order to find potential mechanisms

of interaction we took advantage of the binary nature of individual trees in order to

identify which variables are the most influential for the classification of specific samples.

Application to computationally predicted interactions between human gut microbes

We first applied our approach to a large *in silico* data set that we generated by simulating

with dynamic flux balance analysis (12) (using COMETS (13), see Methods) all pairwise

co-culture interactions between 100 metabolic models of human-gut associated bacteria

(14) under rich medium, in a well-mixed batch culture. Each metabolic model is a network

of over a thousand interconnected metabolic reactions that fall into two categories:

intracellular and exchange reactions (15). Intracellular reactions correspond to the various

pathways found within the cell, while exchange reactions represent the ability of an

organism to transport a metabolite across the cell membrane. Among the 100 organisms,

there were a total of 2083 unique metabolic reactions that could serve as potential

predictors. Out of these, 194 were exchange reactions. Since interactions between

organisms emerge through the exchange of or competition for one or more extracellular

metabolites in the environment, we used only the exchange reactions as predictive features

(Fig 2A).

Figure 2. Classification of interactions in an *in silico* model of a community of human gut
microbes. **A.** Organisms are represented *in silico* as large networks of metabolic reactions
that take up metabolites (blue circles) from the environment (arrows leading to model) and
release by-products (arrows leading to metabolite). Organisms may interact with one
another during simulation when both organisms compete for the uptake of a metabolite or
through cross feeding where one model consumes a by-product of the other. **B.** The
distribution of relative yields is sorted and plotted. Interactions resulted in a model
producing a negative relative yield 5563 times. Neutral interactions, a relative yield of
zero, occurred 3917 times, and positive relative yield happened 420 times. Samples were
classified as negative or non-negative. **C.** Histogram of the fraction of interactions that
were the negative class for each organism. The distribution is consistent with a truncated

normal distribution centered on .562 (t test, $p \approx .67$) **D.** ROC curve of a random forest
classifier using 388 exchange reactions as predictors for 9900 *in silico* observations
compared to the ROC curve obtained from using Jaccard Distance as a threshold to predict
negative versus non-negative relative yield. **E.** Learning curves for sub-communities of
the full *in silico* community. These learning curves are the median learning curve for 5
sub-communities selected at random for each value of $N_{organisms}$. **F.** 20 most influential
predictors as determined by mean decrease in accuracy. The '.p' suffix indicates that the
predictor belongs to the interaction partner. Some metabolite names are shortened: DAP =
meso-2,6-Diaminopimelate, dhptd = 4-5-dihydroxy-2-3-pentanedione, XAN = xanthine,
GlcNac = N-Acetylglucosamine.
181

Interactions in the network were computed by determining the influence of each organism

on each other organism in co-culture simulations. We compared the accumulated biomass

of each model in co-culture experiment to its accumulated biomass in monoculture and

expressed the phenotypic response as relative yield (Methods). A negative relative yield

indicates that a model produces less biomass in co-culture than it does when growing

alone, a relative yield of 0 indicates that its growth is unaffected by interaction with

another model, and a positive relative yield means that the model benefits from the

presence of another. For the purpose of binary classification, we divided observations into

two classes based on their relative yields. Samples with a negative relative yield were

classified as 'negative' responders (5563/9900). Samples with a positive relative yield

(420/9900) or a relative yield of zero (3917/9900) were classified as 'non-negative'

responders (Fig 2B). We refer to the model whose response is being predicted as the

'responder' and its interaction partner is the 'partner'. In order to develop an intuition for

how difficult this classification task might be we calculated what fraction of the 99

interactions each responder took part resulted in a negative relative yield. Classification

could become a trivial task if the distribution of these fractions were bimodal with peaks

far from each other, the most extreme scenario being one where responders experience

either only negative or non-negative relative yields in co-culture. On the other hand, a

normal or uniform distribution would indicate a more complicated reality where

classification would benefit from machine learning. This last option was indeed confirmed

to hold for our data, as the histogram of the negative fractions follows a truncated normal

distribution (Fig 2C).

In order to establish a baseline for comparing the effectiveness of the random forest as a

classifier, we calculated the Jaccard distance of each interaction pair and then used the

Jaccard distance as a decision threshold for predicting whether a model would have a

negative or non-negative relative yield in co-culture. Jaccard distance was chosen as a

baseline predictor because it is easy to calculate and is commonly used in statistical

analyses of microbial communities to infer interactions (16, 17). The resulting receiver

operator characteristic (ROC) curve was then compared to the ROC curve obtained from a

random forest classifier trained using the 194 exchange reactions as features to predict the

outcome the full set of 9900 observations. As a classifier, the Jaccard distance does not

perform much better than randomly guessing, while the random forest was surprisingly

good (Fig 2D). To evaluate the accuracy of the random forest classifier on the full data set

we examined the out of bag (OOB) error estimates. OOB estimates in random forests have

been shown to be roughly equivalent to five-fold cross-validation (18). We therefore took

the OOB error rate as an estimate for the overall test error rate. The random forest resulted

in a balanced accuracy of 90.4%.

High predictive accuracies are encouraging but will be of little use if they can only be

achieved when the vast majority of the experiment outcomes are already known. Learning

curves visualize how the performance of a classifier behaves as the data available for

trainings increases. We constructed a series of learning curves to measure how the

balanced accuracy of the random forest classifier is affected by the size of the community

being studied and as the fraction of interaction outcomes known increases (Fig 2E). As is

typically seen with learning curves, classifier performance improves when more of the

data is made available. Interestingly we observe that for the smallest communities

($N_{organisms}$ = 10) balanced accuracy was better than random when as little as 10% of the

data was available (2 experiments), but the trajectory with additional data improves at a

much slower rate than it does for larger communities. When $N_{organisms}$ is increased to 20,

significant improvements to balanced accuracy manifest immediately and have a stronger

benefit with the outcome of additional experiments. Encouragingly, these benefits appear

moderate when compared to the trajectory of much larger communities ($N_{organisms} \geq 30$).

The general trend indicates that the larger a community is, the smaller the relative fraction

of experiments needed to get a high accuracy. In fact, similar learning curves could be

used as guidelines to determine how many experiments should be performed to reach a

desired balanced accuracy.

Variable importance plots are commonly used with random forests to evaluate which

variables are the most important to the model by comparing their mean decrease in

accuracy scores. Mean decrease in accuracy for each variable is the change in the mean

accuracy of the forest predictions when the variable in question is randomly permuted

(19). Variable importance is then determined by computing the ratio between their mean

change in accuracy and the corresponding standard deviation of accuracy. The

randomForest package for R (10) performs this calculation, which we then used to rank

exchange reactions as predictors. Variable importance should be interpreted as a ranked

list of which variables are generally the most informative rather than a quantification of

their effects. These variable rankings are indicators of global predictive importance and

can be used to develop insights into why certain features are influential in a general sense.

Visualization of the top 20 predictors revealed that the most important predictors tend to

belong to the interaction partner (Fig 2F). Interestingly, features from both halves of the

interaction vector for the amino acids L-Lysine and L-Glutamate are highly ranked, as are

the features for the monosaccharides D-Ribose and Thyminose.

The tree-based approach of random forest to classification can be exploited to determine

why specific samples were classified the way they were by examining the feature

contributions of each predictor. A feature contribution (Methods) is the quantification of

how much a given variable influences the decision of the random forest when a single

sample is evaluated. Feature contributions were originally developed for analysis of

regression models (20) but have since been adapted for binary classification models (11).

In the context of binary classification, feature contributions can be interpreted as how

much a feature changes the probability that a given sample is classified as class 1 by the

random forest. In the case of our *in silico* data class 1 refers to the non-negative responder

type. For our purposes this convention means that a negative feature contribution increases

the probability of a sample being classified as a negative responder and a positive feature

contribution increases the probability of classified as a non-negative responder. We used

the forestFloor package in R (21) to efficiently calculate feature contributions for all 9900

samples.

If the choice of representation faithfully reflects the underlying nature of the system of

interest, then feature contributions may be used to gain insight into the underlying

mechanisms of an interaction. Were we investigating our *in silico* data as a novel

microbial community via pairwise interactions, we would wish to perform additional

experiments to identify a metabolite that mediates competition in each negative interaction

and then design further detailed experiments to describe molecular details. Absent any

particular insight into the nature of the community, metabolites mediating any particular

interaction would have to be identified by querying them randomly. In situations where

there are few metabolites mediating competition such a process would be a costly

endeavor. We wondered if the experimental load could be reduced if for each sample we

ranked the 194 metabolites by their net feature contributions and then used the rankings as

a guide for the order in which metabolites should be examined (Fig 3A).

Because the role of every extracellular metabolite in an interaction is known with

COMETS, we were able to evaluate the effectiveness of feature contributions as an

experimental guide. For each negative interaction, we identified which metabolites were

subject to competition and calculated how many metabolites we would expect to examine

at random before encountering any one of the contended metabolites. We then determined

the guided rate of discovery by proceeding along the ranked list as determined by net

feature contributions and recorded the position at which we first find one of the contended

metabolites. Using feature contributions to guide discovery compares favorably to a

random selection process. For this community, one would expect on average to perform

19.55 experiments before discovering a relevant metabolite through random selection.

Using feature contributions as a guide instead shifted the probability distribution to the

left, reducing the expected number of inquiries to 5.54 (Fig 3B). Early discovery of

metabolites is particularly valuable when there are very few metabolites mediating an

interaction. In particular we wanted to determine how effective feature contributions were

in the most challenging cases, those in which a single contended metabolite caused the

negative response. We found that for those 99 samples the contended metabolite was

found at median rank 4 and in 95 cases was encountered within the top 20 positions (Fig

3C).

Since random forest classifies based on patterns it finds in the data, we can expect that

metabolites that tend to be high-ranking predictors are also more likely to be broadly

significant to the community than metabolites encountered through random sampling.

Across all negative samples there were 109 metabolites that were subjected to competition

in at least one interaction. 82 of those metabolites were the first ones encountered using

feature contributions, but the majority of encounters were concentrated among eight of

them (Supplemental Table 1). D-Fructose was the most commonly found metabolite,

accounting for ~18.7% of all discovered metabolites. Interestingly, fructose has been

shown to be implicated in altering the gut microbiome in connection to a number of

diseases, including antibiotic treatable (22) metabolic syndrome (23, 24), liver disease

(25), and obesity (26).

A

B

Figure 3. Using feature contributions to find a metabolite for which two organisms compete (also referred to as a contended metabolite) **A.** The first half of the composite trait vector corresponds to metabolite transporters belonging to the organism of interest while the second half corresponds to metabolite transporters belonging to its interaction partner. We were interested in identifying a metabolite that is associated with the negative relative yield for the organism of interest. To establish a ranking of metabolites we took the summation of feature contributions from both halves of the composite trait vector and then sorted the new vector according to the net contribution. Proceeding from the negative end, the rank and identity of the first contended metabolite encountered relative to the negative end of the new vector was recorded. **B.** The probability distribution of the average rank at which the first contended metabolite would be encountered by sampling metabolites randomly one at a time was calculated for each sample and compared to the observed probability distribution. By chance the first metabolite would be encountered after 13 queries. Feature contributions reduce the median number of queries to 4. **C.** 99 samples produced a negative relative through competition for exactly one metabolite. Randomly investigating the 194 candidate metabolites one at a time results in an average of 97.5 experiments before discovering the contended metabolite. Using feature contributions to prioritize the order in which to investigate metabolites instead would typically reveal the contended metabolite on or before the fourth experiment (median = 4).

Notably, our approach is also readily applicable for the discovery of metabolites that

mediate positive interactions, which comprise a small minority of all interactions in this

specific dataset (420/9900). Due to the scarcity of their occurrence and the dearth of

metabolites that mediate positive interactions, discovery of these mechanisms is more

challenging. Nevertheless, using ranked feature contributions to find facilitative

metabolites was a powerful improvement over a naive approach; requiring a median of 27

queries before discovery versus 65 when selecting metabolites randomly (Supplemental

Figure 1).

Application to a Community of Auxotrophic *Escherichia coli* strains

We analyzed the results of a study in which all-pairwise co-culture experiments for 14 *E.*

coli MG1655 auxotrophs were performed (27). In this study, auxotrophic *E. coli* strains

were generated by knocking out a single gene that was essential for the production of each

of 14 amino acids. Interactions between any given pair of *E. coli* strains are presumably

dependent on the direct exchange of the knocked out amino acids, or related precursors

(Fig 4A). The total growth of each strain in the 91 experiments was measured after 84

hours and reported as the net fold change relative to the initial inoculum, resulting in 182

total observations. We classified growth phenotypes based on the fold change response a

given *E. coli* auxotroph strain had in co-culture with another auxotrophic strain. We used a

fold change of 2 as a threshold in order to separate response classes. Fold change 2 is an

intuitive threshold since doubling is often used when discussing growth of bacterial

populations (28) and classifying all samples with a fold change ≤ 2 as a separate class

from those with a fold change greater than 2 results in a balanced data set (Fig 4B). We

refer to the 90 growth responses with fold change ≤ 2 as 'weak' responses and the 92

growth responses with fold change > 2 as 'strong' responses. When discussing a particular

E. coli interaction, the strain whose response is being predicted is referred to as the

'receiver' and its interaction partner is the 'giver'. We calculated the fraction of

interactions that resulted in a weak response for each of the 14 strains and visualized the

distribution with a histogram (Fig 4C). Based on this histogram we expect that

classification will not be a trivial task because by it appears that the distribution follows

either a uniform (Kolmogorov-Smirnov test: $p \approx .93$, t test: $p \approx .95$) or truncated normal

distribution (Kolmogorov-Smirnov test: $p \approx .33$, t test: $p \approx .96$).

It has been previously observed that biosynthetically costly amino acids tend to promote

stronger cooperative interactions than biosynthetically cheap amino acids (27). Given this

observation we tested if biosynthetic costs would be useful for predicting whether a strain

will have a strong or a weak response in a given interaction. We used the biosynthetic cost

of the amino acid provided by the giver strain, needed by the receiver strain, or the

difference of these costs as decision thresholds to classify response classes and compared

the performance of the random forest classifier to these benchmarks. Since the

auxotrophic *E. coli* strains were all derived from the same ancestral strain, only the

biosynthetic capabilities for each of the 14 amino acids were relevant predictors for

machine learning. As a result, vectors with just 28 elements represented each pairwise *E.*

coli interaction. Examination of the corresponding ROC curves shows that biosynthetic

costs of amino acids are poor predictors for the qualitative outcome of these *E. coli*

auxotroph experiments whereas random forest fares much better as indicated by its ROC

curve and by area under the curve (Fig 4D inset). Random forest yielded a balanced

accuracy of ~79.2%. Moreover, the trajectory of the learning curve most closely resembles

the trajectory of the learning curve for *in silico* communities of 20 members (Fig 4E).

Variable importance rankings show that in general, the identity of the receiver's needed

amino acid is often more impactful on classification accuracy than the amino acid that the

giver needs, suggesting that specificity of interaction is dominated by auxotrophies,

whereas most mutants can in principle provide the missing amino acid (Fig 4F).

Since the pair of knocked-out amino acids determines the interaction for any two

auxotrophs, we evaluated how often the corresponding features were the most influential

for classification. For each sample, we ranked the feature contributions by the magnitude

of their influence and then identified which amino acids were ranked first and second. The

feature space is relatively simple and the interaction outcomes are a direct consequence of

the relevant auxotrophies. Therefore it is reasonable to expect that the random forest be

more strongly influenced by the absence of a predictor than the presence. Of all 182

observations, the knocked out amino acid from the receiver had the largest feature

contribution 140 times and the amino acid from the giver was the largest contributor 40

times (Supplemental Table 2). We further found that the top two ranked positions were

occupied by the giver and receiver's amino acids, in any order, 132 of 182 times. Thus the

pair of most influential predictors tended to correspond to the underlying mechanism of

the interaction, even in instances where the predicted class was incorrect.

Fig 4. Data representation and results for the case study of a network of auxotrophic *E.*
coli strains. **A.** In the original experiment, single gene knockout *E. coli* auxotrophs were
co-cultured in a minimal medium. In order for ΔA to grow it must receive amino acid A
from ΔB, which in turn must receive another amino acid, B, in order to grow itself.
Auxotroph strains were constructed for the following amino acids: cysteine,
phenylalanine, glycine, histidine, isoleucine, leucine, methionine, proline, arginine, serine,
threonine, tryptophan, and tyrosine. **B.** Sorted fold change for each auxotroph strain across
all experiments. *E. coli* strains had a weak response (fold change ≤ 2) 90 times and failed

to grow at all 9 times (green circles). In 92 instances the *E. coli* auxotroph population
more than doubled over the course of 84 hours. **C.** Histogram of weak responses as a
fraction of each strains' total number of interactions. **D.** ROC curve for random forest
classifier using 28 amino acids as predictors for 182 observations. Single value thresholds
based on the biosynthetic costs of knocked out amino acids resulted in poorer performance
than random forest. **E.** The trajectory of a learning curve built for the *E. coli* interactions
closely resembles that of the learning curve for *in silico* communities with 20 organisms.
F. The 28 amino acids ranked according to their affects on prediction accuracy when
randomly permuted. Amino acids corresponding to the receiver strain are enriched near
the top of the list. Amino acids are represented by their single letter codes. The suffix '.p'
indicates that the predictive feature belongs to the giver strain.
425

Scenarios where the presumed mechanisms are the strongest contributors yet result in

misclassification present opportunities to direct research toward interesting outliers in

order to understand why they diverge from our expectations. The response of the

methionine auxotroph (ΔMet) to co-culture with the cysteine auxotroph (ΔCys) was one

such case, which is described in detail in Fig. S2.

Discussion

Exhaustive pairwise co-culture studies of microbial communities are becoming

increasingly common. While such pairwise interactions do not necessarily capture all

possible interdependencies in a community (29, 30), they have been shown to be a

dominant factor (31), making the reliable prediction and interpretation of predictive

models matters of great importance. In this study, we have described a conceptual

framework for the representation of microbes and their pairwise interactions in order to

address both of these challenges. Our results indicate that representing genome-derived

traits of microbes as binary vectors is sufficient for building reliable classifiers for

microbial interactions. We also demonstrated two methods for utilizing feature

contributions from random forest models to aid in the development of testable hypotheses

regarding interaction mechanisms.

Qualitatively predicting the outcome of unobserved interactions is most valuable if those

predictions allow precious resources and time to be conserved. To this end the

construction of learning curves is an important step in identifying how much data is

required in order to achieve desired prediction accuracy from machine learning. Our

results indicate that prediction of interactions in communities of all sizes may benefit from

machine learning. In situations where the prediction of interaction outcomes is not

necessary the properties of random forest makes it a good choice for deciding which traits

to study first. Because predictions will always benefit from more data we suggest that if

the experimental space is not prohibitively large that all pairwise experiments be

performed and feature contributions then be used to derive testable hypotheses.

Conversely, when the experimental space is large then one should perform a subset of

experiments and incorporate the results of any additional experiments into the training set

in order to build new classifiers recursively. The larger the community being studied is the

smaller the relative fraction of possible experiments that must be initially performed, these

results are promising both for future studies of natural communities, which can contain

upward of a thousand unique community members (32) and the assembly of synthetic

communities from large libraries of microbes.

Feature contributions provide a clear window into the decision-making process of a

random forest when the underlying mechanisms are straightforward, as was the case for

the *E. coli* auxotrophs. In cases such as this, interpretation of the model is clear and novel

detailed hypotheses can be readily developed. Even incorrect predictions are useful since

instances that go against the expectations of the classifier are likely to be worth closer

scrutiny. In situations where many factors contribute in a complex manner to an

interaction we demonstrated the utility of feature contributions for guiding exploratory

experiments by enriching underlying competitive mechanisms near the top of ranked lists.

In our particular application of feature contributions to an *in silico* community we used

their net effects to identify metabolites that are competed for in negative cases or are used

in cross feeding in positive interactions. The particular method of evaluating feature

contributions, summing the net effects or sorting them by magnitude is a decision that

must be made on a case-by-case basis.

Although we concatenated the binary trait vectors of two organisms in order to form a new

composite trait representation, alternative representations of microbes and their

interactions should also be explored. Predictions may also benefit from incorporating

more information into the base representation of a microbe such as gene copy number or

mean transcriptional levels. We also encourage future researchers to acquire information

on the same interactions in multiple environmental conditions. Varying the environmental

conditions will allow abiotic factors to be incorporated into the representation and should

yield additional insight into situations where certain combinations of traits are most

relevant.

Going forward we expect that the importance of machine learning in microbial ecology

will continue to grow. The need to identify microbial strains that interact in a desired way

in any given environment will be one of the most pressing issues for synthetic ecology in

the future. Likewise, it would not be surprising if many novel methods for interpreting

machine learning algorithms emerge in response to the challenges of understanding the

properties of microbial communities.

Data Availability. Pointers to Datasets obtained from previous work, and used in our

analysis are reported in the Materials and Methods Section.

The code necessary to reproduce all our figures and analyses is hosted at:

https://github.com/ddimucci/MicrobialCommunities

Materials and Methods

Auxotrophic *E. coli* interaction network data. We obtained the measured growth

response of individual *E.coli* strains and biosynthetic costs of amino acids from the

supplemental files provided by (27).

Simulation of *in silico* pairwise interactions among gut microbes with dFBA in

COMETS. Metabolic reconstructions of human gut associated microbes were obtained

from Bauer et al (14). At the time of this writing these models can be downloaded directly

from the following URL:

https://wwwen.uni.lu/content/download/86230/1056013/file/Bauer_et_al_301_microbe_m

odels.rar

Each metabolic reconstruction encompasses the stoichiometry of virtually all metabolic

reactions present in an organism, including uptake/secretion. Flux balance analysis (FBA)

is a constraint-based steady state approach that uses this stoichiometry to predict fluxes

and growth capacity under a given boundary condition of nutrient availability, and has

been described in detail before (15, 33–35). Dynamic flux balance analysis (DFBA) (12)

extends classical FBA to perform dynamic simulations in which intracellular metabolites

are still assumed to be at steady states, but total biomass and environmental metabolites

are treated as time-dependent variables in a discretized approximation. We performed

DFBA simulations using our platform for Computation of Microbial Ecosystems in Time

and Space (COMETS), which has been previously used to model microbial communities

(13) . COMETS allows users to implement DFBA in a two-dimensional simulated world

populated with multiple metabolic models. We selected 100 metabolic models (14) and

identified a common medium that would permit the growth of nearly all models in a

monoculture scenario. We then performed all pairwise co-culture simulations of the 100

models using the common media set in a well-mixed batch culture scenario (approximated

by using COMETS without spatial structure). For each scenario we saved the record of

biomass accumulation and fluxes in order to calculate relative yield and identify

mechanisms of interaction, respectively.

Relative Yield. Relative yield quantifies the change in net growth of an organism in a new

environment relative to a reference scenario. For our purpose we compared the growth of

models in co-culture to their accumulated growth in monoculture. Relative yield was

calculated according to the equation:

$$RY = (Biomass_{coculture} - Biomass_{monoculture})/Biomass_{monoculture}$$

An $RY < 0$ indicates that the responder is detrimentally affected by its partner.

Correspondingly, an RY of 0 indicates no effect and an $RY > 0$ indicates a positive affect

from co-culture with the partner.

Jaccard Distance. A profile ($model_i$) encoding the presence (1)/absence (0) of different

metabolic reactions in each model i was identified based on its stoichiometric matrix. The

Jaccard distance (JD) between two metabolic models i and j was determined with the

equation:

$$JD(model_i, model_j) = 1 - |\ model_i \cap model_j\ |\ /\ |\ model_i \cup model_j\ |$$

Representation of interactions with trait-derived features. For a given community C

the observed co-culture response of each species i in the presence of j is encoded into the

element X_{ij} of an interaction matrix $\mathbf{X}$. To define a set of trait vectors for each organism in

C, we start by obtaining a list of λ features that can be assigned systematically across all

organisms. These features could be the presence/absence of specific genes, functions, or

any other trait. In the two case studies reported here, the feature vectors correspond to the

presence/absence of specific metabolite transporters in stoichiometric models, and to

amino acid auxotrophies, respectively. Thus, each organism i is associated with an λ-long

vector V_i, whose element k is 0 or 1 depending on whether or not trait k is absent or

present in organism i. Traits (i.e. elements of the feature vector) that are identical across

all organisms are removed from the feature set. Each pair of organisms (i,j) is then

associated with a co-culture feature vector, defined as the concatenation of vectors V_i and

V_j, also indicated as $V_{i,j} = [V_i , V_j]$ (see also Fig. 1). Note that in this concatenated vector,

order matters. For the purpose of feeding the data into the random forest algorithm, the

complete information about how organism i responds in a co-culture with organism j, is

encoded in the composite feature vector $V_{i,j}$ and the observed phenotypic response for that

specific pair, i.e. X_{ij}.

Machine learning. R was used to implement K-nearest neighbor (Knn), Random Forest

(RF), and support vector machine (SVM). Knn was implemented with the rknn package,

with K set to 3. Library e1071 was used for SVM and we used a linear kernel and

cost=0.1. Random forest was implemented with the randomForest library. All three

algorithms had similar performance on the *E. coli* data set but RF was significantly better

on the *in silico* data set (data not shown).

Random forests are ensemble classifiers that aggregate the results of many individual

decision trees. Each tree in a random forest is assigned a synthetic data set that is of the

same size as the training set but generated through sampling with replacement. The result

is that the average tree is trained on approximately 2/3 of the observations; these

observations are referred to as in bag samples. The remaining 1/3 of observations not in

the synthetic data sets are referred to as out of bag samples. The new synthetic data set is

placed at the root node of a new tree; next a randomly selected subset of predictive

features is queried for the best split of the data into two child nodes. This process is

repeated at each node until a stopping criterion is met. Classification accuracy of

individual trees is assessed by running their out of bag samples down the tree and

recording the results. See (19) for a full description of the algorithm.

Evaluation of classifiers. We used balanced accuracy to evaluate performance of

classifiers. This metric is based on the values from the confusion matrix: true positive

(TP), true negative (TN), false positive (FP), and false negative (FN). Balanced accuracy

is calculated as follows:

$$\text{Balanced Accuracy} = (TP/(TP+FN) + TN/(TN+FP))/2$$

Learning curves. To construct learning curves we defined a set of fractions, $fr = [.05, .1,$

$.2, .3, .4, .5, .6, .7, .8, .9, .95]$ where we would evaluate balanced accuracy of the model

using cross validation. For all cross-validation experiments we ensured that observations

X_{ij} and X_{ji} were either both in the training set or in the test set. For each fraction in fr we

randomly selected $\max(1/fr_i , 1/(1-fr_i))$ mutually exclusive subsets of the data to use as a

training set or as a hold out test set if $fr_i > .5$. This process was repeated until at least 10

subsets of the data were selected for each fraction. The median balanced accuracy of the

classifier was then calculated at each point along fr. In order to investigate the effect of the

community size on the learning curve we defined a set of community sizes $S = [10, 20, 30,$

$40, 50, 60, 70, 80, 90]$. For each community size S_i we randomly selected five community

sub-matrices, X_k, from the full *in silico* community matrix (X). Then for each X_k a learning

curve was determined and the median learning curve for balanced accuracy of each

community size was calculated

Feature contributions for binary classifications. Each tree in the random forest is

presented with a bootstrapped subset of the provided data as a training set that is used to

grow the tree. The training set is placed at the root node of the tree. The fraction of

instances in the training set of class C_1 is Y^n_{mean}. Y^n_{mean} is the probability that an instance

selected at random from the root node is assigned to class C_1.

There are two steps in the calculation of feature contributions for a new sample: First

calculate the sum of all local increments in each tree, second determine the average

contribution over the forest. A local increment for a feature f is calculated if the split was

performed on f and is defined as the change in probability of C_1 in a parent node (p) and a

child node (c):

$$LI^c_f = Y^c_{mean} - Y^p_{mean}$$

617 Local increments quantify the change in the probability of a sample being classified as C_1

618 between the child node and the parent node when f is the splitting criterion. The feature

619 contribution, $FC^f_{i,t}$ of feature f in tree t for observation i is the sum of all LI_f along the path

620 from the root node to the terminal node. FC^f_i is given by the equation:

$$FC^f_i = 1/T \sum(FC^f_{i,t})$$

Feature contributions were calculated with the forestFloor package and are calculated

using only trees for which a sample was out of bag.

Application to positive samples. Positive samples constituted a small minority of the

total samples (420/9900) and result in a heavily imbalanced data set when we try to

classify these samples as separate from either neutral or negative responses. Imbalanced

datasets often result in very high classification accuracies because the classifier simply

predicts every instance to be of the majority class. This is an issue because if we are to

have confidence in feature contributions an adequately performing classifier is desired. In

order to develop a reliable classifier we under sampled the non-positive instances by

randomly selecting a subset of 420 of them to pair with the 420 positive observations and

then trained a random forest on the new data set. To estimate the efficacy of the random

forest we repeated this process 100 times and note that there was a median balanced

accuracy of $\approx 85\%$. We then used a single random forest model to calculate feature

contributions in the context of identifying positive responses.

Acknowledgments

We are grateful to Dr. Jenny Bhatnagar and Dr. Carolyn Zeiner whose work with fungal

interactions served as the initial inspiration for this study and to members of the Segrè lab

for helpful discussions and for feedback on the manuscript. DS and DD acknowledge

funding from the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (Purchase Request No.

HR0011515303, Contract No. HR0011-15-C-0091), the U.S. Department of Energy (DE-

SC0012627), the NIH (T32GM100842, 5R01DE024468, R01GM121950 and

Sub_P30DK036836_P&F), the National Science Foundation (1457695 and NSFOCE-BSF

grant 1635070), the Human Frontiers Science Program (RGP0020/2016), and the Boston

University Interdisciplinary Biomedical Research Office.

References

1.   Røder HL, Sørensen SJ, Burmølle M. 2016. Studying Bacterial Multispecies
Biofilms: Where to Start? Trends Microbiol.
2.   Aziz FAA, Suzuki K, Ohtaki A, Sagegami K, Hirai H, Seno J, Mizuno N, Inuzuka
Y, Saito Y, Tashiro Y, Hiraishi A, Futamata H. 2015. Interspecies interactions are
an integral determinant of microbial community dynamics. Front Microbiol 6.
3.   Johns NI, Blazejewski T, Gomes ALC, Wang HH. 2016. Principles for designing
synthetic microbial communities. Curr Opin Microbiol.
4.   Ling LL, Schneider T, Peoples AJ, Spoering AL, Engels I, Conlon BP, Mueller A,
Schäberle TF, Hughes DE, Epstein S, Jones M, Lazarides L, Steadman VA, Cohen
DR, Felix CR, Fetterman KA, Millett WP, Nitti AG, Zullo AM, Chen C, Lewis K.
2015. A new antibiotic kills pathogens without detectable resistance. Nature
517:455–459.
5.   Goers L, Freemont P, Polizzi KM. 2014. Co-culture systems and technologies:
taking synthetic biology to the next level. J R Soc Interface 11:20140065–
20140065.
6.   Lasken RS, McLean JS. 2014. Recent advances in genomic DNA sequencing of
microbial species from single cells. Nat Rev Genet 15:577–584.
7.   Gawad C, Koh W, Quake SR. 2016. Single-cell genome sequencing: Current state
of the science. Nat Rev Genet.
8.   Seemann T. 2014. Prokka: Rapid prokaryotic genome annotation. Bioinformatics
30:2068–2069.
9.   Dam P, Olman V, Harris K, Su Z, Xu Y. 2007. Operon prediction using both
genome-specific and general genomic information. Nucleic Acids Res 35:288–
298.
10.   Liaw a, Wiener M. 2002. Classification and Regression by randomForest. R news
2:18–22.
11.   Palczewska A, Palczewski J, Robinson RM, Neagu D. 2013. Interpreting random
forest classification models using a feature contribution method (extended). 2013
IEEE 14th Int Conf Inf Reuse Integr 1–30.
12.   Henson MA, Hanly TJ. 2014. Dynamic flux balance analysis for synthetic
microbial communities. IET Syst Biol 8:214–229.
13.   Harcombe WR, Riehl WJ, Dukovski I, Granger BR, Betts A, Lang AH, Bonilla G,
Kar A, Leiby N, Mehta P, Marx CJ, Segrè D. 2014. Metabolic resource allocation
in individual microbes determines ecosystem interactions and spatial dynamics.
Cell Rep 7:1104–1115.
14.   Bauer E, Laczny CC, Magnusdottir S, Wilmes P, Thiele I. 2015. Phenotypic

differentiation of gastrointestinal microbes is reflected in their encoded metabolic
repertoires. Microbiome 3:55.

15. Orth JD, Thiele I, Palsson BØ. 2010. What is flux balance analysis? Nat
Biotechnol 28:245–248.

16. Bach EM, Williams RJ, Hargreaves SK, Yang F, Hofmockel KS. 2018. Greatest
soil microbial diversity found in micro-habitats. Soil Biol Biochem 118:217–226.

17. Mainali KP, Bewick S, Thielen P, Mehoke T, Breitwieser FP, Paudel S, Adhikari
A, Wolfe J, Slud E V., Karig D, Fagan WF. 2017. Statistical analysis of co-
occurrence patterns in microbial presence-absence datasets. PLoS One 12.

18. Svetnik V, Liaw A, Tong C, Christopher Culberson J, Sheridan RP, Feuston BP.
2003. Random Forest: A Classification and Regression Tool for Compound
Classification and QSAR Modeling. J Chem Inf Comput Sci 43:1947–1958.

19. Breiman L. 2001. Random forests. Mach Learn 45:5–32.

20. Kuz'min VE, Polishchuk PG, Artemenko AG, Andronati SA. 2011. Interpretation
of QSAR models based on random forest methods. Mol Inform 30:593–603.

21. Welling SH, Refsgaard HHF, Brockhoff PB, Clemmensen LH. 2016. Forest Floor
Visualizations of Random Forests_Supplementrary. Supplementrary 1–13.

22. Di Luccia B, Crescenzo R, Mazzoli A, Cigliano L, Venditti P, Walser JC, Widmer
A, Baccigalupi L, Ricca E, Iossa S. 2015. Rescue of fructose-induced metabolic
syndrome by antibiotics or faecal transplantation in a rat model of obesity. PLoS
One 10.

23. Khitan Z, Kim DH. 2013. Fructose: A key factor in the development of metabolic
syndrome and hypertension. J Nutr Metab.

24. Bantle JP. 2009. Dietary Fructose and Metabolic Syndrome and Diabetes. J Nutr
139:1263S–1268S.

25. Lambertz J, Weiskirchen S, Landert S, Weiskirchen R. 2017. Fructose: A dietary
sugar in crosstalk with microbiota contributing to the development and progression
of non-alcoholic liver disease. Front Immunol.

26. Payne AN, Chassard C, Lacroix C. 2012. Gut microbial adaptation to dietary
consumption of fructose, artificial sweeteners and sugar alcohols: Implications for
host-microbe interactions contributing to obesity. Obes Rev 13:799–809.

27. Mee MT, Collins JJ, Church GM, Wang HH. 2014. Syntrophic exchange in
synthetic microbial communities. Proc Natl Acad Sci 111:E2149–E2156.

28. POWELL EO. 1956. Growth Rate and Generation Time of Bacteria, with Special
Reference to Continuous Culture. J Gen Microbiol 15:492–511.

29. Bairey E, Kelsic ED, Kishony R. 2016. High-order species interactions shape
ecosystem diversity. Nat Commun 7.

30. Levine JM, Bascompte J, Adler PB, Allesina S. 2017. Beyond pairwise
mechanisms of species coexistence in complex communities. Nature.

31. Venturelli OS, Carr AC, Fisher G, Hsu RH, Lau R, Bowen BP, Northern T, Arkin
AP. 2017. Deciphering microbial interactions in synthetic human gut microbiome
communities. bioArxiv.

32. Raynaud X, Nunan N. 2014. Spatial ecology of bacteria at the microscale in soil.
PLoS One 9.

33. Raman K, Chandra N. 2009. Flux balance analysis of biological systems:
Applications and challenges. Brief Bioinform.

34.   Maarleveld TR, Khandelwal RA, Olivier BG, Teusink B, Bruggeman FJ. 2013.
735   Basic concepts and principles of stoichiometric modeling of metabolic networks.
736   Biotechnol J.
737   35.   O'Brien EJ, Monk JM, Palsson BO. 2015. Using genome-scale models to predict
738   biological capabilities. Cell 161:971–987.
739   36.   Park S, Imlay JA. 2003. High levels of intracellular cysteine promote oxidative
740   DNA damage by driving the Fenton reaction. J Bacteriol 185:1942–1950.
741   37.   Takumi K, Nonaka G. 2016. Bacterial cysteine-inducible cysteine resistance
742   systems. J Bacteriol 198:1384–1392.
743