Modelling bacteria-phage interactions driving predation and horizontal gene

transfer

Jorge A. Moura de Sousa[1,2,*], Ahlam Alsaadi[3], Jakob Haaber[3], Hanne Ingmer[3], Eduardo P.C.

Rocha[1,2]

[1]Microbial Evolutionary Genomics, Institut Pasteur, 28, rue Dr Roux, Paris, 75015, France.
[2]CNRS, UMR3525, 28, rue Dr Roux, Paris, 75015, France.

[3]Department of Veterinary and Animal Sciences, University of Copenhagen, Frederiksberg, Denmark

* corresponding author: jorge-andre.sousa@pasteur.fr

Keywords: individual based modelling; bacteria; phage; predation; horizontal gene transfer.

ABSTRACT

Bacteriophages shape microbial communities by predating on them and by accelerating their

adaptation through horizontal gene transfer. The former is the basis of phage therapy, whereas

the latter drives the evolution of numerous bacterial pathogens. We present a novel computational

approach (eVIVALDI – eco-**eV**olutionary m**I**crobial indi**V**idu**AL**-base**D** s**I**mulations) to study

bacteria-phage ecological interactions that integrates a large number of processes, including

population dynamics, environmental structure, genome evolution, and phage-mediated horizontal

transfer. We validate and illustrate the relevance of the model by focusing on three specific

questions: the ecological interactions between bacteria and virulent phage in the context of phage

and antibiotic therapy, the role of prophages as competitive weapons, and autotransduction

leading to bacterial acquisition of antibiotic resistance genes upon lysis of resistant competitors.

Our model recapitulates experimental and theoretical observations and provides novel insights. In

particular, we find that environmental structure has a strong effect on community dynamics and

evolutionary outcomes in all three case studies. Strong environmental structure, especially if

antibiotics are heterogeneously distributed, promotes the acquisition of resistance to both phages

and antibiotics, creates variation in the dynamics of arm-races between bacteria and phage, and

better predicts dynamics of lysogen invasion in the gastrointestinal tract, compared to models

assuming well-mixed environments. Moreover, we predict a parameter space where co-existence

between invaders and resident lysogens can occur during autotransduction, which we then

confirm experimentally. By linking ecological and evolutionary dynamics, our modelling approach

sheds light on the factors that influence the dynamics of bacteria-phage interactions. It can also

be expanded to put forward novel hypotheses, facilitating the design of phage therapy treatments

and the assessment of the role of phages in the spread of antibiotic resistance.

Introduction

Microbial organisms are pervasive across all natural environments, including the human body. Their adaptation and organization in communities may lead to disease [1], drive host evolution [2], and produce major changes in ecosystems [3,4]. Ecological interactions in microbial communities influence, and are influenced by, the rapid pace with which microbes acquire adaptive changes [5,6]. A striking example is the relationship between bacteria and bacteriophages (from here on referred to as phages), because the latter predate on the former whilst also driving their adaptation [4]. Phages are the most abundant entities in nature [7,8] and very efficient bacterial predators; it has been estimated that they promote the turnover of ~20% of bacterial mass every single day in certain environments [9,10]. In the context of widespread antibiotic resistance, this has led to a rekindled interest in phage therapy as an adjuvant or a replacement of antibiotic therapy against multi-resistant bacteria [11].

Virulent phages follow a strictly lytic cycle within their hosts, but they often exist in diverse communities with other virulent and temperate phages. Infection by the latter can lead to either the lytic cycle or their integration in bacterial genomes, as prophages (lysogenic cycle). Temperate phages are not used for phage therapy because lysogeny prevents them from extinguishing bacterial populations and drives the latter's resistance to closely, and sometimes distantly related phages – a mechanisms called superinfection exclusion [12-14]. However, half of the bacterial genomes contain at least one, and up to 20, prophages, and these are more frequent in bacterial pathogens [15], which means that they cannot be ignored in phage therapy. The expression of prophage genes may provide novel phenotypes to the host (lysogenic conversion), and many cases have been described where prophages carry adaptive traits implicated in virulence or resistance to stress [16]. Virions arising from prophage induction can infect closely related competitor bacteria that are non-lysogenic for the phage, decreasing bacterial competition,

increasing prophage frequency, and liberating resources that can be used for the growth of the

remaining lysogenic population [17]. In this case, prophages have been regarded as weapons

against bacterial competitors [13,18].

Phages can drive horizontal gene transfer between bacteria by transduction [19]. This can be a

hazard in the case of phage therapy if the transferred traits are virulence factors or antibiotic

resistance genes. Specialized transduction occurs in temperate phages when erroneous prophage

excision leads to the transfer of neighboring chromosomal genes. Generalized transduction

occurs when bacterial DNA is delivered to other cells after being mistakenly encapsulated in

virions, due to the specificities of the *pac* DNA packaging system [20]. Although these mechanisms

are commonly used as genetic engineering tools [21], their rates in nature are poorly known. In

the lab, they vary across several orders of magnitude (between 10^{-11} and 10^{-3} [22,23]), depending

on the phage, the environment, and the type of culture media [19]. Importantly, phage driven

transmission of bacterial DNA can have particularly nefarious consequences for humans.

Transducing phages are responsible for the transmission of virulence factors in *Staphylococcus*

aureus [24], and may accelerate the spread of antibiotic resistance genes [25,26]. Transduction

can also have an impact at very short time scales: prophage induction facilitates the capture of

adaptive traits (e.g., an antibiotic resistance gene) from a second bacterial strain that is infected

by the phage and, through generalized transduction, transfers the gene to the lysogenic strain.

This process has been called autotransduction [27]. Hence, phages drive the evolution of bacterial

gene repertoires and may spread virulence or antibiotic resistance factors during phage therapy.

The diversity of interactions between phages and bacteria may obscure the effects of each of

them. Experimental approaches have described and clarified the mechanisms underlying these

interactions, but usually focused on simplified environments [8,28]. *In vivo* studies of these

interactions (e.g., in mammalian hosts [29]) tackle more natural environments, but have limited

resolution in tracking temporal dynamics or the effects of individual mechanisms. Mathematical

modelling provides a complementary approach to the study of phage-bacteria interactions,

providing important insights on their co-evolutionary processes [30] or the dynamics of particular

bacterial defense mechanisms [31,32]. Previous models have focused on individual mechanisms

of interaction in simple environments (*e.g.*, how the evolution of resistance to phage can affect

clinical treatments [33]), because tackling multiple mechanisms and spatial heterogeneity hinders

the development of analytical solutions. Yet, natural communities, and particularly those relevant

for phage therapy, include complex interactions and spatial structure [34-37]. This may explain

why models sometimes fail to fully reproduce *in vivo* dynamics of phage infection [28], and why

there is paucity of models on the impact of phage-mediated horizontal gene transfer in the

adaptation of bacterial communities (but see the work of Volkova et al [38] for a theoretical

comparison between the relative efficacy of transduction versus conjugation in transmitting an

adaptive trait).

Individual-based models (IBMs) are an alternative to population-based mathematical approaches

for studying complex microbial systems [39], and they have been useful to understand, for

instance, the interactions between bacteria and phages in biofilms [36]. Although computationally

intensive, IBMs provide a framework to study biological systems through the incorporation of

different (and potentially interacting) mechanisms at the level of the individual. Population-level

dynamics can then emerge from the collective individual behaviors. This makes IBMs particularly

appealing to investigate bacteria-phage interactions, because these involve both ecological (e.g.,

predation) and evolutionary (e.g., transduction of adaptive traits) scales, with antagonistic

mechanisms defined at the individual level (e.g., the lysis-lysogeny decision of temperate phage).

To study these multiple roles of phages in microbial communities, we developed an IBM approach

that is able to simulate diverse mechanisms and eco-evolutionary contexts: eVIVALDI – eco-

eVolutionary m**I**crobial indi**V**idu**AL**-base**D** s**I**mulations. We focus on three questions, of gradually

increasing complexity, that are relevant for bacterial evolution and phage therapy, and that cover

a good range of possible eco-evolutionary interactions between bacteria and phage. First, we

introduce the basic scheme of the simulation with the study of ecological interactions between co-

evolving virulent phages and bacteria under phage and antibiotic pressure in structured

environments. Then we introduce lysogeny and super-infection exclusion in the model to study

the role of prophages as competitive weapons. We show that our model provides better fit to

previous experimental results than earlier models. Finally, we introduce transduction and the way

we encode individual genomes in the model to elucidate how bacteria may obtain novel adaptive

genes from sensitive bacteria by autotransduction. We use eVIVALDI to explore and quantify the

different mechanisms of phage-bacteria interactions and to gain insights on how the structure of

the environment can affect these interactions and the community dynamics. We tackle each

question by demonstrating the ability of the model to capture previous results and then show how

its complexity highlights new relevant features.

Methods

Concept and basic implementation

The eVIVALDI model was developed in Python (version 2.7.3), using an object-oriented approach, with a focus on the flexibility and extensibility of mechanisms and parameters simulated. The complete ODD (Overview, Design concepts, and Details) protocol [40] of the developed model is available as supplementary text (Text S1), but below is a brief overview of the model. The source of the software can be obtained from the authors. The simulations can be run on a typical desktop computer. In a 3GHz 8-core Mac Pro, with 32GB of RAM, a replicate of a simulation (100 iterations), takes from ~5 to 30 minutes, depending on the parameters. Computations can also be performed in a cluster, allowing the parallel simulation of multiple parameters.

Entities and their ecological setup

Both bacterial cells and phage particles are represented as independent individuals on an environment represented as a two-dimensional grid with Moore neighbourhood (the 8 connected grid spaces of each location, for a Moore distance of one) (Fig 1A). Bacteria can be of different species. Each individual bacterium has a genome with core, accessory and, eventually, prophage genes. Bacteria have individual phenotypes, such as growth rate or the ability to survive antibiotic exposure. Phages can be from different species, have different lifestyles (temperate, virulent or defective), and possess individual phenotypes (e.g., attachment receptors and burst sizes). The host range of phage hosts is defined by a matrix (Fig 1B), and the superinfection exclusion rules amongst phages is defined in a similar way (Fig 1C).

Environmental and bacterial updates

The environment and the individuals are updated and behave according to biologically inspired rules. The environment can be completely structured, semi-structured or not structured at all (i.e.,

well-mixed), and it can be set as bounded or have a toroidal space. The type of structure influences

the diffusion of the different bacterial cells and environmental particles (phage and antibiotics).

Each location can hold a single bacterial cell and several phage cells. Free space is the bacterial

resource to be consumed, and it is freed whenever bacteria die. Bacterial death can be

intrinsic (e.g., of old age) or explicit (e.g., exposure to antibiotics or predation by phage) (Fig 1D).

When a free space is available, the neighboring bacteria compete for reproduction. The outcome

of the competition is chosen through a roulette wheel method that accounts for the fitness of each

bacterium. The successful bacterium generates an offspring into the free space (Fig 1E). Bacteria

can be infected by phage in the environment. The outcome of the infection depends on the phage

lifestyle and, for temperate phage, the lysis-lysogeny decision. This decision is stochastic but

influenced by the number of surrounding phages. For temperate phage, integration in the host

genome means vertical inheritance with host replication, until the phage excises from the genome,

according to a probability that can be low but non-null throughout the simulation (stochastic

prophage induction) and that can also be influenced by the level of antibiotic stress to which the

host is exposed. Phage can transduce bacterial genes to other bacteria by generalized or

specialized transduction (depending on phages' characteristics, Fig 1F).

Input, output and documentation of the model

The inputs of each simulation are two text files that define the general parameters and also the

ecological setup of the environment (types and numbers of bacteria and/or phage, along with their

attributes). The statistics collected at different time points are stored in dictionaries and dataframes

(using *pandas*), can be tailored to the experimenter's choice and can be represented visually

(using *matplotlib* and *seaborn*) or created as an output file.

Random Forest Analysis

The Random Forest Analysis is based on simulations performed with the model, covering 3000

random combinations of parameters, with 30 simulated repeats per combination. The output of

this cohort of simulations is grouped and resumed in response variables, to which a column with

3000 rows of a random parameter is added (i.e., a choice of a number between 1 and 3). This

table is used as input of the randomForest package in R (version 4.6.12), where the *randomForest*

function is run with the parameters ntrees set to 10000. The relative importance of each parameter

(the percentage increase in minimum squared error, %IncMSE) is assessed using the *importance*

function from the same package.

FIG 1. Mechanisms and workflow of the eVIVALDI model. A) Bacterial cells and bacteriophage particles are modelled in a 2-

dimensional space, where each (x,y) location holds at most a single bacterial cell and at most a predefined maximum number of

phages. The environment ranges from completely well-mixed (liquid), where the contents of each location are randomized at each

iteration, to spatially structured, where they are fixed. An intermediate structure is achieved by allowing replication of bacterial cells

into a neighbourhood of a given distance. Bacteria and phage can be of different species, and the latter exist as entities either in the

environment, where they can infect new hosts, or within hosts, where they either replicate or integrate into their genomes. B) Phage

host range is defined in a matrix where each phage has a probability of infecting a given bacterial species. C) Superinfection exclusion

is the probability that infection by a given phage aborts when a given type of prophage is present. D) The basal probability of bacterial

death can increase by antibiotic exposure or phage infection. Phages decay in function of the period of time spent outside a bacterial

host. E) Bacteria compete to reproduce to empty locations, with the fittest bacteria being more likely to produce an offspring. The

offspring inherits the traits of the parent cell, but can undergo mutations and is placed into the free location. F) The type of phage

infection is determined by the lifestyle of the phage, with virulent following an obligatory lytic cycle, whilst temperate phage can

undertake the lytic or the lysogenic cycle following a stochastic decision affected by the density of phages in the environment. The

probability of specialized transduction is computed during excision, leading eventually to the incorporation into the phage DNA of a

neighboring gene. Generalized transduction occurs before the burst, and a virion has the probability to incorporate random genes from

its host, instead of its own DNA. Transduced genes can be used by the subsequently infected bacterial hosts. G) The main cycle of a

typical simulation within the model. See complete ODD in Supplementary Material.

Results and Discussion

Ecology of phage-bacteria interactions in the light of antibiotic and phage therapy

Antimicrobial therapies rely on the effectiveness of selective agents to kill sensitive bacteria. Phage therapy involves infection and reproduction of the killing agents, thus extending the ability of standard chemical therapies. We started by investigating if eVIVALDI could reproduce simplified but typical ecological scenarios where sensitive individuals are killed by antibiotics and/or predated by virulent phages, thus promoting the increase in frequency of resistant bacteria. A simple community of two bacterial species, one sensitive and another resistant (either to antibiotic or virulent phage), was simulated in a well-mixed environment, and no new resistant bacterial mutants are allowed to emerge in these simulations. Resistance can be defined as costly, in line with experimental data [41], rendering resistant bacteria less competitive in the absence of selection pressure (Fig S1). However, when either antibiotics (Fig 2A) or phage (Fig 2B) are introduced in the environment, the resistant population rapidly increases to fixation. Predation by phage leads to an initial increase in their numbers, because of the abundance of sensitive bacteria, but also to their subsequent rapid extinction when sensitive hosts become unavailable (Fig 2B). A combined treatment of antibiotics and virulent phages leads to the extinction of both populations because none has the ability to survive both selective pressures (Fig 2C). However, the decrease of the antibiotic sensitive population is slower in the presence of phages because of lower competition from antibiotic resistant cells, which are killed by the phage (Fig S2A).

Our model allows to test explicitly the effect of spatial structure on community composition. Antibiotics applied homogeneously in spatially structured communities delay the extinction of the sensitive bacteria in comparison to non-structured environments (Fig S2B). However, antibiotics are more likely to be applied non-homogeneously when environments are structured. The delayed extinction is more pronounced in these conditions leading to long term coexistence between

sensitive and resistance bacteria (Fig S3). The effect of phage predation on community dynamics

is markedly different between well-mixed and spatially structured environments because the latter

decreases dispersion leading to "predation waves" that produce spatial arrangements of dead

cells akin to those observed in phage plaque assays (see Fig S4 and Video S1). Ultimately, spatial

structure results in delayed extinction of phage sensitive cells (Fig 2E vs Fig 2B). Similar to well-

mixed environments, presence of antibiotics and phage in spatially structured environments leads

to a much slower extinction of antibiotic resistant bacteria compared to environments with

antibiotics but lacking phages (Fig 2F vs Fig 2D). However, the presence of phages and antibiotics

in spatially structured environments leads to a faster extinction of antibiotic sensitive populations,

compared to well mixed environments (Fig 2F vs Fig 2C, Fig S2C), due to a much less efficient

phage predation of their competitors when the environment is structured.

Fig 2. Community dynamics driven by antibiotic selection and phage predation. A small community composed of two different

species is subjected to different selective pressures. Bacteria can be sensitive to antibiotics but resistant to phage (in green), or

resistant to antibiotics but sensitive to phage (in red). We follow the temporal dynamics and show the populations in their respective

colors (the number of free phage in the environment is shown in black). Solid lines indicate mean values for 30 simulations ran with

the same parameters and shaded areas show their 95% confidence interval. At the right of each plot is a representative time lapse at

3 time points of the lattices for each scenario, where the colors represent each bacterial species and white spaces represent the

absence of bacterial cells. In A) and D) antibiotics are applied at the indicated time. In B) and E), virulent phages (10 individual particles)

are co-inoculated with the bacteria at time 0. In C) and F), both selective regimes are applied, with antibiotics applied at the indicated

time and virulent phage co-inoculated with bacteria at time 0. In A), B) and C), the environment is homogeneous (well-mixed), as in

liquid culture. In D), E) and F), the environment is spatially structured. In D) and F) antibiotics are applied homogenously in the

structured environment, and in E) and F) each of the 10 phage particles is initially placed randomly in the biofilm. The complete set of

parameters for these simulations is show in supplementary data.

The introduction of mutations in the model, eventually reversing the sensibility to antibiotics or

phages, tends to stabilize the bacterial populations (Fig S5A-B). Nevertheless, some populations

still go extinct because of the loss of rare mutants by genetic drift or because no adaptive

mutations occurred in the time span. For similar mutation rates, cells resistant to antibiotics

increase in frequency faster than the ones resistant to phages, due to differences in the dynamics

of the two selection pressures (Fig S5C). Under pressure of antibiotics and phages, double

resistant cells emerge only when the mutation rate is very high. The impact of the environmental

structure in the dynamics of predation (Fig 2) led us to analyze how it affects the emergence of

resistant lineages (Fig 3). Whilst single resistant mutants increase in frequency slower in

structured environments (Fig S5D), double mutants resistant to antibiotics and phage are much

more likely to emerge (Fig 3A-D) for intermediate rates of mutation (Fig 3E). This is because in

structured environments, the rare mutants resistant to antibiotics benefit from the resources

available from neighboring dead cells and rise in frequency without contact with phages (that

diffuse less efficiently). This increases the span of time available for the acquisition of secondary

mutations conferring resistance to phages, especially if the initial number of phages is not very

high (Fig S6). Hence, the acquisition of multiple adaptive mutations is more likely to occur in

structured environments.

Fig 3. Spatial structure promotes the emergence of multi-resistant bacteria. A-D) Simulations of a single bacterial species, initially

sensitive to antibiotics and phage. Lines show 30 replicate simulations with emerging resistant lineages (to one or both selective

pressures). Single mutants resistant to phage are shown in red, whilst single mutants resistant to bacteria are shown in green. Double

mutant lineages resistant to antibiotics and phage are shown in grey. In A) and B) mutants emerge at a rate of 10^{-4}. C and D) mutants

emerge at a rate of 10^{-3}. A and C show dynamics from well-mixed environments. B and D show dynamics from spatially structured

environments. E) Percentage of simulations (out of 30) where lineages resistant both to antibiotics and phage have emerged, in either

well mixed or spatially structured environments, for all the mutation rates tested (x-axis).

The ability of bacteria to evolve resistance to phage might be futile if phage can also adapt to

overcome the changes in their bacterial hosts [42]. When we allowed bacteria *and* phage to evolve

in our simulations (Fig S7A), we observed co-evolutionary arms races similar to both theoretical

expectations [33] and experimental observations [43]. Spatially structured environments showed

slower co-evolution dynamics and higher variability between simulations than well-mixed ones

(Fig S7B). Heterogeneous antibiotics added in structured environments further delayed the co-

evolution dynamics (Fig S7C-D), due to the death of a significant part of the bacterial population.

Importantly, and as before (Fig 3), surviving bacteria (either resistant to antibiotics or not exposed

to lethal concentrations) were able to generate mutants resistant to phages for a longer period of

time. This is not only due to the limited diffusion of phage, but also because phages need bacterial

hosts to replicate and to generate their own genetic diversity. Thus, a reduction in the number of

bacterial hosts due to antibiotic exposure hinders both phage propagation and evolution. This

suggests that, in natural environments, multiple stressors might render co-evolutionary arms races

less predictable than proposed by theoretical models and experimental settings that assume

homogeneous populations and environments.

Lysogeny as a weapon

Contrary to virulent phages, temperate phages may integrate the bacterial host genome and

reproduce vertically with it. The lysis-lysogeny decision in our simulations mimics experimental

observations [44], and is influenced by the amount of competition faced by the phage: lysogeny is

more likely under high viral concentrations or high multiplicity of infection (Fig S8). Since lysogens

are protected from further infections by similar phages, due to superinfection exclusion, the

environmental concentration of phages in the simulations decreases rapidly with the increase of

lysogens (and depending on free phage half-life). When lysogeny occurs mostly at high viral

concentration the bacterial population can become extinct before lysogens can arise.

Theoretically, this can also result in the extinction of the phage population.

When a lysogen invader arrives at a community with resident bacteria sensitive to its prophage,

lysis of a small fraction of the invaders can dramatically reduce the population of resident sensitive

bacteria. This liberates resources for the lysogenic invaders [13]. eVIVALDI recapitulates previous

experimental data on this prophage-as-a-weapon hypothesis [17] (Fig 4a): prophage induction

rapidly decreases the sensitive population of residents in the early stages of the process, but

lysogenization of the latter rapidly neutralizes this process (because the resident lysogens are

now resistant to the phage). Hence, the use of prophages as a biological weapon can provide a

decisive advantage for colonizing a new niche, but is rapidly neutralized by lysogenization of

competitor bacteria. This is also in agreement with previous theoretical works exploring dynamics

of invasion in well-mixed environments, using prophages as a competitive weapon [45].

The advantage of lysogens in the colonization of an environment of resident sensitive bacteria

was recently demonstrated in the mouse gut and was suggested to depend on the initial ratio

between invaders and resident cells [29]. Indeed, our simulations considering different initial ratios

of invading lysogens versus resident non-lysogens showed that the latter were more likely to

survive as lysogens when more abundant in the beginning of the process (Fig S9). The

abovementioned study presented a population-based mathematical model that fitted well most

experimental data, but predicted faster initial infection rates than the observed ones. While

different parameters can slow down these dynamics (e.g., the burst size of the phage [29]), the

spatially structured mouse gastrointestinal tract is likely to interfere with the temporal dynamics of

lysogeny. Interestingly, the inclusion of spatial structure in our model, absent from the

abovementioned models, led to a slower increase of free viral particles and slower generation of

lysogens in the resident strain (Fig 4B-C). This implicates that invading lysogens may be more

successful *in vivo* than would have been predicted by *in vitro* studies in well-mixed environments.

Fig 4. The role of lysogeny in community dynamics. A) Genomes from species A (invaders, grey bars) carry an inducible prophage, whereas those of species B (residents, white bars) are initially non-lysogens. Species are co-inoculated at a 1:10 mixture. Phages (black lines) are spontaneously induced from the lysogenic population. These phages infect the sensitive resident population, which may form lysogens that are protected from phages (B*, black bars). Eventually, the resident that are not lysogens become extinct. All bars represent the average of 30 replicate simulations with similar parameters, with the error bars indicating their 95% confidence interval. Data was displayed as in Figure 1 of [17] for comparison. B) Invading lysogens (L, red lines) and resident sensitive cells (S, blue lines) are co-inoculated at a ratio of 1:10. Phages (purple lines) are spontaneously induced and generate new lysogens in the sensitive resident cells (S^L, green lines). Full lines: well-mixed environments. Dashed lines: spatially structured environment. Data was displayed as in Figure 3 of [29] for comparison. C) Emergence of resident lysogens in well-mixed (blue) and in spatially structured (orange) environments during the initial 10 iterations of the simulations shown in B. Shown is the polynomial fit of order 2 for the initial 10 iterations, for each of the two types of environment; ANCOVA between the two environments, F=485.5, p=0.

Autotransduction of an antibiotic resistance gene

When the phages lysing the resident sensitive cells are able to do generalized transduction, they can transfer adaptive traits back to the invader lysogens (autotransduction [27], Fig 5A). To study this process, we started by demonstrating the adaptive effect of lysogenic conversion in bacteria and how it can impact the competition between different phages (Fig S10). We recreated the conditions for autotransduction within our model, by introducing two strains with similar initial population sizes: a non-lysogenic strain resistant to antibiotics ("residents") and a strain of lysogenic antibiotic sensitive "invaders" (Fig 5A). After initial growth, antibiotics are applied in the environment and, as in the experimental study [27], the invaders survive because they acquire the resistance gene by generalized transduction (Fig 5A-B). The analysis of the bacterial genomes in the simulations indicates multiple successive transduction events from the resistant to the invader cells (Fig 5C). These events are random (i.e., transduction can transfer any part of bacterial DNA), but natural selection results in over-representation of those transferring antibiotic resistance genes. Overall, invaders lead residents to extinction in most simulations (62%), but sometimes residents become lysogens and outcompete invaders (3%). Interestingly, many simulations

exhibited coexistence of lysogenic invaders and lysogenic residents (22%, Fig 5D), and a few

showed extinction of all bacterial populations (13%).

Fig 5. Simulation of autotransduction. A) Representation of the autotransduction events. We created a multispecies community akin

to the experimental work of [27], where the invader lysogenic species (red) is sensitive to antibiotics and the resident non-lysogenic

species (green) is resistant to antibiotics but sensitive to the phage of the invaders. B) Temporal dynamics of a typical simulation

leading to the survival of the invaders. The black line indicates the number of phages in the environment and the time of application of

antibiotics is indicated with the grey line. C) Samples of genomes in the population at two different time points of the simulations of

panel B. Before antibiotics (*t=2*), the genomes of the resident population (green) carry the resistance trait (orange marker). The invader

population (red) is not resistant (grey marker indicates sensitivity to drugs). After the application of antibiotic (*t=10*) most of the invaders

have the original prophage and a random sequence of bacterial DNA transduced from the resident cells (other ellipses). D) Outcome

of 100 simulations.

eVIVALDI includes many complex stochastic mechanisms and it is not straightforward to

empirically disentangle the importance of each in the final outcome. Therefore, we used a machine

learning approach, Random Forest Analysis (RFA, see Methods), to quantify the importance of

the mechanisms driving the increase of the population of invaders (Fig 6A, Table S1). We focused

on the percentage increase in minimum squared error (MSE) associated with each variable in the

simulation. Generalized transduction had the strongest effect in the efficiency of autotransduction

(86% increase in mean square error [MSE], Fig 6B), whilst specialized transduction was almost

negligible (3% increase in MSE). Autotransduction also improved with higher probability of

adsorption (44% increase in MSE) and infection distance (i.e., the maximum distance between a

bacterium and a phage still allowing infection, 70% increase in MSE), because they increase the

reach and efficiency of infection by phage and, subsequently, the likelihood of generalized

transduction (Fig 6C, Fig S11B). In contrast, when the decision to enter lysogeny (49% increase

in MSE) can be made with high probability for relatively low viral concentrations, the resident

population proliferates (Fig S11D and Fig S11I for the lysis-lysogeny decision functions explored

with the RFA). The importance of the remaining parameters is detailed in Fig S11.

Fig 6. Identification of the main mechanisms affecting the rate of autotransduction of an antibiotic resistance gene using

Random Forest Analysis. A) Analysis is based on 3000 randomized combinations of parameters and 30 repeated simulations for

each combination). Parameters with a higher % in increased minimum square error have a higher importance for the measured

outcome: the median of the final relative frequency of the invader. A random parameter (in grey) was included in the analysis to provide

a baseline reference of importance. B-C) The directionality of the impact of two parameters is assessed by plotting the frequency of

the invader population at the end of the simulation (across all simulations), in function of the parameter of interest (the other parameters

are shown in Fig S11). In the left y-axis, and as strip plot of grey dots, is the distribution of the frequency of the invader population in

all simulations. In the right y-axis, and as red dots and lines, is the median of this frequency across the simulations.

To better understand the relationship between two of the most important parameters, generalized

transduction and probability of phage attachment, we explored their space of parameters at a

higher resolution than before (Fig 7A), while fixing all other parameters. We found that a critical

combination of high adsorption efficiency and high (but not too high) probability of generalized

transduction is required for the survival of invaders (red region). The survival of the resident

population is the most likely outcome when rates of transduction and/or infection are low, but also

when all phages engage in generalized transduction (100% probability of generalized

transduction), because no viable particles are released in the environment (green region). The

space of parameters leading to coexistence (yellow region) separates the region leading to the

overrepresentation of the invaders from the one leading to the overrepresentation of the resident

species (see also Fig S12).

The study revealing autotransduction focused on the process of gene acquisition by the invaders

and did not address the possibility of co-existence [27]. We thus experimentally addressed the

prediction of co-existence by co-culturing in liquid media supplemented with chloroamphenicol two

strains of *Staphylococcus aureus*: a lysogenic strain (JH944, "invaders") sensitive to the antibiotic

and a non-lysogenic strain (JH938, "residents") resistant to the antibiotic (see Methods). The

majority of the clones isolated at the end of the experiment are from the JH944 background, and

these are now resistant to chloroamphenicol, indicating the acquisition of the resistance gene from

the resident bacteria by autotransduction. However, in all 3 replicates a subpopulation of JH938

was observed to coexist with the invader strain (Fig 7B), confirming our predictions.

Importantly, coexistence is strictly dependent on the generation of lysogenic variants of the

resident bacteria, being suppressed when we performed simulations without the generation of

new lysogens (Fig S13A-D). This is experimentally corroborated with the observed release of

phage particles from the surviving resident clones at the end of the co-culture, when these are

exposed to Mitomycin C (Fig 7B, see Methods). This confirms that lysogenization of the resident

bacteria is the mechanism responsible for the coexistence between the two strains.

Our simulations further suggest that structured environments (Fig S12A) provide an additional

region, for extremely high rates of transduction, where coexistence is prevalent (upper regions in

Fig S12B-C). These high rates are biologically implausible for viable phages, but not for defective

phages or for gene transfer agents [46]. Finally, extinctions of both strains were more frequent

when the probability if adsorption was high and transduction was low, suggesting that an inducible

phage that is highly infective but a poor transducer is more likely to lead to the collapse of both

the invaders and the antibiotic resistant populations. The likelihood of double extinctions is higher

in structured environments (Fig S12A, Fig S14 and Fig S15) or in the absence of lysogenization

of the resident bacteria (Fig S13E-F and Fig S16). Our results suggest that ecological interactions

between strains invading communities of susceptible bacteria can be very diverse, depending on

the rates of infection, transduction, lysogenization and population structure.

Fig 7. The combined role of probability of adsorption and generalized transduction for the autotransduction of an antibiotic resistance gene. The simulation scenario is similar to Fig 6. **A)** The heatmap represents the likelihood of the outcome of the simulations in function of the two parameters. The color scale ranges from green (100% of the final population composed resident bacteria) to red (100% of the final population composed of invader bacteria), with yellow regions indicating cases where coexistence is the outcome more likely to occur in the timeframe of the simulations. 30 repeat simulations were performed for each combination of parameters, and their median value is used to construct the heatmap. When both populations went extinct, this was either ignored to compute the median (if it occurred in less than 50% of the cases), or was marked as grey (otherwise). **B)** Co-cultures of a lysogenic choloroamphenicol sensitive strain of *S. aureus* (JH944, "invaders") and a non-lysogenic choloroamphenicol resistant strain (JH938, "residents") indicate coexistence between the two strains at the end of the experiment. Y-axis shows the percentage of colonies with a given genotype (out of 127 in total). Boxplots and dots represent the data for 3 independent replicates of the experiment.

Conclusion

Individual-based modelling is providing novel ways to analyze and predict the behavior of microbial systems [39]. Our novel approach integrates multiple and different bacterial species, phages, environmental structures and ecological conditions to explore different aspects of bacteria-phage interactions: temporal changes in community composition (e.g., between lysogens and non-lysogenic bacteria), the concurrent effects of mechanisms of infection, lysogeny, and transduction, and their consequences for the genomic composition of each individual bacteria and phage. To the best of our knowledge, no other theoretical or computation model integrates these different scales of bacteria-phage interactions. This has allowed us to characterize and quantify key ecological components, such as structured environments, in the dynamics emerging from these interactions.

Nonetheless, models are grounded on simplifying assumptions to make biological systems more tractable. This facilitates pinpointing the relevance of certain mechanisms or agents, but may result in misleading over-simplifications of the system. One major difference between biological systems and our model concerns the number of cells which, due to computational reasons, is lower than the one typically used in experimental settings. Even though our results are qualitatively similar to experimental and/or other theoretical works, this difference may affect the quantitative results. The decreased effective population size (and the consequent increase in the effect of drift) requires that certain rates (e.g., mutation or transduction rates) are simulated at higher values, in order to increase the probability of detecting such events. Another limitation lies in the characterization of the environment. Even if we allow for different levels of structure, environments are spatially and temporally constant throughout the simulations, which might not always be the case in nature. This can change the dynamics of propagation of phages, and lead to subpopulations specialized for different spatial niches. A third limitation of the model lies on the

lack of a true physiological description of the bacteria. We assume that phages can infect bacteria

at any time, but phage infectivity is known, in some cases, to depend on whether its bacterial host

is in exponential or stationary phase [47]. In other cases, a stochastic or induced persistence state

in bacteria allows the population to maintain alive a sensitive subpopulation [48]. This can lead to

a slowdown or complete halt of infection, particularly in structured environments. Nevertheless, it

is important to underline that the model was designed to be easily extensible and further assimilate

new mechanisms. Some that are already implemented but not thoroughly explored here include

phage resistance based on adaptive immunity (e.g., CRISPR-Cas [32,49]) or mutations affecting

the phage host range [50].

One of the major conclusions of this work is that spatial structure affects the dynamics of bacterial

populations in the face of antibiotic exposure, phage predation or a combination of both. Whilst

combining phages and antibiotics is one of the proposed strategies for the clinical use of phage

[51,52], we show here that the emergence of bacteria resistant to both stressors can be enhanced

by structured environments, particularly when antibiotics are not homogeneously distributed, as

seems common in natural settings [53,54].

Adaptation of bacterial cells can also be driven by temperate phage, and we explore in detail how

autotransduction can promote the spread of antibiotic resistance, quantifying the relative

importance of different mechanisms for this outcome. Importantly, we predict that different

community outcomes (coexistence and extinction) can occur by modulating the efficiency of

phages' infection, lysogeny and transduction, as well as the structure of the environment. We

experimentally confirm the emergence of co-existence between strains of *S. aureus* in well mixed

environments, but it would be interesting in the future to modulate the efficiency of phage infection

and of generating transducing particles. Furthermore, experimentally assessing the predicted role

of structured environments in generating different conditions for co-existence and extinction will

be important. It would also be crucial to explore how co-existence between virulent phage and

prophage influences the outcomes of a combined treatment with phage and antibiotics. Exploring

these and other ecological settings is key to understand which factors impact the efficiency of

phage therapy, and their evolutionary consequences for bacterial populations.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thank Marie Touchon and José Pénadés for comments, suggestions, and criticisms during the

development and testing of the model. This work was funded by European Research Council grant

[EVOMOBILOME n°281605] to E.P.C.R. and by an EU FP7 PRESTIGE grant [PRESTIGE-2017-

1-0012] from Campus France to J.A.M.S.

REFERENCES

1. Didelot X, Walker AS, Peto TE, Crook DW, Wilson DJ. Within-host evolution of bacterial
pathogens. Nat Rev Micro.; 2016;14: 150–162. doi:10.1038/nrmicro.2015.13

2. Brooks AW, Kohl KD, Brucker RM, van Opstal EJ, Bordenstein SR. Phylosymbiosis:
Relationships and Functional Effects of Microbial Communities across Host Evolutionary
History. Relman D, editor. PLoS Biol.; 2016;14: e2000225–29.
doi:10.1371/journal.pbio.2000225

3. Fuhrman JA. Marine viruses and their biogeochemical and ecological effects. Nature.;
1999;399: 541–548. doi:10.1038/21119

4. Koskella B, Brockhurst MA. Bacteria-phage coevolution as a driver of ecological and
evolutionary processes in microbial communities. FEMS Microbiol Rev. 2014;38: 916–
931. doi:10.1111/1574-6976.12072

5. Perfeito L, Fernandes L, Mota C, Gordo I. Adaptive mutations in bacteria: high rate and
small effects. Science. American Association for the Advancement of Science; 2007;317:
813–815. doi:10.1126/science.1142284

6. Ghoul M, Mitri S. The Ecology and Evolution of Microbial Competition. Trends in
Microbiology. 2016;24: 833–845. doi:10.1016/j.tim.2016.06.011

7. Engelhardt T, Kallmeyer J, Cypionka H, Engelen B. High virus-to-cell ratios indicate
ongoing production of viruses in deep subsurface sediments. ISME J.; 2014;8: 1503–

1509. doi:10.1038/ismej.2013.245

8.   Díaz-Muñoz SL, Koskella B. Bacteria-phage interactions in natural environments. Adv
Appl Microbiol. Elsevier; 2014;89: 135–183. doi:10.1016/B978-0-12-800259-9.00004-4

9.   Clokie MR, Millard AD, Letarov AV, Heaphy S. Phages in nature. Bacteriophage. Taylor &
Francis; 2011;1: 31–45. doi:10.4161/bact.1.1.14942

10.   Suttle CA. Marine viruses--major players in the global ecosystem. Nat Rev Micro.; 2007;5:
801–812. doi:10.1038/nrmicro1750

11.   Roach DR, Debarbieux L. Phage therapy: awakening a sleeping giant. Emerg Top Life
Sci. Portland Press Journals portal; 2017;1: 93–103. doi:10.1042/ETLS20170002

12.   Susskind MM, Botstein D, Wright A. Superinfection exclusion by P22 prophage in
lysogens of Salmonella typhimurium. III. Failure of superinfecting phage DNA to enter
sieA+ lysogens. Virology. 1974;62: 350–366.

13.   Harrison E, Brockhurst MA. Ecological and Evolutionary Benefits of Temperate Phage:
What Does or Doesn't Kill You Makes You Stronger. Bioessays. 2nd ed. 2017;197:
1700112. doi:10.1002/bies.201700112

14.   Bondy-Denomy J, Qian J, Westra ER, Buckling A, Guttman DS, Davidson AR, et al.
Prophages mediate defense against phage infection through diverse mechanisms. ISME
J.; 2016;10: 2854–2866. doi:10.1038/ismej.2016.79

15.   Touchon M, Bernheim A, Rocha EP. Genetic and life-history traits associated with the
distribution of prophages in bacteria. ISME J.; 2016. doi:10.1038/ismej.2016.47

16.   Brüssow H, Canchaya C, Hardt W-D. Phages and the evolution of bacterial pathogens:
from genomic rearrangements to lysogenic conversion. Microbiology and Molecular
Biology Reviews. American Society for Microbiology; 2004;68: 560–602– table of
contents. doi:10.1128/MMBR.68.3.560-602.2004

17.   Bossi L, Fuentes JA, Mora G, Figueroa-Bossi N. Prophage contribution to bacterial
population dynamics. Journal of Bacteriology. American Society for Microbiology (ASM);
2003;185: 6467–6471. doi:10.1128/JB.185.21.6467-6471.2003

18.   Gama JA, Reis AM, Domingues I, Mendes-Soares H, Matos AM, Dionisio F. Temperate
bacterial viruses as double-edged swords in bacterial warfare. Brown SP, editor. PLoS
ONE. 2013;8: e59043. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0059043

19.   Touchon M, Moura de Sousa JA, Rocha EP. Embracing the enemy: the diversification of
microbial gene repertoires by phage-mediated horizontal gene transfer. Current Opinion
in Microbiology. 2017;38: 66–73. doi:10.1016/j.mib.2017.04.010

20.   Weinstock GM. Transduction in Gram-Negative Bacteria. Modern Microbial Genetics.
New York, USA: John Wiley & Sons, Inc; 2002. pp. 561–579.
doi:10.1002/047122197X.ch21

21.   Henry M, Debarbieux L. Tools from viruses: bacteriophage successes and beyond.

Virology. 2012;434: 151–161. doi:10.1016/j.virol.2012.09.017

22.   Kenzaka T, Tani K, Sakotani A, Yamaguchi N, Nasu M. High-frequency phage-mediated
gene transfer among Escherichia coli cells, determined at the single-cell level. Appl
Environ Microbiol. 2007;73: 3291–3299. doi:10.1128/AEM.02890-06

23.   Kenzaka T, Tani K, Nasu M. High-frequency phage-mediated gene transfer in freshwater
environments determined at single-cell level. ISME J.; 2010;4: 648–659.
doi:10.1038/ismej.2009.145

24.   Xia G, Wolz C. Phages of Staphylococcus aureus and their impact on host evolution.
Infect Genet Evol. 2014;21: 593–601. doi:10.1016/j.meegid.2013.04.022

25.   Balcazar JL. Bacteriophages as Vehicles for Antibiotic Resistance Genes in the
Environment. Miller V, editor. PLoS Pathog. 2014;10: e1004219–4.
doi:10.1371/journal.ppat.1004219

26.   Haaber J, Penadés JR, Ingmer H. Transfer of Antibiotic Resistance in Staphylococcus
aureus. Trends in Microbiology. Elsevier Ltd; 2017;25: 1–13.
doi:10.1016/j.tim.2017.05.011

27.   Haaber J, Leisner JORJ, Cohn MT, Catalan-Moreno A, Nielsen JB, Westh H, et al.
Bacterial viruses enable their host to acquire antibiotic resistance genes from
neighbouring cells. Nature Communications.; 2016;7: 1–8. doi:10.1038/ncomms13333

28.   Bull JJ, Gill JJ. The habits of highly effective phages: population dynamics as a
framework for identifying therapeutic phages. Front Microbiol. Frontiers; 2014;5: 1–12.
doi:10.3389/fmicb.2014.00618

29.   De Paepe M, Tournier L, Moncaut E, Son O, Langella P, Petit M-A. Carriage of λ Latent
Virus Is Costly for Its Bacterial Host due to Frequent Reactivation in Monoxenic Mouse
Intestine. Hughes D, editor. PLoS Genet. 2016;12: e1005861.
doi:10.1371/journal.pgen.1005861

30.   Weitz JS, Hartman H, Levin SA. Coevolutionary arms races between bacteria and
bacteriophage. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences. 2005;102: 9535–9540.
doi:10.1073/pnas.0504062102

31.   Berngruber TW, Lion S, Gandon S. Evolution of suicide as a defence strategy against
pathogens in a spatially structured environment. Thrall P, editor. Ecology Letters.
2013;16: 446–453. doi:10.1111/ele.12064

32.   Koonin EV, Wolf YI. Evolution of the CRISPR-Cas adaptive immunity systems in
prokaryotes: models and observations on virus–host coevolution. Molecular
BioSystems. Royal Society of Chemistry; 2014;11: 20–27. doi:10.1039/C4MB00438H

33.   Levin BR, Bull JJ. Population and evolutionary dynamics of phage therapy. Nat Rev
Micro. Nature Publishing Group; 2004;2: 166–173. doi:10.1038/nrmicro822

34.   McVay CS, Velásquez M, Fralick JA. Phage therapy of Pseudomonas aeruginosa
infection in a mouse burn wound model. Antimicrobial Agents and Chemotherapy.

2007;51: 1934–1938. doi:10.1128/AAC.01028-06

35.   Brockhurst MA, Buckling A, Rainey PB. Spatial heterogeneity and the stability of host-
parasite coexistence. J Evol Biol. Blackwell Publishing Ltd; 2006;19: 374–379.
doi:10.1111/j.1420-9101.2005.01026.x

36.   Simmons M, Drescher K, Nadell CD, Bucci V. Phage mobility is a core determinant of
phage-bacteria coexistence in biofilms. ISME J.; 2017;89: 135.
doi:10.1038/ismej.2017.190

37.   Roach DR, Leung CY, Henry M, Morello E, Singh D, Di Santo JP, et al. Synergy between
the Host Immune System and Bacteriophage Is Essential for Successful Phage Therapy
against an Acute Respiratory Pathogen. Cell Host and Microbe. 2017;22: 38–47.e4.
doi:10.1016/j.chom.2017.06.018

38.   Volkova VV, Lu Z, Besser T, Gröhn YT. Modeling the infection dynamics of
bacteriophages in enteric Escherichia coli: estimating the contribution of transduction to
antimicrobial gene spread. Appl Environ Microbiol. 2014;80: 4350–4362.
doi:10.1128/AEM.00446-14

39.   Hellweger FL, Clegg RJ, Clark JR, Plugge CM, Kreft J-U. Advancing microbial sciences
by individual-based modelling. Nat Rev Micro.; 2016;14: 461–471.
doi:10.1038/nrmicro.2016.62

40.   Grimm V, Berger U, Bastiansen F, Eliassen S, Ginot V, Giske J, et al. A standard protocol
for describing individual-based and agent-based models. Ecological Modelling. 2006;198:
115–126. doi:10.1016/j.ecolmodel.2006.04.023

41.   Andersson DI, Levin BR. The biological cost of antibiotic resistance. Current Opinion in
Microbiology. 1999;2: 489–493.

42.   Samson JE, Magadán AH, Sabri M, Moineau S. Revenge of the phages: defeating
bacterial defences. Nat Rev Micro.; 2013;11: 1–13. doi:10.1038/nrmicro3096

43.   Gómez P, Ashby B, Buckling A. Population mixing promotes arms race host-parasite
coevolution. Proc Biol Sci. 2015;282: 20142297–20142297. doi:10.1098/rspb.2014.2297

44.   Zeng L, Skinner SO, Zong C, Sippy J, Feiss M, Golding I. Decision making at a
subcellular level determines the outcome of bacteriophage infection. Cell. 2010;141: 682–
691. doi:10.1016/j.cell.2010.03.034

45.   Brown SP, Le Chat L, De Paepe M, Taddei F. Ecology of microbial invasions:
amplification allows virus carriers to invade more rapidly when rare. Current Biology.
2006;16: 2048–2052. doi:10.1016/j.cub.2006.08.089

46.   Lang AS, Westbye AB, Beatty JT. The Distribution, Evolution, and Roles of Gene Transfer
Agents in Prokaryotic Genetic Exchange. Annu Rev Virol. 2017;4: 87–104.
doi:10.1146/annurev-virology-101416-041624

47.   Chibani-Chennoufi S, Bruttin A, Dillmann M-L, Brüssow H. Phage-host interaction: an
ecological perspective. Journal of Bacteriology. American Society for Microbiology;

2004;186: 3677–3686. doi:10.1128/JB.186.12.3677-3686.2004

48.   Chapman-McQuiston E, Wu XL. Stochastic receptor expression allows sensitive bacteria
to evade phage attack. Part I: experiments. Biophys J. 2008;94: 4525–4536.
doi:10.1529/biophysj.107.120212

49.   Bradde S, Vucelja M, Teşileanu T, Balasubramanian V. Dynamics of adaptive immunity
against phage in bacterial populations. Komarova NL, editor. PLoS Comput Biol. 2017;13:
e1005486–16. doi:10.1371/journal.pcbi.1005486

50.   De Sordi L, Khanna V, Debarbieux L. The Gut Microbiota Facilitates Drifts in the Genetic
Diversity and Infectivity of Bacterial Viruses. Cell Host and Microbe. 2017;22: 801–808.e3.
doi:10.1016/j.chom.2017.10.010

51.   Torres-Barceló C, Hochberg ME. Evolutionary Rationale for Phages as Complements of
Antibiotics. Trends in Microbiology. Elsevier Ltd; 2016;24: 249–256.
doi:10.1016/j.tim.2015.12.011

52.   Arias-Sánchez FI, Allen RC, Hall AR. Effects of prior exposure to antibiotics on bacterial
adaptation to phages. J Evol Biol. 2018;11: 2970–10. doi:10.1111/jeb.13220

53.   Anderl JN, Franklin MJ, Stewart PS. Role of antibiotic penetration limitation in Klebsiella
pneumoniae biofilm resistance to ampicillin and ciprofloxacin. Antimicrobial Agents and
Chemotherapy. American Society for Microbiology (ASM); 2000;44: 1818–1824.

54.   Pratama AA, van Elsas JD. The "Neglected" Soil Virome – Potential Role and Impact.
Trends in Microbiology. Elsevier Ltd; 2018;: 1–14. doi:10.1016/j.tim.2017.12.004

Fig 1

A

Spatially Structured ◀━━━━ Well-Mixed

2D Environment

Virulent phage

Temperate phage

B Phage-bacteria host range

0%	100%	1%
0.01%	0%	80%

C Superinfection Exclusion

100%	0%
50%	90%

D Death and selection by antibiotics

Antibiotic resistant

Antibiotic sensitive

Antibiotic spike → *Stochastic death* → *Resistance Cell Selection*

E Bacterial Selection and Replication

Roulette wheel probability proportional to reproductive fitness

F Infection and Transduction of Bacterial Traits

Infection — *Within Host Cycle* — *Burst*

Lysogenic Cycle, genome integration

Temperate

Specialised Transduction

No Transduction

Temperate or Virulent

Lytic Cycle, No genome integration

Generalised Transduction

G

Initial Setup

Setup Environment and Ecosystem
- Bacteria species/types
- Phage species/types
- Phage/Bacteria Infection matrix
- Superinfection Protection matrix
- Environmental Size/Structure
- Antibiotic treatment schedule

Main Cycle

Collect Population Statistics

Antibiotic Application

(If scheduled)

Randomise Population Access Order

Bacterial Death
- Calculate probability of death
  - Intrinsic
  - Antibiotics
  - Phage induction and lysis
- Release lysed phage into the environment
- Remove cells and free resources (space)

Phage Infection

Decision between lytic and lysogenic cycle for temperate phage

Selection and Reproduction

Probability of reproduction followed by roulette wheel selection

Randomise Cell Locations

(If environment is defined as "Well-Mixed")

Environment Update
- Phage dispersal and decay
- Antibiotics dispersal and decay

Fig 2

Well Mixed Environment

A — Antibiotics

Antibiotic spike

- Antibiotic resistant/phage sensitive bacteria
- Phage resistant/antibiotic sensitive bacteria
- Free phage particles

Number of individuals vs Iteration

t=5   t=10   t=40

B — Phage

Number of individuals vs Iteration

t=5   t=10   t=40

C — Antibiotics + Phage

Antibiotic spike

Number of individuals vs Iteration

t=5   t=10   t=40

Spatially Structured Environment

D

Antibiotic spike

- Antibiotic resistant/phage sensitive bacteria
- Phage resistant/antibiotic sensitive bacteria
- Free phage particles

Number of individuals vs Iteration

t=5   t=10   t=40

E

Number of individuals vs Iteration

t=5   t=10   t=40

F

Antibiotic spike

Number of individuals vs Iteration

t=5   t=10   t=40

Fig 3

Fig 4

Fig 5

A

Invaders AR −

ProPh +

Residents ProPh −

AR +

Death by antibiotics

Death by lysis

Antibiotics Applied

Death by lysis

Transducing particles

ProPh +

AR +

Time

B

Antibiotic spike

Number of Individuals

Invader Bacteria
Resident Bacteria
Free phage particles

Iteration

C

Prophage

Inactive antibiotic resistance gene

t=2

Active antibiotic resistance gene

t=10

Phage transduced genes

D

% of simulations

Invader Population
Extinction
Coexistence
Resident Population

Fig 6

Fig 7