Cheater-mediated evolution shifts phenotypic heterogeneity in *Bacillus subtilis*

biofilms

Marivic Martin[1,2], Anna Dragoš[1], Daniel Schäfer[2], Gergely Maróti[3], and

Ákos T. Kovács[1,2]

[1] Bacterial Interactions and Evolution Group, Technical University of Denmark, 2800 Kongens

Lyngby, Denmark

[2] Terrestrial Biofilms Group, Friedrich Schiller University Jena, 07743 Jena, Germany

[3] Institute of Plant Biology, Biological Research Center of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences,

3600 Szeged, Hungary

Corresponding Author: Ákos T. Kovács

Bacterial Interactions and Evolution Group, Technical University of Denmark, 2800 Kongens

Lyngby, Denmark; atkovacs@dtu.dk; +45 45252527

Keywords: *Bacillus subtilis*, biofilm, phenotypic heterogeneity, experimental evolution,

exopolysaccharide

ABSTRACT

Biofilms are closely packed cells held and shielded by extracellular matrix composed of structural proteins and exopolysaccharides (EPS). As matrix components are costly to produce and shared within the population, EPS-deficient cells can act as cheaters by gaining benefits from the cooperative nature of EPS producers. Remarkably, genetically programmed EPS producers can also exhibit phenotypic heterogeneity at single cell level. For instance, mature biofilms of *Bacillus subtilis* contain cells in an 'ON' state, expressing extracellular matrix genes, as well as cells in an 'OFF' state. Previous studies have shown that spatial structure of biofilms limits the spread of cheaters, but the long-term influence of cheating on biofilm evolution is not well understood. In addition, the influence of cheats on phenotypic heterogeneity pattern within matrix-producers, was never examined. Here, we describe the long-term dynamics between EPS producers (cooperators) and non-producers (cheaters) in *B. subtilis* biofilms and track changes in phenotypic heterogeneity of matrix production within the populations of co-operators. We discovered that cheater-mediated evolution in pellicles leads to a transient shift in phenotypic heterogeneity pattern of co-operators, namely an increased number of *eps* expressing cells as depicted by hyper ON phenotype. Although hyper ON strategy seems adaptive in presence of cheats, it is soon substituted by hyper OFF phenotype and/or soon after by population collapse. This study provides additional insights on how biofilms adapt and respond to stress caused by exploitation in long-term scenario.

SIGNIFICANCE STATEMENT

Microbial biofilms are significant in medical, environmental and industrial settings. Biofilm control strategies have been proven to be challenging due to their increased resistance to antimicrobials. Here, we employ a cheater-mediated evolution study in *Bacillus subtilis* pellicles to understand in long-term scale how biofilms' social behavior evolves as triggered by stress. We show that evolution of matrix-producing cells (cooperators) in the presence of non-producers

(cheaters) leads to a cheating strategy that allows cheaters to benefit from cooperators, that

subsequently result to population tragedy. However, cooperators can also adapt and evade

exploitation via an anti-cheating system that involves shift in phenotypic heterogeneity related

to biofilm matrix expression. This study highlights biofilm adaptation and stress response

mechanisms within the context of evolution.

INTRODUCTION

Cooperative interactions are prevalent for all life forms (1), even for simple microbes that often

exist in communities of matrix bound surface-attached cells called biofilms (2–6). However, when

costly products such as siderophores (7, 8), extracellular polymeric substances (9, 10), digestive

enzymes (11), and signaling molecules (12, 13) are secreted and shared, cooperative behavior

becomes susceptible to cheating (2, 14–16), where mutants defective in cooperation can still

benefit from cooperative community members (4, 5, 17). It has been shown that spatially

structured biofilms, where interactions with clonemates are common and diffusion of public

goods is limited, may serve as natural defense against cheating (18–20). However, long time scale

studies have recently reported that biofilm defectors can spontaneously emerge and spread in

biofilms by exploiting other matrix-proficient lineages (21–24). In fact, a pioneering microbial

evolution study on *Pseudomonas fluorescens* has already pointed towards dynamic evolutionary

interplay between cooperation and exploitation in biofilm matts (25), where emergence of

cellulose overproducer (Wrinkly) allowed matt formation, but also created an opportunity for

exploitation by non-producers (Smooth), eventually leading to so called 'tragedy of the

commons' (4, 26, 27).

Taken together, biofilms are suitable model to understand social interactions in an evolutionary

time scale (23, 28–31). Modelling and empirical data confirm that mutualism (beneficial to both

actor and recipient) and altruism (beneficial to recipient but not to actor) play crucial role in

biofilm enhancement (32) but at the same time can lead to biofilm destabilization (25). Can

cooperators evolve tactics to evade exploitation and in turn, can cheats utilize evolution to

enhance their selfish actions?

Recent studies showed that in well-mixed environment, cooperators adapt to cheats by reducing

cooperation (14, 15, 33). Such reduction could be achieved by various strategies, for instance

decrease in motility (15), down regulation or minimal production in public goods (14, 15, 33), up-

regulation of other alternative public goods (14), or bi-stable expression in virulence gene (2).

Interestingly, populations of cooperators often exhibit phenotypic heterogeneity at the single

cell level (34, 35). Therefore, an alternative and simple mechanism to modulate levels of

cooperation in a population, would be through changes in phenotypic heterogeneity pattern.

However, the long-term effects of cheats on costly goods' expression at individual cell level have

never been examined. Understanding how heterogeneity of gene expression within the

population is affected in the presence of cheats would provide better insight on microbial

adaptation and stress response mechanisms.

Here, we address this question using pellicle biofilm model of *Bacillus subtilis.* Pellicle formation

in *B. subtilis* involves, amongst others, aerotaxis driven motility and subsequent matrix

production (36). Aerotaxis is important for oxygen sensing to aid cells reach the surface, while

matrix formation is significant to sustain cells to adhere to the surface and to each other.

Exopolysaccharide (EPS) is a costly public good in *Bacillus subtilis* biofilms (10, 18, 37) and is

heterogeneously expressed during biofilm formation with approximately 40% of cells exhibiting

the ON state (37, 38). We aimed to investigate the long-term dynamics between EPS producer

(cooperator) and EPS deficient (cheater) cells and assess cheat-dependent alteration related to

phenotypic heterogeneity in *eps* expression by the producer.

We reveal, that initial cheating mitigation by the EPS producers involves shift in phenotypic

heterogeneity towards increased frequency of *eps*-expressing cells, which is achieved by loss-of-

function mutation in a single regulatory gene. We also demonstrate, that although 'hyper ON'

phenotype helps to reduce cheating, it is rapidly replaced by hyper OFF strategy, which,

combined with certain mutations in EPS deficient strain, results in tragedy of the commons and

population collapse. Our study uncovers an alternative anti-cheating mechanism based on

changes in phenotypic heterogeneity and highlights meandering trajectories prior cooperation

collapse.

RESULTS

Long-term cheating in pellicle biofilms leads to population collapse

Exopolysaccharide EPS is one of the major components of *B. subtilis* biofilm matrix and mutants

deficient in EPS production (Δ*eps*) are not able to form pellicle biofilms (*SI Appendix*, Fig. S1A and

S1B). Since it was previously demonstrated that EPS can be shared (10, 18, 37), we predicted that

Δ*eps* would be able to take advantage of EPS-producing wild type (WT) and incorporate into the

pellicle biofilm. Indeed, when co-cultivated with the WT (at 1:1 initial ratio), the Δ*eps* became

part of the pellicle with negative impact on WT productivity (*SI Appendix*, Fig. S1b). In addition,

presence of the mutant resulted in decreased level of surface complexity as typical wrinkly

structures were absent in the mixed pellicle (*SI Appendix*, Fig. S1a). These results reveal that the

Δ*eps* serves as cheater in the pellicle biofilms by taking advantage of the EPS producer strain.

In order to examine long-term population dynamics in co-culture of EPS producers (wild type-

WT) and cheats (Δ*eps*), we allowed 8 parallel pellicle populations of Δ*eps*+WT to evolve for 35

cycles (~200 generations) starting at 1:1 initial ratio. Every 5th transfer, we determined relative

frequencies (%) of both strains in the pellicles using plate count assay (CFU/ml). The results

revealed that cheats were able to outnumber the producer strain, eventually leading to

decreased productivity of the entire population, as pellicle formation was no longer possible

(Fig. 1). Such scenario was observed in 6 out of 8 populations and will be referred to as

population collapse (Fig. 1). Evolutionary time points when a collapse occurred varied among

the population, for instance in population 1 and 7, the collapse was observed after 30th transfer

while in population 2 it took place already after 10th transfer. No collapse was observed for

populations 5 and 8, where cheats coexisted with WT until the end of the evolution cycle (35th).

We also observed different patterns of how productivity of the WT changed when evolved in

the presence of cheats (Fig. 1). A "decline-collapse" trend was noticed for populations 2, 3 and

4, wherein the WT continuously declined and then proceeded to population collapse after 5th,

15th and 10th transfers, respectively. For populations 1, 6 and 7, we witnessed a "decline-

recovery-collapse" pattern. Finally, we detected a "decline-recovery-no collapse" model for

populations 5 and 8, wherein the populations after recovering from an early decline persisted

until 35th transfer.

'Hyper ON' matrix producers emerge during evolution with cheats

Previous studies have shown that cooperators can adapt to presence of cheats for example by

decreasing the amount of released public goods and therefore minimizing cheating opportunities

(2, 14, 15). As *B. subtilis* exhibits phenotypic heterogeneity in *eps* matrix gene expression (37, 38)

(*SI Appendix*, Fig. S2), we investigated how such heterogeneous expression is influenced by the

presence of cheats in an evolutionary perspective. Using confocal laser scanning microscopy,

qualitative assessment of randomly selected isolates revealed that early populations of the EPS

producers (5-10 transfer) which co-evolved with cheats exhibited a so called hyper ON

phenotype, where the fraction of *eps* expressing cells was largely increased as compared to the

ancestral strain (*SI Appendix*, Fig. S2). On the contrary, evolution in the absence of Δ*eps* mostly

resulted in hyper OFF phenotype, with larger amounts of cells that do not express *eps*. To further

verify this phenomenon, we quantified the average P_{eps}-GFP intensity of 95 single isolates per

each WT population (see methods) (Fig. 2). The results revealed major changes in distribution of

P_{eps}-GFP intensity across the evolved and co-evolved WT populations as compared to the WT

ancestor (Fig. 2). Specifically, for all WTs evolved alone, the distributions narrowed and

dramatically shifted to the left, so that the clear majority of isolates matched the hyper OFF

category across the entire evolutionary time (5-35th transfer) (Fig. 2.). On the contrary, in some

co-evolved WT populations (population 3, 5 and 7) the distributions widened at the 10th transfer

(Fig. 2), resulting in increased frequency of hyper ON isolates (Fig. 2). A transient increase of

hyper ON phenotype frequency appeared rather temporary, as it was followed by dramatic

increase in frequency of hyper OFF phenotype in later evolutionary time points (Fig. 2.).

Mutations in *rsiX* lead to Hyper ON phenotype

To unravel the genetic basis of the hyper ON phenotype that evolved in presence of cheats,

several single isolates from the evolved populations were subjected to genome resequencing

(for details see methods). The comparative analysis of sequencing data revealed that the WT

isolates that co-evolved with cheats and exhibited the hyper ON phenotype, shared mutations

in *rsiX* gene (*SI Appendix*, Dataset S1). The *rsiX* gene encodes for an anti-sigma factor that controls

the activity of extracellular cytoplasmic function (ECF) sigma factor X which is involved in cationic

antimicrobial peptide resistance important for cell envelope stress response (39). Detected

mutations resulted either in substitution of Valine 106 to Alanine or frameshift mutations in

Serine 104 or Isoleucine 347 that could lead to change or loss of anti-SigX function. Indeed, we

were able to recreate the evolved hyper ON phenotype in the pellicle solely by deleting the *rsiX*

gene in the WT ancestor (Fig. 3C). Interestingly, a different type of frameshift mutation in Lysine

200 was found in one population of evolved WT alone but this population demonstrated a hyper

OFF phenotype (Fig. 3A), suggesting that only certain types of mutations in *rsiX* lead to the

increase in number of *eps* expressing cells in the population or additional mutations have

antagonistic effects in this isolate.

Mutation in *rsiX* contributes to competitive advantage of producer strains against cheats

As mutation in *rsiX* resulted in hyper ON phenotype that may be linked to elevated secretion of

EPS, we hypothesized that Δ*rsiX* producers could support the spread of cheats and contribute to

population collapse scenario (Fig.1). To better understand how ancestor WT and Δ*rsiX* interact

with Δ*eps,* we cultivated the Δ*eps* in presence of EPS-containing supernatants obtained from the

WT and Δ*rsiX* (*SI Appendix*, Fig. S4). Both supernatants could partially restore pellicle formation

by Δ*eps* resulting in similar productivities of Δ*eps,* thereby not supporting our hypothesis on

improved performance of the mutant in presence of hyper ON Δ*rsiX* strain.

In order to determine the effect of *rsiX* deletion on fitness of the WT in presence of cheats, we

performed a series of competition assays*.* Apparently, the Δ*rsiX* showed two-fold increase in

relative frequency (40%) (Fig. 4 and *SI Appendix*, Fig. S5) when competed against the Δ*eps*, as

compared to the WT ancestor (20%).

It is worth to mention that we could not detect any significant fitness costs or benefits linked to

rsiX deletion in pairwise competition between Δ*rsiX* and WT (*SI Appendix*, Fig. S5; relative fitness

of Δ*rsiX* = 1.00 ±0.02 S.D.). Furthermore, we did not observe significant differences in

productivities of WT and the hyper ON Δ*rsiX* mutant, when grown in monoculture pellicles (*SI*

Appendix, Fig. S3), suggesting that positive effect of *rsiX* mutation only manifests in presence of

cheats.

Relative frequencies of the evolved WT strains carrying hyper ON phenotype and specific

mutations in *rsiX* were even higher (average ranged from 58% to 99%) as compared to Δ*rsiX*

carrying ancestral genetic background (Fig. 4, Fig. S6). Remarkably, the significant fitness

improvement of the WT evolved with cheats was already observed in 5th transfer and 10th

transfer, mutually with an early occurrence of hyper ON phenotype in those populations. This

was not the case for the WT evolved alone at 5th transfer (20%), where a remarkable fitness

increase (average ranged from 87% to 94%) could only be observed in later evolutionary time

point (Fig. 4 and *SI Appendix*, Fig. S6). These results suggest that the early improvement in

competitive strategies against cheats are caused by the *rsiX* mutation and other mutations

associated with hyper ON phenotype, while in later evolutionary time points this effect can be

amplified by cheating-independent adaptation to the medium. Interestingly, frequencies of Δ*eps*

in pellicles formed by the ancestor or evolved matrix producers, did not manifest in productivity

assay (Fig. 4b). These suggests that hyper ON phenotypes are vested on the increase in *eps*-

expressing cells or limiting the spread of cheats but do not result in an increase in total yield.

sinR mutation negatively affects the competitive advantage of cheats

Interestingly, evolved cheaters that were isolated from the same populations as *rsiX* mutation

containing matrix producers (i.e. populations 3 at 5th and 10th transfers and 7 at 10th and 30th

transfers), harbored a *sinR* mutation of an amino acid substitution from Leucine 1 to Tryptophan

(*SI Appendix*, Dataset S1). Therefore, we anticipated that the mutation may influence

competitive fitness of the Δ*eps* against the WT matrix producer. The *sinR* gene encodes for a

transcriptional repressor and biofilm master regulator that controls the operons e*psA-O* and

tapA-sipW-tasA for matrix exopolysaccharide and protein component, respectively (40).

Interestingly, our results showed that the evolved Δ*eps* with an ancestor *sinR* (Δ*eps sinR*^WT)

performed better against the WT ancestor as compared to evolved Δ*eps* that carried *sinR*

mutation (Δ*eps sinR*^Leu1Trp) (Fig. 5 and *SI Appendix*, Fig. S7), suggesting that mutation in *sinR* could

prevent the spread of cheats in the evolved populations, especially at early stage of co-evolution

(Fig. 4 and *SI Appendix*, Fig. S6). Interestingly, the impact of *sinR* mutation in Δ*eps* is nearly lost

when WT carries *rsiX* deletion or other adaptive mutations (Fig. 5 and *SI Appendix*, Fig. S7, S8).

Population collapse may be linked to adaptive mutations in cheats and loss of rsiX mutants in

producer populations

To explore possible reasons behind the collapse of certain WT vs Δ*eps* populations, the co-

evolved populations of WTs and Δ*eps* were isolated from selected co-cultures stocks (see

methods) at final evolutionary timepoint (populations 5 and 8) or at last time point prior to

collapse (populations 4 and 6) and subjected to whole genome re-sequencing. Genomic analysis

of Δ*eps* populations that caused early pellicle collapse (pop 4 and 6) revealed several mutations

in chemo/aerotaxis genes, namely in *hemAT* (Fig. 6 and *SI Appendix*, Dataset S2) with amino acid

change from Glutamic acid 254 to Lysine and Lysine 131 to Threonine for populations 6 and 4,

respectively. Interestingly, we did not identify any genetic changes in WT from population 4,

suggesting that the collapse was triggered by adaptation of the Δ*eps.* On the other hand, for the

non-collapsed populations (population 5 and 8) the consensus could be observed in the WTs,

which showed mutations in *yvrG* gene (Fig. 6 and *SI Appendix*, Dataset S2) encoding for two-

component histidine kinase involved in cell wall process. Finally, *rsiX* mutation was not detected

neither in the last populations before collapse, with an exemption of population 7 with 1% hyper

ON phenotype (Fig. 2, 6 and *SI Appendix*, Dataset S1), nor at the last transfer point for the non-

collapse, implying that this mutation was lost in parallel with the loss of hyper ON phenotype in

the late populations.

DISCUSSION

Studies on evolution of cooperative behavior is important to understand how social behaviors

are shaped in longer time scale. Moreover, exploring long term consequences of exposure to

cheating allows to better understand how cooperation prevails in nature where environmental

stress and exploitation exist inherently. Previous evolution studies on cheater-cooperator

interactions in spatially structured environment showed cheater mitigation via minimization of

the cooperative trait (2, 14, 15). On the contrary, here we show that cooperators initially respond

to cheating by intensifying the cooperative behaviors through shift in phenotypic heterogeneity

pattern towards hyper ON phenotype, where, in contrast to the ancestral strain, nearly all

members of the population express the operon involved EPS production. Further molecular

analysis of the hyper ON isolates strongly suggests that this phenotype is triggered by loss-of-

function mutation in *rsiX* gene. The product of *rsiX* represses the activity of ECF sigma factor, SigX

that is involved cell envelope stress response against cationic antimicrobial peptides (41).

Importantly, SigX has been previously shown to induce expression of *epsA-O* in B. subtilis via a

complex regulatory pathway involving Abh and SlrR (42), explaining the observed enhanced in

eps gene expression in *rsiX* mutant. Another example of matrix overproduction via ECF

adaptation was also reported in Gram-negative bacterium *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* where

mutations in another ECF called AlgT led to alginate overproduction and increased resistance to

antimicrobials (43). Therefore, adaptive boosts in matrix production through modulation of ECF

is not exclusive for *B. subtilis* but seems to occur also in medically relevant Gram-negative

pathogens like *P. aeruginosa*.

Interestingly, we also observed that *rsiX* mutation carrying matrix producers tend to co-occur

with *sinR*$^{\text{Leu1Trp}}$ cheaters (Δ*eps*) (Fig. 6 *SI Appendix*, Dataset S1). SinR is a transcriptional repressor

and master regulator of biofilm (40) and changes in the N terminal of SinR reveal big impact on

its functions (44), we expect that alterations in the first amino acid could provide immense effect

either on translation rate, folding stability or function. We have previously observed that loss-of-

function mutation in Δ*eps* enhances the production of TasA, a protein constituent which is

another essential matrix component (37). Furthermore, biofilm productivity can be maximized

by division of labor between TasA- and EPS-producers (37). We hypothesize that similar

phenomenon might transiently improve productivity of mixed pellicles, where cooperators

overproduced EPS while cheaters overproduced TasA. Alternatively, as TasA carries antimicrobial

properties (45, 46), its increased abundance could trigger stress response in the co-operator,

selecting for *rsiX* mutation. This could explain the synchronous appearance of *rsiX* mutations with

hyper ON phenotypes in evolved cooperators and *sinR* mutations in evolved cheaters.

In contrast to previous studies, that addressed long term cheating on diffusible siderophores, we

explored evolutionary interplay between biofilm producers and non-producers in structured

environment. Our results support previous observations on evolution of specific cheating-

resisting mechanisms in co-operators, pointing towards ubiquity of this phenomenon. In

addition, our work brings up two major findings 1) matrix producers can adapt to matrix non-

producers by shifting phenotypic heterogeneity towards increased number of matrix-expressing

cells 2) hyper ON anti-cheating strategy is a short-term solution, which can either be replaced by

another, yet unknown strategy linked to hyper OFF phenotype, or followed by tragedy of the

commons. As recently demonstrated, alternative EPS-independent biofilm formation strategies

can emerge by single amino acid change is TasA (47). It remains to be discovered whether shifts

in phenotypic heterogeneity in response to long term cheating is general phenomenon that

applies to different types of public goods.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Bacterial strains and culture conditions

Strain *B. subtilis* 168 $P_{hyperspank}$-mKATE P_{eps}-GFP (TB869) was obtained by transforming the

laboratory strain, *B. subtilis* 168 $P_{hyperspank}$-mKATE (TB49) (10, 18), with genomic DNA from

NRS2243 (*sacA*::P_{epsA}-*gfp*(Km)*hag*::cat) and selecting for Km resistance. The Δ*rsiX* strain with

fluorescence reporters (TB959) was obtained by transforming TB869 with genomic DNA isolated

from BKE23090 (168 *trpC*2 Δ*rsiX*::erm) (48). Strains were maintained in LB medium (Lysogeny

Broth (Lennox), Carl Roth, Germany), while 2×SG medium was used for biofilm induction (10).

The Δ*eps* strains (TB608) was created previously (10).

Experimental evolution

Eight biological replicates of the co-cultures of 1:1 ratio of *B. subtilis* TB869 and TB608 were

grown in 48-well plate containing 1ml 2×SG medium at 30°C for two days. Pellicles were

harvested into Eppendorf tubes containing 500 µl sterile 2×SG medium and 100 µl of sterile glass

sand, vortexed for 90 seconds, 10 µl fraction was transferred into 1ml 2×SG medium of a 48 well

plate, and incubated at 30°C static condition for two days. This cycle was continuously repeated

35 times. As control, four biological replicates of mono-cultures of *B. subtilis* TB869 were evolved

using the same transfer method. Every 5th transfer cycle, harvested cultures were mixed with

15% glycerol and stored at −80°C.

Population ratio assay

307 At every 5th transfer, pellicle biofilm productivities and relative frequencies of mutants and WT

308 were qualitatively assessed (colony forming units (CFU)/ml) using LB agar containing selective

309 antibiotics. LB agar plates were incubated at 37°C for 16 hours and colonies were counted. Three

310 single clones of WT and of *Δeps* per population per timepoint were isolated from plates and

311 stored at −80°C in the presence of 15% glycerol.

Quantitative assessment of hyper ON and hyper OFF populations

Ninety-five single isolates of ancestor or evolved TB869 strains obtained from the population per

timepoint were allowed to form pellicles in 96-well PCR plate containing 100µl 2×SG medium.

After incubation at 30°C for 24 hours, the plate was vortexed for 90 seconds, bath sonicated

(mini ultrasonic bath, Carl Roth, Germany) for 5 minutes and fluorescence was recorded using

TECAN Infinite F200 PRO microplate reader (excitation at 485/20 nm and emission at 535/10 nm

for GFP; excitation at 590/20 nm and emission at 635/35 nm for RFP; using manual gain of 35

and 50 for GFP and RFP, respectively). Hyper ON and hyper OFF phenotypes were categorized

based on cut off value of the WT ancestor mean ± 1SD. GFP intensity values above 134 arbitrary

units (AU) were considered as hyper ON and values below 70 AU were categorized as hyper OFF.

Pellicle competition assay

325 Pellicles grown from 1:1 ratio of competing strains and incubated for two days were subjected

326 to competition assay as previously described (10).

Qualitative assessment of Hyper ONs and Hyper OFFs via microscopy

Single clones of WT obtained from population ratio assay were allowed to form 1-day old pellicle.

Harvested pellicles were subjected to microscopic analysis using an Axio Observer 780 Laser

Scanning Confocal Microscope (Carl Zeiss) equipped with a Plan-Apochromat 63×/1.4 Oil DIC

M27 objective, an argon laser for stimulation of fluorescence (excitation at 488 for green

fluorescence and 561 nm for red fluorescence, with emission at 528/26 nm and 630/32 nm

respectively). Zen 2012 Software (Carl Zeiss) and FIJI Image J Software (49) were used for image

recording and processing, respectively.

Genome re-sequencing and genome analysis

Genomic DNA of single clones from selected evolved populations were isolated using Bacterial

and Yeast Genomic DNA kit (EURx) directly from −80°C stocks grown in LB medium for 5 hours at

37°C with shaking at 220 rpm. For population sequencing analysis, approx. 100 colonies

belonging to the evolved populations were harvested into 2ml LB broth and incubated at 37°C

shaking at 220 rpm for 2-3 hours. Re-sequencing was performed on an Illumina NextSeq

instrument using V2 sequencing chemistry (2x150 nt). Base-calling was carried out with

"bcl2fastq" software (v.2.17.1.14, Illumina). Paired-end reads were further analyzed in CLC

Genomics Workbench Tool 9.5.1. Reads were quality-trimmed using an error probability of 0.05

(Q13) as the threshold. Reads that displayed ≥80% similarity to the reference over ≥80% of their

read lengths were used in mapping. Quality-based SNP and small In/Del variant calling was

carried out requiring ≥10× read coverage with ≥25% variant frequency. Only variants supported

by good quality bases (Q ≥ 30) on both strands were considered. Gene functions (product names)

in *SI Appendix* Datasets were reported based on SubtiWiki (50).

Acknowledgements

This work was funded by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG) to Á.T.K. (KO4741/2.1)

within the Priority Program SPP1617. M.M. was supported a FEMS Research and Training Grant

(FEMS-RG-2017-0054). A.D. has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020

research and innovation programme under the Marie Sklodowska-Curie grant agreement no.

713683 (H.C. Ørsted COFUND). Work in the laboratory of Á.T.K. is supported by a DTU startup

fund and partly by the Danish National Research Foundation (DNRF137) for the Center for

Microbial Secondary Metabolites.

Authors contributions

362 Á.T.K. conceived the project, M.M., A.D., and D.S. performed the experiments. G.M contributed

363 with methods. M.M., A.D. and Á.T.K. wrote the manuscript, with all authors contributing to the

364 final version.

REFERENCES

1. Bourke A (2011) *Principals of social evolution: Oxford series in ecology and evolution.* (Oxford University Press, Oxford, UK).

2. Diard M, et al. (2013) Stabilization of cooperative virulence by the expression of an avirulent phenotype. *Nature* 494:353–356.

3. Nadell CD, Xavier JB, Foster KR (2009) The sociobiology of biofilms. *FEMS Microbiol Rev* 33:206–224.

4. West SA, Diggle SP, Buckling A, Gardner A, Griffin AS (2007) The social lives of microbes. *Annu Rev Ecol Evol Syst* 38:53–77.

5. West S a., Griffin AS, Gardner A (2007) Evolutionary explanations for cooperation. *Curr Biol* 17:661–672.

6. Xavier J, Foster KR (2007) Cooperation and conflict in microbial biofilms. *Proc Natl Adac Sci USA* 104:876–881.

7. Luján AM, Gómez P, Buckling A (2015) Siderophore cooperation of the bacterium Pseudomonas fluorescens in soil. *Biol Lett* 11:20140934.

8. Weigert M, Kümmerli R (2017) The physical boundaries of public goods cooperation between surface-attached bacterial cells. *Proc R Soc B Biol Sci* 284:20170631.

9. Dragoš A, Kovács ÁT (2017) The peculiar functions of the bacterial extracellular matrix. *Trends Microbiol* 25:257–266.

10. Martin M, et al. (2017) *De novo* evolved interference competition promotes the spread of biofilm defectors. *Nat Commun* 8:15127.

11. Folse HJ, Allison SD (2012) Cooperation, competition, and coalitions in enzyme-producing microbes: Social evolution and nutrient depolymerization rates. *Front Microbiol* 3:338.

12. Popat R, et al. (2012) Quorum-sensing and cheating in bacterial biofilms. *Proc R Soc B Biol Sci* 279:4765–4771.

391   13.   Dogsa I, Oslizlo A, Stefanic P, Mandic-mulec I (2014) Social interactions and biofilm

392   formation in *Bacillus subtilis*. *Food Technol Biotechnol* 52:149–157.

393   14.   O'Brien S, Luján AM, Paterson S, Cant MA, Buckling A (2017) Adaptation to public goods

394   cheats in *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*. *Proc R Soc B Biol Sci* 284:20171089.

395   15.   Kümmerli R, et al. (2015) Co-evolutionary dynamics between public good producers and

396   cheats in the bacterium *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*. *J Evol Biol* 28:2264–2274.

397   16.   Harrison F (2013) Dynamic social behaviour in a bacterium: *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*

398   partially compensates for siderophore loss to cheats. *J Evol Biol* 26:1370–1378.

399   17.   Hamilton WD (1964) The genetical evolution of social behaviour. I. *J Theor Biol* 7(1):1–16.

400   18.   van Gestel J, Weissing FJ, Kuipers OP, Kovács ÁT (2014) Density of founder cells affects

401   spatial pattern formation and cooperation in Bacillus subtilis biofilms. *ISME J* 8:2069–

402   2079.

403   19.   Nadell CD, Foster KR, Xavier JB (2010) Emergence of spatial structure in cell groups and

404   the evolution of cooperation. *PLoS Comput Biol* 6:e1000716.

405   20.   Momeni B, Waite AJ, Shou W (2013) Spatial self-organization favors heterotypic

406   cooperation over cheating. *Elife* 2:e00960.

407   21.   Dragoš A, et al. (2018) Evolution of exploitative interactions during diversification in

408   *Bacillus subtilis* biofilms. *FEMS Microbiol Ecol* 94:fix155.

409   22.   Ellis CN, Traverse CC, Mayo-Smith L, Buskirk SW, Cooper VS (2015) Character

410   displacement and the evolution of niche complementarity in a model biofilm

411   community. *Evolution (N Y)* 69:283–293.

412   23.   Poltak SR, Cooper VS (2011) Ecological succession in long-term experimentally evolved

413   biofilms produces synergistic communities. *ISME J* 5:369–378.

414   24.   Goymer P, et al. (2006) Adaptive divergence in experimental populations of

415   Pseudomonas fluorescens. II. Role of the GGDEF regulator WspR in evolution and

416   development of the wrinkly spreader phenotype. *Genetics* 173:515–526.

417   25.   Rainey PB, Rainey K (2003) Evolution of cooperation and conflict in experimental

418   bacterial populations. *Nature* 425:72–74.

419   26.   West SA, Griffin AS, Gardner A, Diggle SP (2006) Social evolution theory for

420   microorganisms. *Nat Rev Microbiol* 4:597–607.

421   27.   Hardin G (1968) The tragedy of the commons. *Science (80-)* 162(June):1243–1248.

422   28.   Martin M, Hölscher T, Dragoš A, Cooper VS, Kovács ÁT (2016) Laboratory evolution of

423   microbial interactions in bacterial biofilms. *J Bacteriol* 198:2564–2571.

424   29.   Traverse CC, Mayo-Smith LM, Poltak SR, Cooper VS (2013) Tangled bank of

425   experimentally evolved *Burkholderia* biofilms reflects selection during chronic infections.

426   *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 110:E250-9.

427   30.   Madsen JS, et al. (2015) Facultative control of matrix production optimizes competitive

428   fitness in *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* PA14 biofilm models. *Appl Environ Microbiol*

429   81:8414–8426.

430   31.   Rainey PB, Travisano M (1998) Adaptive radiation in a heterogeneous environment.

431   *Nature* 394:69–72.

432   32.   Kreft JU (2004) Biofilms promote altruism. *Microbiology* 150:2751–2760.

433   33.   Lyons NA, Kolter R (2018) A single mutation in rapP induces cheating to prevent cheating

434   in Bacillus subtilis by minimizing public good production. *Commun Biol* 1:133.

435   34.   Veening JW, et al. (2008) Transient heterogeneity in extracellular protease production by

436   *Bacillus subtilis*. *Mol Syst Biol* 4:1–15.

437   35.   Davidson FA, Seon-Yi C, Stanley-Wall NR (2012) Selective heterogeneity in exoprotease

438   production by *Bacillus subtilis*. *PLoS One* 7:e38574.

439   36.   Hölscher T, et al. (2015) Motility, chemotaxis and aerotaxis contribute to

440   competitiveness during bacterial pellicle biofilm development. *J Mol Biol* 427:3695–

441   3708.

37.   Dragoš A, et al. (2018) Division of labor during biofilm matrix production. *Curr Biol*

28:1903–1913.

38.   Chai Y, Chu F, Kolter R, Losick R (2008) Bistability and biofilm Formation in *Bacillus*

subtilis. *Mol Microbiol* 67:254–263.

39.   Helmann JD (2016) *Bacillus subtilis* extracytoplasmic function (ECF) sigma factors and

defense of the cell envelope. *Curr Opin Microbiol* 30:122–132.

40.   Chu F, et al. (2004) A master regulator for biofilm formation by Bacillus subtilis. *Mol*

Microbiol 55(3):739–749.

41.   Cao M, Helmann JD (2004) The *Bacillus subtilis* extracytoplasmic-function σX factor

regulates modification of the cell envelope and resistance to cationic antimicrobial

peptides. *J Bacteriol* 186(4):1136–1146.

42.   Murray EJ, Strauch M a, Stanley-Wall NR (2009) SigmaX is involved in controlling *Bacillus*

subtilis biofilm architecture through the AbrB homologue Abh. *J Bacteriol* 191:6822–

6832.

43.   Hentzer M, et al. (2001) Alginate overproduction affects Pseudomonas aeruginosa

biofilm structure and function. *J Bacteriol* 183(18):5395–401.

44.   Subramaniam AR, et al. (2013) A serine sensor for multicellularity in a bacterium. *Elife*

2013:1–17.

45.   Stöver AG, Driks A (1999) Secretion, localization, and antibacterial activity of TasA, a

Bacillus subtilis spore-associated protein. *J Bacteriol* 181:1664–1672.

46.   Dragoš A, Kovács ÁT, Claessen D (2017) The role of functional amyloids in multicellular

growth and development of Gram-positive bacteria. *Biomolecules* 7:60.

47.   Dragoš A, et al. (2018) Collapse of genetic division of labour and evolution of autonomy

in pellicle biofilms. 3:1451–1460.

48.   Koo BM, et al. (2017) Construction and analysis of two genome-scale deletion libraries

for *Bacillus subtilis*. *Cell Syst* 4:291–305.e7.

49.   Rueden CT, et al. (2017) ImageJ2: ImageJ for the next generation of scientific image data.

BMC Bioinformatics 18:529.

50.   Zhu B, Stülke J (2018) SubtiWiki in 2018: From genes and proteins to functional network

471   annotation of the model organism *Bacillus subtilis*. *Nucleic Acids Res* 46:D743–D748.

 Figure legends

Fig. 1. Population dynamics over the course of experimental evolution for eight parallel pellicle

populations. Productivity (total CFU/ml) and cheater frequency (%) in the pellicle obtained from

plate count assay (CFU/ml) for every 5th transfer starting from the initial count prior to incubation

until 35 transfers.

Fig. 2. Quantitative assessment of hyper ONs and hyper OFFs present per evolved population.

Percentage of isolates >134 AU value expressing high intensity level of P_{eps}-GFP (hyper ON) and

low intensity value of < 70 AU (hyper OFF) for WT evolved and non-evolved strains per timepoint

from 5th to 35th transfer for all 8 populations evolved with cheaters and 4 populations evolved

alone (n=95). Cut off based on the mean ± 1SD of WT ancestor strain taken at six different days

(n=336).

Fig. 3. Qualitative assessment of *eps* gene expression based on confocal laser scanning

microscopy showing Δ*rsiX* phenotype similar to strains that were co-evolved with cheaters.

Pellicles formed by single clones of evolved or *rsiX* mutated TB869 belonging to (A) population

C1 evolved alone at 5th, 30th and 35th timepoint showing Hyper OFF phenotype (B) WT ancestor

demonstrating heterogeneous expression (C) Δ*rsiX* exhibiting hyper ON phenotype similar to (D)

evolved with cheaters Pop 3 (5th and 10th) and Pop 7 (30th) viewed under the confocal laser

scanning microscope. Cells constitutively expressing mKATE are represented in magenta and *eps*-

expressing cells are shown in green. Scale bar represents 10μm.

Fig. 4. (A) Pellicle competition assay of single clones belonging to producer populations (non-

evolved (n=9), Δ*rsiX* (n=8), evolved with (n=4) and without cheaters (n=4)) against Δ*eps* ancestor

and (B) corresponding pellicle productivity based on total CFU/ml. Mean is represented in square

inside the box plots; whiskers represent the minimum and maximum; single dots represent the

individual data points (n); asterisk (*) represents the significant difference from the WT ancestor

ANOVA (P value 0.05).

Fig. 5. Pellicle competition assay against evolved cheater with $sinR^{WT}$ (left) and $sinR^{Leu1Trp}$ (right)

(n=4) on single clones of producers (non-evolved, evolved with and without cheaters). Mean is

represented in square; whiskers represent the minimum and maximum; single dots represent

the individual data points (n); asterisk (*) represents the significant difference ANOVA (P value

0.05).

Fig. 6. Figure summary showing the population dynamics based on producer and cheater

frequency per population from 5th transfer to 35th transfers for populations evolved with

cheaters with collapse (Pop 1, 2, 3, 4, 6 and 7), without collapse (Pop 5 and 8), and populations

evolved without cheaters (C1, C2, C3, C4) with indications of phenotypes based on hyper ON,

hyper OFF or heterogenous *eps*-expression. Key mutations on single clone level of evolved WT

and evolved Δ*eps* or population level are specified. *rsiX** mutation is not similar to mutation

observed in strains evolved with cheaters.

Co-evolved w/ cheaters

Transfer #

Population #

A) vs non-evolved Δ*eps*

Relative frequency in the pellicle (%)

WT anc | Δ*rsiX* | 5th.3a | 30th.7a | 5th.C1a | 35th.C1a

evo w/ cheats | evo w/o cheats

B) Co-cultured with non-evolved Δ*eps*

Productivity (CFU/ml)

WT anc | Δ*rsiX* | 5th.3a | 30th.7a | 5th.C1a | 35th.C1a

evo w/ cheats | evo w/o cheats

vs evolved Δ*eps*

Evolved with cheaters :

| | Pop 1 | Pop 2 | Pop 3 | Pop 4 | Pop 6 | Pop 7 | Pop 5 | Pop 8 |

Columns (Evolved without cheaters): C1 C2 C3 C4

Rows: 5th, 10th, 15th, 20th, 25th, 30th, 35th

Key mutation labels visible:
- Pop 3: *rsiX* *sinR* (5th, 10th)
- Pop 4: *hemAT* (10th), *hemAT* (15th)
- Pop 6: (15th) *hemAT*
- Pop 7: *rsiX* *sinR* (10th), *rsiX* *sinR* (30th)
- Pop 5 / Pop 8: *yvrG* (35th)
- C1: *rsiX** (30th)

LEGEND:

eps expression in WT
- Heterogeneous
- Hyper OFF
- Hyper ON

Population frequency
- WT
- Δ*eps*
- ✗ collapse

Key mutations:
Δ*eps*   *WT*