Interspecies interactions in bacterial colonies are determined by physiological traits and the

environment

Running Title

Interspecies interactions in bacterial colonies

Authors

Sean C. Booth[1†] and Scott A. Rice[1,2,3]

[1]The Singapore Centre for Environmental Life Sciences Engineering and [2]The School of

Biological Sciences, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore

[3]The ithree Institute, The University of Technology Sydney, Australia

[†]Current address: Department of Zoology, University of Oxford, UK

Corresponding author: RSCOTT@NTU.EDU.SG, +65 65927944

Abstract

Interspecies interactions in bacterial biofilms have important impacts on the

composition and function of communities in natural and engineered systems. To investigate

these interactions, synthetic communities provide experimentally tractable systems. Agar-

surface colonies are similar to biofilms and have been used for investigating the eco-

evolutionary and biophysical forces that determine community composition and spatial

distribution of bacteria. Prior work has focused on intraspecies interactions, using differently

fluorescent tagged but identical or genetically modified strains of the same species. Here, we

investigated how physiological differences determine the community composition and spatial

distribution in synthetic communities of *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*, *Pseudomonas protegens*

and *Klebsiella pneumoniae*. Using quantitative microscopic imaging, we found that

interspecies interactions in multispecies colonies are influenced by type IV pilus mediated

motility, extracellular matrix secretion, environmental parameters and the specific species

involved. These results indicate that the patterns observable in mixed species colonies can be

used to understand the mechanisms that drive interspecies interactions, which are dependent

on the interplay between specific species' physiology and environmental conditions.

Keywords: Pseudomonas, Klebsiella, biofilm, colony, interspecies interactions, model

community

Introduction

The growth and survival of bacteria in natural and engineered systems is strongly influenced by how they interact with one another [1, 2]. Interactions between community members vary considerably; some interactions facilitate growth and survival, while others inhibit growth or even result in the death of one species [3]. Both faciliatory and inhibitory interactions can be mediated by secreted products, e.g. metabolite exchange [4] and antibiotic production [5] or by contact-dependent mechanisms, e.g. adhesion [6, 7] and Type VI secretion mediated killing [8]. Regardless of the specific mechanism of interaction, the composition and function of a community is influenced by the combination and sum of the various interactions between its constitutive members [9, 10].

Studies of the interactions between community members have shown how interspecies interactions influence community-intrinsic properties [11]. While competitive interactions between individual species are expected and common [12], often due to overlap of metabolic preferences [13], cooperative interactions can also be found in larger communities which enable increased biomass production [14] or resistance to antimicrobial agents [15]. Biofilms are ideal for examining the effect of interactions on a community, as cells are in close proximity to each other and are embedded within self-secreted biofilm matrix [16, 17]. For example, biofilms have been used to show how the genetic division of labor improves pellicle formation [18] and that spatial structure influences the evolution [19], formation [20] and outcome [21] of interspecies interactions. Using a synthetic, three-species community, we have shown that co-culture biofilms exhibit increased growth by particular members and enhanced stress tolerance for the entire community [22]. This occurred despite the community members competing for the same resources and was not observed for planktonic mixed cultures, suggesting that spatial organization within biofilms is important for species interactions.

Colonies grown on a nutrient surface are an efficient system for manipulating and

visualizing the spatial distribution of different microorganisms, but have mostly been used for

studying eco-evolutionary dynamics [23]. They have been used to characterize various

spatiotemporal aspects of microbial interactions including the co-localization of mutually

auxotrophic strains of *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* [24, 25], the vertical separation of differently

sized cells of *Escherichia coli* [26], the sequential range expansion of nitrate reducing

Pseudomonas stutzeri [27], the spatial separation patterns of strains of *Vibrio cholerae* [28] or

Bacillus subtilis [29] that differ in the quantity of extracellular matrix produced, and the

proportion of different antibiotic resistant/sensitive strains of *P. aeruginosa* [30]. All of these

studies have focused on different strains or mutants of a single species (intraspecies

interactions), differing only in the fluorescent marker they express and targeted deletion of

specific genes. However, it is also clear that this approach has considerable potential for

investigating interactions between different species.

In this study, we investigated the interactions between members of a model community

consisting of *P. aeruginosa* PAO1, *P. protegens* Pf-5 (formerly *P. fluorescens* [31, 32]) and *K.*

pneumoniae KP-1. These species can be commonly found in soils and habitats as varied as

metalworking fluid or the gut of silk moths [33, 34]. When co-cultured in flow-cell biofilms,

this community exhibits properties not observed in biofilms of the individual species or liquid

cultures including a relative increase in *K. pneumoniae*, sharing of resistance to sodium dodecyl

sulfate allowing the sensitive species, *P. protegens*, to survive, [22] and reduced production of

morphotypic variants for all species [35]. As colonies offer some advantages compared to flow-

cell biofilms, including higher throughput and the ability to image the entire colony, here we

assessed interactions between each possible pair of these species by co-culturing them in a

colony biofilm model. We determined whether these interactions were beneficial or detrimental

by quantifying the area colonized by each species and qualifying where each species was found.

By manipulating the community through using mutant strains and/or altered environmental

conditions, we also show how organism-specific physiology determines interaction outcomes.

This approach thus has the potential to identify gene systems and environmental conditions

that underlie the interactions between bacteria. This work demonstrates that co-culturing in

colony biofilms is a useful tool for determining the outcome of interactions between bacteria

and visualizing the emergent properties of multi-species biofilms.

Materials and Methods

Strains, media and growth conditions: Colonies were grown on minimal medium (48 mM

Na_2HPO_4; 22 mM KH_2PO_4; 9 mM NaCl; 19 mM NH_4Cl; 2 mM $MgSO_4$; 0.1 mM $CaCl_2$; 0.04

mM $FeSO_4$; 2 mM glucose and 0.4% casamino acids) with either 1.5% or 0.6% agar in 24 well

plates or 8 well Ibidi™ slides. Previously described strains (Table 1) [22] of *P. aeruginosa*

PAO1, *P. protegens* Pf-5 and *K. pneumoniae* KP-1 constitutively expressing fluorescent

protein genes inserted into the chromosome using a Tn7 transposon were recovered from

freezer stocks directly onto LB agar plates and grown for 24-48 h at room temperature. Bacteria

were inoculated into liquid medium from agar plates (because they are highly mucoid, wild-

type *K. pneumoniae* strains were homogenized by passing repeatedly through a 30 G needle),

the OD_{600} was standardized to 0.1 and 1/100 dilutions were used directly or mixed 1:1 and 0.5

µL was spotted at the center of each well. Spots were dried for 30 min in a laminar flow cabinet,

plates were sealed with parafilm and incubated at room temperature. To confirm that mixtures

were equal, colony forming units (CFUs) were determined for the inoculum for each

species/strain. If CFU counts indicated that the ratio of two mixed species/strains was more

than 10 to 1 the sample was not used. For co-culture colonies, only combinations of CFP or

YFP labelled strains with dsRed or mCherry were used, with the exception of KP-1-YFP and

Pf-5-CFP, due to issues of overlapping excitation and emission spectra. When multiple

combinations were possible (e.g. KP-1-dsRed with KP-1-CFP or KP-1-YFP) both

combinations were treated as equivalent i.e. the combination of dsRed with CFP was

considered a replicate of combinations of dsRed with YFP.

Table 1: Species and strains used in this study.

Species and strain	Genotypic and phenotypic characteristics	Tn7 chromosomal fluorescent protein	Source or reference
P. aeruginosa PAO1	Wild-type	YFP, mCherry	ATCC BAA-47 [19], this study
P. aeruginosa PAO1 Small colony variant (SCV)	*pilT* Thr210 frameshift, twitching defect	YFP	[32]
P. protegens Pf-5	Wild-type	CFP, mCherry	ATCC BAA-477 [19], this study
K. pneumoniae KP-1	Wild-type	dsRed, CFP, YFP	[19]
K. pneumoniae KP-1 Non-mucoid variant (NMV)	UDP-glucose lipid carrier transferase Phe123Ile, matrix secretion defect	dsRed	[32]

Image acquisition: Colonies were imaged on a Zeiss Axio Observer.Z1 inverted (24 well

plates) or Imager.M2 upright (8 well slides) microscope using an HXP 120 C halogen light

source. On the Z1 a 5X/0.16 objective was used and a 10X/0.3 objective on the M2. The filter

sets (excitation/emission) used were: Zeiss Set 10 for CFP (450-490/515-565), Set 46 for YFP

(490-510/520-550) and Set 31 (550-580/590-660) for dsRed and mCherry on the Z1. Set 43

(520-570/565-630) was used for dsRed and mCherry on the M1. Exposure times and focus

were manually optimized for each sample then colonies were imaged using 'Tilescan' mode in

Zeiss Zen (Blue edition) with 10% overlap. Twelve-bit images were captured using an

AxioCamMRm3. Shading correction was applied using precaptured profiles of fluorescent

slides. Images from both microscopes were treated equivalently in downstream processing.

Image Presentation: Representative images from each experimental combination were

selected for presentation. Images were processed for viewing to improve contrast and remove

artefacts, but only raw images were used for quantitative analysis. Images were corrected for

flat-field illumination using BaSiC [36], stitched together in ImageJ [37, 38] and then the

brightness was scaled manually for each channel in each image. In cases when there was high

background signal, the background was either subtracted manually by segmenting the colony

area or by using the background subtraction tool.

Image Analysis: For full details, see the supplementary material. Briefly, tilescan images

stitched together using Zeiss Zen were imported into R and processed using the package

'imager' [39]. Each channel was normalized to a range of 0 to 1 and any background signal

was subtracted. To segment the colony from the background, a mask of the colony was

generated by taking the sum of all channels (including the inverted brightfield) then

thresholding this image using either "IJDefault" or "triangle" in the R package

'auto_thresholdr' [40]. To determine the amount of overlap between the two strains within a

colony, the ratio between channels was calculated at every pixel by subtracting one channel

from the other and dividing them by the sum of both $((c1-c2)/(c1+c2))$. Thus, values can range

from 1/-1 indicating only the presence of one strain, to 0, indicating an exactly equal mix of

the two strains. The proportion of mixed pixels was then calculated by dividing the number of

bins in the range -0.25:0.25 by the total number of pixels within the colony as defined by the

segmentation. We then attempted to determine the area occupied by each strain within the

colony by thresholding each fluorescent channel with several different methods (including Li,

Huang and triangle), then manually selecting the most accurate method. Due to the manual

intervention required to pick an appropriate threshold, which varied substantially between

images, the area of each strain was instead manually determined in ImageJ. For all conditions

a minimum of 6 biological replicates were analyzed.

Statistics: Analysis of variance, Tukey's honest significant difference post-hoc test and

multiple-testing p-value adjustment were used to determine if there were significant differences

in colony area between single and dual species colonies.

<u>Results</u>

Monospecies Colonies

To compare patterns of interactions with previously published studies, we first

examined intraspecies interactions by growing colonies consisting of two strains of the same

species (Figure 1). Qualitative inspection of the colonies after 24 and 48 h of growth indicated

that each species differed in how they separate into sectors. *P. protegens* (Figure 1B,E) and *K.*

pneumoniae (Figure 1C,F) showed clear segregation between strains, although the shape of the

borders differed. For *P. aeruginosa* (Figure 1A,D), separation into sectors was only apparent

at 48 h and the borders between strains were less distinct than for the other species.

Figure 1: Colonies consisting of *P. aeruginosa* PAO1 (A, D), *P. protegens* Pf-5 (B, E) or *K.*

pneumoniae KP-1 (C, F). Each species was labeled separately with two different fluorescent

protein genes and are presented here as red or yellow (false colouring). Strains were mixed 1:1

(OD_{600}) at the time of inoculation and colonies were imaged after 24 and 48 h of growth. Scale

bars indicate 1000 µm. Overlap between strains was calculated from raw images as the

percentage of mixed pixels (G). Boxplots are presented in Tukey style.

To better characterize the differences in colony growth, quantitative analyses were

performed by determining the percentage of pixels with similar relative signal within each

colony (Figure 1, G). Around 50% of pixels were mixed in the *P. aeruginosa* colonies

compared to 25% or less in the other two species after 48 h of growth. Even at the leading edge

of *P. aeruginosa* regions that appeared to consist of a single strain, cells of both colours were

present and were well mixed (Supplementary Video 1). Movement and mixing of the two

strains was visible 500 µm inward from the colony edge (Supplementary Video 2). For all three

species, there was no change in mixing between 24 and 48 h.

Figure 2: Dual species colonies of *P. aeruginosa* PAO1 and *P. protegens* Pf-5 (A, D), *P. aeruginosa* PAO1 and *K. pneumoniae* KP-1 (B, E), and *P. protegens* Pf-5 and *K. pneumoniae* KP-1 (C, F), overlap between differently labeled strains (G) and the area covered by individual species in colonies (H). Each species was labeled with different fluorescent protein genes and are presented here as yellow (*P. aeruginosa* PAO1), blue (*P. protegens*) and red (*K. pneumoniae*). Strains were mixed 1:1 (OD$_{600}$) at the time of inoculation and colonies were imaged after 24 and 48 h of growth. Scale bar indicates 1000 μm. Boxplots are presented in Tukey style.

Dual Species Colonies

In contrast to monospecies colonies, dual species colonies differed in the area colonized

and mixing of species (Figure 2). None of the combinations of species separated into clear

radial sectors, as observed for the dual-strain colonies described above, and instead formed

distinct patterns. *P. aeruginosa* localized around the perimeter of *P. protegens* colonies (Figure

2A,D), especially after 48 h and these species did not mix at either timepoint. While *P.*

aeruginosa appeared to be restricted to the interior of the colony when cultured with *K.*

pneumoniae (Figure 2B,E), closer inspection of brightfield images (Supplementary Figure 1)

showed that *P. aeruginosa* was also present around the outside perimeter of *K. pneumoniae*, as

visible with its distinct lattice morphology. This combination changed from unmixed (~25%,

though variable) at 24 h to mixed at 48 h (consistently 50%). When grown with *K. pneumoniae*,

P. protegens grew around the outer edge of the colony (Figure 2C,F) and these species were

also partially mixed (~40%) at 48 h. The amount of area covered by each strain in the dual-

species colonies was compared to the area covered by single species colonies (Figure 2, H,

Supplementary Table 1). At 24 h, the area covered by *P. aeruginosa* (~8 mm^2) was lower when

co-cultured with *P. protegens* (~2 mm^2) and was similarly reduced at 48 h, from ~70 mm^2

(monospecies) compared to ~35 mm^2 (dual species). In contrast, there was no difference in the

area covered by *P. protegens* when co-cultured with *P. aeruginosa*, although it was

significantly decreased (from ~4 to ~1.5 mm^2) at 24 h, but not 48 h, with *K. pneumoniae*. The

area covered by *K. pneumoniae* increased when co-cultured with *P. aeruginosa* from ~5 to ~10

mm^2 at 24 h and ~12 to ~40 mm^2 at 48 h, but was not affected by *P. protegens*.

Figure 3: Co-culture colonies consisting of *P. aeruginosa* PAO1 and *P. aeruginosa* PAO1

small colony variant (SCV) (A, D), *P. aeruginosa* PAO1 SCV and *P. protegens* Pf-5 (B, E)

and *P. aeruginosa* PAO1 SCV and *K. pneumoniae* KP-1 (C, F), overlap between differently

labeled strains (G), and the area covered by individual species/strains (H). Each species was

labeled with different fluorescent protein genes and are presented here as yellow (*P. aeruginosa*

wild-type when paired with the SCV, SCV when paired with the other two species), magenta

(*P. aeruginosa* SCV), blue (*P. protegens*) and red (*K. pneumoniae*). Strains were mixed 1:1

(OD_{600}) at the time of inoculation and colonies were imaged after 24 and 48 h of growth. Scale

211   bar indicates 1000 µm. Boxplots are presented in Tukey style. For the area boxplots (H)

212   combinations of *P. aeruginosa* with *P. protegens* or *K. pneumoniae*, boxes outlined in black

213   represent the wild-type (same data as Figure 2H), outlines in magenta represent combinations

214   with the SCV.

216   **Co-cultures with a *P. aeruginosa* Small Colony Variant**

217   To investigate the effect of the type IV pilus (TFP) of *P. aeruginosa* in colonies, a small

colony variant (SCV) was cultured in dual species colonies with the parental strain, *P.*

protegens and *K. pneumoniae*. Based on whole genome sequencing, we previously determined

that this SCV differs from the wild-type only by a single mutation in *pilT* [35], preventing pilus

retraction and therefore TFP motility [41, 42]. Colonies formed with the SCV differed from

those with wild-type *P. aeruginosa* and the mixing of strains/species also differed (Figure 3).

Both *P. aeruginosa* (Figure 3A,D) and *P. protegens* (Figure 3B,E) formed a perimeter around

the SCV, but there was very little (≤10%) mixing of strains/species. The SCV only mixed

slightly more with *K. pneumoniae* (Figure 3C,F). The SCV colonized less area than wild-type

P. aeruginosa, ~12 mm^2 compared to ~70 mm^2, respectively, after 48 h (Figure 3, H). In dual

species colonies, the area covered by the SCV was reduced to ~2 mm^2 at 48 h in the presence

of *P. protegens*. When grown with *K. pneumoniae*, the SCV covered less area at 24 h but this

was not apparent at 48 h. The SCV did not affect the area covered by the other strains and in

contrast to when the parental strain of *P. aeruginosa* was present, the SCV did not increase the

area covered by *K. pneumoniae*.

Figure 4: Co-culture colonies consisting of *K. pneumoniae* KP-1 with the *K. pneumoniae* KP-1 non-mucoid variant (NMV) (A, D), *K. pneumoniae* KP-1 NMV with *P. aeruginosa* (B, E), and *K. pneumoniae* KP-1 NMV with PAO1 *P. protegens* Pf-5 (C, F), overlap between differently labeled strains (G) and the area covered by individual species/strains (H). Each species was labeled with different fluorescent protein genes and are presented here as yellow (*P. aeruginosa*), blue (*P. protegens*), red (*K. pneumoniae* wild-type when paired with the NMV, *K. pneumoniae* NMV when paired with the other species) and cyan (*K. pneumoniae* NMV). Strains were mixed 1:1 (OD_{600}) at the time of inoculation and colonies were imaged

after 24 and 48 h of growth. Scale bar indicates 1000 µm. Boxplots are presented in Tukey

style. For the area boxplots (H), combinations of *K. pneumoniae* with *P. aeruginosa* or *P.*

protegens, boxes outlined in black represent the wild-type (same data as Figure 2, H), outlines

in cyan represent the NMV.

Co-cultures with a Non-Mucoid *K. pneumoniae* Variant

To investigate the effects of extracellular matrix (ECM) production by *K. pneumoniae*,

a non-mucoid variant (NMV) was cultured in dual strain/species colonies with the parental

strain, *P. aeruginosa* and *P. protegens*. This previously characterized NMV has a mutation

within a probable colanic acid synthesis gene cluster, preventing it from producing its normal,

thick ECM [35]. Single-strain colonies formed by the NMV differed from wild-type *K.*

pneumoniae (Supplementary Figure 2). Boundaries between sectors of the NMV were jagged

instead of straight as was observed for the wild-type. Dual-species colonies with the NMV also

differed as it did not mix with wild-type *K. pneumoniae* or *P. protegens* (Figure 4). When

grown with *P. aeruginosa* (Figure 4B,E), mixing was low at 24 h (10-20%) and was not readily

observed at 48 h. When grown as single-strain colonies, wild-type *K. pneumoniae* and the

NMV each covered a similar amount of area. When the two were co-cultured together (Figure

4A,D), the NMV covered less area, ~2.5 mm^2, compared to when grown alone, ~7 mm^2, at 24

h, and was also reduced at 48 h (from ~12 to ~5 mm^2). The area covered by the NMV was also

decreased when paired with *P. protegens* (Figure 4C,F)*,* however, neither of these differences

persisted at 48 h. In contrast, the area covered by *P. aeruginosa* was decreased when grown in

the presence of the *K. pneumoniae* NMV at 24 h but not 48 h. When paired with *P. aeruginosa*,

the area covered by the NMV was not significantly increased as was observed for the parental

K. pneumoniae strain when paired with *P. aerguinosa*.

Figure 5: Co-culture colonies on 0.6% agar consisting of *P. aeruginosa* PAO1 with *P. aeruginosa* small colony variant (SCV) (A, C), and *K. pneumoniae* with *K. pneumoniae* KP-1 non-mucoid variant (NMV) (B, D), overlap between differently labeled strains (E) and the area covered by individual species/strains (F). Each species was labeled with different fluorescent protein genes and are presented here as yellow (*P. aeruginosa* wild-type), magenta (*P. aeruginosa* SCV), red (*K. pneumoniae* wild-type) and cyan (*K. pneumoniae* NMV). Strains were mixed 1:1 (OD_{600}) at the time of inoculation and colonies were imaged after 24 and 48 h of growth. Scale bar indicates 1000 µm. Boxplots are Tukey style.

Colonies Cultured on 0.6% Agar

The percentage of agar influences motility, as lower percentages enable swarming and/or swimming motility and affect the colony growth of highly mucoid strains [28]. Culturing on a lower percentage of agar was thus expected to affect interactions between the wild-type strains of *P. aeruginosa* and *K. pneumoniae* and their non-motile (SCV) and non-mucoid (NMV) variants. Colonies consisting of wild-type and mutant strains grown on 0.6% agar had altered morphologies (Figure 5) and areas colonized (Table 2), but those consisting of two differently labeled wild-type strains did not. Additionally, the wild-type strains did not differ in how they separated into sectors (Supplementary Figure 3). When the *P. aeruginosa* SCV was co-cultured with its parental strain (Figure 5A,C), both strains expanded outwards together, but were less mixed (~22% at 48 h) compared to the two differently coloured wild-type *P. aeruginosa* strains (~55% at 48 h, Figure 1G), which was similar to that observed on 1.5% agar (50%, Figure 1G). When the *K. pneumoniae* NMV was co-cultured with the wild-type (Figure 5B,D), the two strains showed little mixing, however by 48 h the wild-type had expanded much more than the NMV (Figure 5, D). When two wild-type *K. pneumoniae* strains were grown together, they mixed comparably on both percentages of agar (~25%, Figure 5E, Figure 1G). Colony area was significantly higher for the *P. aeruginosa* SCV on 0.6% compared to 1.5% agar at 48 h (~20 vs ~10 mm^2, Figure 5F). This was significantly lower than the wild-type on 0.6% agar (~50 mm^2), which was also significantly decreased compared to on 1.5% agar (~70 mm^2). When cultured with the SCV on 0.6% agar, wild-type *P. aeruginosa* area was significantly reduced at both timepoints (from 45 to 22 mm^2 at 48 h). The *K. pneumoniae* wild-type colonized a significantly increased area on 0.6% agar (~27 mm^2) compared to the NMV (~10 mm^2) and the wild-type on 1.5% agar (~11 mm^2). When they were co-cultured, the area colonized by wild-type, but not NMV *K. pneumoniae*, was significantly lower after 48 h.

Table 2: Comparison of effects of 0.6% agar on colonies of *P. aeruginosa*, *P. aeruginosa* small

colony variant (SCV), *K. pneumoniae* and *K. pneumoniae* non-mucoid (NM) variant.

	Wild-type compared to mutant				Monospecies 0.6% agar		Wild-type and mutant 0.6% agar	
	1.5% Agar		0.6% Agar					
Time	24 h	48 h	24 h	48 h	24 h	48 h	24 h	48 h
PAO1	SCV ↓	SCV ↓		SCV ↓		↓	↓	↓
PAO1-SCV						↑		
KP-1						↑		↓
KP-1-NMV				NMV ↓				

* Results from comparisons between the wild-type and mutant on each percentage of agar,

between agar percentages for each strain and the between cultivation alone or in combination

are shown. Interactions that resulted in a significant increase in area are indicated by ↑ and

decreases by ↓, using analysis of variance and Tukey's honest significant differences post-

hoc test. Differences were considered significant if their multiple-testing adjusted p-value

(95% confidence) was below 0.05. Empty cells indicate no significant change.

Discussion

Colonies highlight differences in intraspecies interactions

For each of the three species from our model community, intraspecific competition

resulted in species-specific patterns of sector formation. Separation of mixed colonies into

sectors has been attributed to genetic drift at the leading edge of the colony, as despite having

equal fitness, stochastic effects result in new territory being colonized by either one strain or

the other, but not both [43]. Here we show that the shape of the boundaries between sectors

depends on the bacterium's physiological traits. The separation of wild-type *K. pneumoniae*

strains into sectors with straight boundaries resembled that of *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* [25],

whereas the jagged boundaries of *P. protegens* were more similar to those of *P. stutzeri* [27],

simulated rod-shaped cells [44] or *E. coli* [43]. In the case of *E. coli*, the formation of fractal

boundaries between sectors has been explained by the anisotropic forces of cell division and

growth causing unlinked chains of rod-shaped cells to buckle [45]. Thus, similar buckling

likely causes the formation of jagged edges between boundaries of the wild-type *P. protegens*

strains. The jagged boundaries visible between sectors within *K. pneumoniae* NMV colonies

(Supplementary Figure 2) indicate that its secreted extracellular matrix causes the straight

boundaries between sectors observed in the wild-type. Colonies of *P. aeruginosa* grown on

nutrient rich LB medium were previously shown to be well mixed [46], similar to our

observations here using minimal medium. The observation that *pilB* mutants segregate into

clear sectors [46] and the resemblance of videos of the edge of *P. aeruginosa* colonies

(Supplementary Video 1) to those showing TFP motility [47] indicates that this motility likely

enabled the mixing of the *P. aeruginosa* wild-type strains.

Interspecies interactions differ from intraspecies interactions

Previous studies have focused on colonies of either identical, but differently labeled

strains of the same species, or strains with specific genetic modifications, whereas here, we

investigated interactions between different species. While the patterns for our single strain data

resemble previous work, it is clear that patterns of species distribution in mixed species

colonies differ markedly. Thus, the data presented here show how the different physiological

traits of the three studied bacteria determine community composition and spatial distribution

in colonies.

We have assessed the three pairwise interactions tested here using the notation of

Momeni et al. [24], where A [~,~] B indicates a neutral interaction and A[↑,↓]B indicates a

relationship where A benefits and B is negatively affected (Table 3). The spatial distribution

patterns of *P. aeruginosa* with *P. protegens*, and *P. protegens* with *K. pneumoniae* are similar

as one strain expanded outward faster and surrounded the other. Although the area covered by

the inner strains was not reduced compared to when they were grown alone, both interactions

negatively affect the inner strain as it no longer had equal access to space/nutrients. For the

first pair, the area covered by the outer strain, *P. aeruginosa,* was significantly decreased,

indicating that both strains experienced negative outcomes from the interaction, so *P.*

aeruginosa [↓,↓] *P. protegens*. For the second pair, *P. protegens* was the outer strain but its

area was not reduced so, *P. protegens* [~,↓] *K. pneumoniae*. In the third case, when *P.*

aeruginosa was paired with *K. pneumoniae*, *P. aeruginosa* did not differ in the amount of area

covered but the area of *K. pneumoniae* was significantly increased, so, *P. aeruginosa* [~,↑] *K.*

pneumoniae. Consistent with our previous work comparing planktonic and biofilm growth

modes, these results differ from our observations in planktonic culture where *P. protegens*

outgrew the other two species by between 10-100 fold and *P. aeruginosa* and *K. pneumoniae*

equally reduced each other's growth by ~100 fold [22].

Table 3: Comparison of dual species interactions for *P. aeruginosa*, *P. aeruginosa* small

colony variant (SCV), *P. protegens*, *K. pneumoniae* and *K. pneumoniae* non-mucoid variant

(NMV).

Recipient / Actor	*P. aeruginosa*	*P. aeruginosa* SCV	*P. protegens*	*K. pneumoniae*	*K. pneumoniae* NMV
P. aeruginosa				↑	
P. aeruginosa-SCV	↓				ND
P. protegens	↓	↓		↓	
K. pneumoniae					↓
K. pneumoniae-NMV		ND			

* Empty cells indicate no difference between single and dual species colonies was observed,

ND indicates a combination which was not determined. Interactions that resulted in a

significant increase in area are indicated by ↑ and decreases by ↓ compared to the monospecies

colony by analysis of variance and Tukey's honest significant differences post-hoc test.

Differences were considered significant if their multiple-testing adjusted p-value was below

0.05 for 48 h comparisons.

The interactions between *K. pneumoniae* and the two *Pseudomonas* species were

starkly different. When it was grown with *P. aeruginosa* it colonized more than twice as much

area than it could alone, indicating a strong benefit from being co-cultured. *P. fluorescens* Pf0-

1 has been observed to rapidly evolve a division of labour where two different mutant strains

are able to make a faster expanding colony than either the wild-type or each strain individually

[48]. In those mixed colonies, one strain produced the force for colony expansion through cell

division while the other produced an extracellular polymer which acts as a lubricant at the

expanding edge of the colony. In our work, *K. pneumoniae* may have been taking advantage

of the extracellular DNA [49] or rhamnolipid surfactants [50] produced by *P. aeruginosa* to

enable colony expansion. Non-motile *E. coli* was observed to take advantage of motile

Acinetobacter baylyi, forming intricately branched floral patterns [51]. These patterns were

qualitatively dissimilar to those we observed, indicating that the mechanism by which *K.*

pneumoniae takes advantage of *P. aeruginosa* motility is also likely different. This strong

effect of *P. aeruginosa* on *K. pneumoniae* is consistent with our observations in flow cell

biofilms where despite making up only a small (1-5%) proportion of the 3-species community,

P. aeruginosa influences the relative proportions of both other bacteria [22]. Conversely, *P.*

protegens did not assist *K. pneumoniae* but was found around the outside of *K. pneumoniae*

and these two strains were also more mixed at 48 h than monospecies colonies of each species.

In strains of *E. coli* engineered to have equal growth rates but different cell shapes, small cells

were found to reside on top of the colonies and larger cells were below, at the agar surface,

where they maintained access to nutrients obtained from an agar surface [26]. *K. pneumoniae*

cells are larger than *Pseudomonas* which may have allowed *P. protegens* to overgrow it and

prevent *K. pneumoniae* from expanding further. In the third case, *P. aeruginosa* was also found

around the outside of *P. protegens*, but these species were not mixed. This indicates that *P.*

protegens could not take advantage of *P. aeruginosa*'s motility and these species mutually

exclude each other in space.

***P. aeruginosa* twitching motility is important for interactions**

Twitching motility by *P. aeruginosa* has been best studied in interstitial biofilms where

cells are sandwiched between an agar surface and a glass coverslip [42, 47, 49, 52]. The

colonies studied here are qualitatively similar, although the expanding front does not form as

intricate lattices. Without a functional TFP, the SCV could only colonize about 20% of the area

of the wild-type. When paired with wild-type *P. aeruginosa* or *P. protegens*, the SCV was

outcompeted for space, indicating that TFP motility is a competitive trait. It also appears to be

a cooperative trait as the area colonized by *K. pneumoniae* was not increased when paired with

the *P. aeruginosa* SCV, whereas it was increased three-fold when paired with TFP motile,

wild-type *P. aeruginosa*. TFP motility can also be abrogated by deleting the gene for pilin

subunits, pilA [52]. It will be interesting to contrast our observations of a hyper-piliated *pilT*

mutant with a non-piliated *pilA* mutant. In flow-cell biofilms, a *pilA* mutant of *P. aeruginosa*

was less competitive with *Agrobacterium tumefaciens* [53], but conversely, outcompeted

Staphylococcus aureus [54]. Motility, as a competitive trait, has been suggested to allow strains

better access nutrients, to cover other organisms or to disrupt their biofilms [55], which is

supported by our results. Even though *P. aeruginosa* was able to cover *K. pneumoniae* with

and without a functional TFP, only the motile wild-type *P. aeruginosa* had a commensal

relationship with *K. pneumoniae*, indicating that motility can also be a cooperative trait.

K. pneumoniae secreted matrix is important for interactions

Self-secreted extracellular matrix is a hallmark of biofilms that influences the spatial

positioning and interactions between cells within a biofilm [23]. Matrix secretion allows

producing cells to better access nutrients in colonies of *P. fluorescens* [56] and for simulated

cells under flow conditions [57], by excluding other cells. In flow-cell biofilms, the *K.*

pneumoniae NMV outcompeted its isogenic wild-type strain, but was less fit when grown with

P. aeruginosa and *P. protegens* [35]. In colony biofilms, the *K. pneumoniae* NMV colonized

the same total area as the wild-type strain when alone, but did not mix when the two were co-

cultured. Furthermore, the NMV did not colonize more area when paired with *P. aeruginosa*

and was outcompeted by *P. protegens*, resulting in less area covered compared to the NMV

when cultured alone. This indicates that the biofilm matrix normally produced by *K.*

pneumoniae KP-1 improves interspecies, but not [58] intraspecies, competition. The mutual

exclusion observed between the wild-type and NMV also indicates that the NMV cannot take

advantage of the wild-type, similarly to exclusion by *B. subtilis* [59] and *V. cholerae* [60].

When co-cultured, *Pantoea agglomerans* and *B. subtilis* form colonies with structural

properties not observed in either single species alone, even with a *B. subtilis* mutant that does

not produce EPS, indicating that it could share the exopolysaccharide being produced by *P.*

agglomerans [58]. Our results indicate that the *K. pneumoniae* NMV can not similarly make

use of *Pseudomonas* matrix components.

Agar concentration changes inter-strain interaction outcomes

It is well understood that agar concentration influences bacterial motility [61]. It also

affects the ability of biofilms to extract nutrients as it determines the osmotic pressure of an

environment [28]. Here we showed that lowering the agar concentration from 1.5% to 0.6%

increased the area colonized by the TFP motility deficient *P. aeruginosa* SCV, though it was

still less than the wild-type. However, in co-culture it colonized as much area as the wild-type

and was not encircled by the parental wild-type (Table 3). Conversely, the *K. pneumoniae*

NMV was less effective at colonization compared to the wild-type on 0.6% but not 1.5% agar,

but was still able to compete with the wild-type when co-cultured in both situations. For the *P.*

aeruginosa SCV, lowering the agar concentration likely enabled flagella-based motility that

could partially compensate for the defect in twitching motility. Motility is important for

colonization of roots [62], the gastrointestinal tract of Zebra fish [63] and for the persistence

of uropathogenic *E. coli* [64]. Here, we showed that motility influenced intraspecies

competition but the outcome depended on environmental conditions. Previously, we observed

that the *P. aeruginosa* SCV completely outcompeted wild-type *P. aeruginosa* in flow cell

biofilms [35]. The increased attachment provided by hyper-piliation of the SCV [42, 65] likely

provides this benefit in flow cells, whereas the lack of motility was a detriment in colonies.

This highlights the differences in environmental pressures between the culturing methods.

Hyper-piliation also leads to aggregation [66], which may explain how the *P. aeruginosa* wild-

type and SCV separated into sectors with straight boundaries on 0.6% agar. This appeared to

be similar to the differently tagged strains of *K. pneumoniae*, indicating that this community

morphology may not exclusively be caused by matrix secretion.

456   For *K. pneumoniae* (which is non-motile), lowering the agar concentration allowed the

wild-type to colonize more area, which was similar to how a rugose strain of *V. cholerae* that

hypersecretes extracellular matrix (ECM)formed larger colonies on lower concentrations of

agar [28]. In *V. cholerae*, it was demonstrated that matrix secretion generates an osmotic

pressure gradient between the agar and the colony, allowing the colony to expand by physical

swelling and also drawing more nutrients out of the agar. It is likely that this is a general

mechanism attributable to the biofilm matrix. In this context, the wild-type *K. pneumoniae*

would be similar to the rugose *V. cholerae*, producing larger amounts of ECM, while the *K.*

pneumoniae NMV and wild-type *V. cholerae* are analogous in their relatively lower amount of

ECM production. The community morphology of dual strain colonies of ECM secretors and

non-secretors differed between the two species. In *V. cholerae*, the hyper-secretor was

encircled by the non-secretor at both 1.5 and 0.6% agar, but colonized far more area at 0.6%

as the non-secretor was pushed to the outside of the colony. Conversely, the *K. pneumoniae*

NMV was not displaced and even prevented spreading by wild-type *K. pneumoniae* (Figure 5,

D). Similar to *V. cholerae*, the *K. pneumoniae* NMV did not benefit from the matrix secreted

by wild-type *K. pneumoniae* as its area was not increased in co-culture. In *B. subtilis*, it was

also observed that ECM-producing cells outcompete non-secretors [29], and to a higher degree

when the humidity is higher (which is similar to lower agar concentration). Additionally,

osmotic pressure generated by the ECM enhances colony spreading in this species [67]. Thus,

matrix production appears to be a general strategy of bacteria that increases competitiveness in

colonies.

Conclusions

Interactions between bacteria are key for determining the composition and function of

communities. Here we used colonies to investigate intra- and inter-species interactions. Using

the members of our three species model community, we showed that they differ in how they

interact with members of their own species due to their physiological traits: TFP motility in *P.*

aeruginosa allowed populations to mix whereas ECM in *K. pneumoniae* caused straight

borders between population sectors. Using mutants deficient in these traits, we showed that

their impact depended on the agar concentration. These physiological traits were also important

when interspecies interactions were examined. The motility of *P. aeruginosa* enabled it to

outcompete *P. protegens* and to facilitate increased colonization area by *K. pneumoniae*.

Importantly, the spatial distribution of species, observed for dual-species colonies did not

resemble any patterns previously seen for experimental or simulated monospecies and dual-

strain colonies. These experiments show that interspecies interactions differ substantially from

intraspecies interactions and that co-culture colonies are a powerful way to investigate how

bacterial physiology determines these interactions.

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank Sujatha Subramoni for helpful advice regarding the three

species community, Talgat Sailov for microscopy assistance and Diane McDougald for reading

the manuscript and providing helpful comments. We would also like to thank the Singapore

Centre for Environmental Life Sciences Engineering (SCELSE), whose research is supported

by the National Research Foundation Singapore, Ministry of Education, Nanyang

Technological University and National University of Singapore, under its Research Centre of

Excellence Programme.

Conflict of Interest

The authors state that they have no conflict of interest.

References

1.   Elias S, Banin E (2012) Multi-species biofilms: living with friendly neighbors. FEMS

Microbiol Rev 36:990–1004. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1574-6976.2012.00325.x.

2.   Rendueles O, Ghigo J-M (2012) Multi-species biofilms: how to avoid unfriendly

neighbors. FEMS Microbiol Rev 36:972–989. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1574-

6976.2012.00328.x

3.   Ghoul M, Mitri S (2016) The Ecology and Evolution of Microbial Competition.

Trends Microbiol 24:833–845. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tim.2016.06.011

4.   Morris BEL, Henneberger R, Huber H, Moissl-Eichinger C (2013) Microbial

syntrophy: interaction for the common good. FEMS Microbiol Rev 37:384–406.

https://doi.org/10.1111/1574-6976.12019

5.   Cornforth DM, Foster KR (2015) Antibiotics and the art of bacterial war. Proc Natl

Acad Sci U S A 112:10827–8. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1513608112

6.   Sharma A, Inagaki S, Sigurdson W, Kuramitsu HK (2005) Synergy between

Tannerella forsythia and Fusobacterium nucleatum in biofilm formation. Oral

Microbiol Immunol 20:39–42. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1399-302X.2004.00175.x

7.   Yamada M, Ikegami A, Kuramitsu HK (2005) Synergistic biofilm formation by

Treponema denticola and *Porphyromonas gingivalis*. FEMS Microbiol Lett 250:271–

277. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.femsle.2005.07.019

8.   Gonzalez D, Sabnis A, Foster KR, Mavridou DAI (2018) Costs and benefits of

provocation in bacterial warfare. Proc Natl Acad Sci 115:7593–7598.

https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1801028115

9.   Cordero OX, Datta MS (2016) Microbial interactions and community assembly at

529   microscales. Curr Opin Microbiol 31:227–234.

530   https://doi.org/10.1016/J.MIB.2016.03.015

531 10. Abreu NA, Taga ME (2016) Decoding molecular interactions in microbial

532   communities. FEMS Microbiol Rev 40:648–663.

533   https://doi.org/10.1093/femsre/fuw019

534 11. Madsen JS, Sørensen SJ, Burmølle M (2018) Bacterial social interactions and the

535   emergence of community-intrinsic properties. Curr Opin Microbiol 42:104–109.

536   https://doi.org/10.1016/J.MIB.2017.11.018

537 12. Foster KR, Bell T (2012) Competition, not cooperation, dominates interactions among

538   culturable microbial species. Curr Biol 22:1845–1850.

539   https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2012.08.005

540 13. Russel J, Røder HL, Madsen JS, et al (2017) Antagonism correlates with metabolic

541   similarity in diverse bacteria. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A 114:10684–10688.

542   https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1706016114

543 14. Ren D, Madsen JS, Sørensen SJ, Burmølle M (2015) High prevalence of biofilm

544   synergy among bacterial soil isolates in cocultures indicates bacterial interspecific

545   cooperation. ISME J 9:81–89. https://doi.org/10.1038/ismej.2014.96

546 15. Burmølle M, Webb JS, Rao D, et al (2006) Enhanced biofilm formation and increased

547   resistance to antimicrobial agents and bacterial invasion are caused by synergistic

548   interactions in multispecies biofilms. Appl Environ Microbiol 72:3916–23.

549   https://doi.org/10.1128/AEM.03022-05

550 16. Tan CH, Lee KWK, Burmølle M, et al (2017) All together now: experimental

551   multispecies biofilm model systems. Environ Microbiol 19:42–53.

https://doi.org/10.1111/1462-2920.13594

17.   Røder HL, Sørensen SJ, Burmølle M (2016) Studying Bacterial Multispecies Biofilms:

Where to Start? Trends Microbiol 24:503–513.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tim.2016.02.019

18.   Dragoš A, Kiesewalter H, Martin M, et al (2018) Division of Labor during Biofilm

Matrix Production. Curr Biol 28:1903-1913.e5.

https://doi.org/10.1016/J.CUB.2018.04.046

19.   Hansen SK, Rainey PB, Haagensen JAJ, Molin S (2007) Evolution of species

interactions in a biofilm community. Nature 445:533–536.

https://doi.org/10.1038/nature05514

20.   Haagensen JAJ, Hansen SK, Christensen BB, et al (2015) Development of Spatial

Distribution Patterns by Biofilm Cells. Appl Environ Microbiol 81:6120–8.

https://doi.org/10.1128/AEM.01614-15

21.   Christensen BB, Haagensen JAJ, Heydorn A, Molin S (2002) Metabolic

commensalism and competition in a two-species microbial consortium. Appl Environ

Microbiol 68:2495–502. https://doi.org/10.1128/aem.68.5.2495-2502.2002

22.   Lee KWK, Periasamy S, Mukherjee M, et al (2014) Biofilm development and

enhanced stress resistance of a model, mixed-species community biofilm. ISME J

8:894–907. https://doi.org/10.1038/ismej.2013.194

23.   Nadell CD, Drescher K, Foster KR (2016) Spatial structure, cooperation and

competition in biofilms. Nat Rev Microbiol 14:589–600.

https://doi.org/10.1038/nrmicro.2016.84

24.   Momeni B, Shou W, Brileya KA, Fields MW (2013) Strong inter-population

cooperation leads to partner intermixing in microbial communities. Elife 2013:e00230.

https://doi.org/10.7554/eLife.00230

25. Müller MJI, Neugeboren BI, Nelson DR, Murray AW (2014) Genetic drift opposes

mutualism during spatial population expansion. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A 111:1037–

42. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1313285111

26. Smith WPJ, Davit Y, Osborne JM, et al (2017) Cell morphology drives spatial

patterning in microbial communities. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A 114:E280–E286.

https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1613007114

27. Goldschmidt F, Regoes RR, Johnson DR (2017) Successive range expansion promotes

diversity and accelerates evolution in spatially structured microbial populations. ISME

J 11:2112–2123. https://doi.org/10.1038/ismej.2017.76

28. Yan J, Nadell CD, Stone HA, et al (2017) Extracellular-matrix-mediated osmotic

pressure drives Vibrio cholerae biofilm expansion and cheater exclusion. Nat Commun

8:327. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-017-00401-1

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

affects spatial pattern formation and cooperation in Bacillus subtilis biofilms. ISME J

8:2069–2079. https://doi.org/10.1038/ismej.2014.52

30. Frost I, Smith WPJ, Mitri S, et al (2018) Cooperation, competition and antibiotic

resistance in bacterial colonies. ISME J 12:1582–1593.

https://doi.org/10.1038/s41396-018-0090-4

31. Ramette A, Frapolli M, Saux MF Le, et al (2011) Pseudomonas protegens sp. nov.,

widespread plant-protecting bacteria producing the biocontrol compounds 2,4-

diacetylphloroglucinol and pyoluteorin. Syst Appl Microbiol 34:180–188.

598   https://doi.org/10.1016/j.syapm.2010.10.005

599 32. Lim CK, Hassan KA, Penesyan A, et al (2013) The effect of zinc limitation on the

600   transcriptome of *Pseudomonas protegens* Pf-5. Environ Microbiol 15:702–715.

601   https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1462-2920.2012.02849.x

602 33. Chazal PM (1995) Pollution of modern metalworking fluids containing biocides by

603   pathogenic bacteria in France. Eur J Epidemiol 11:1–7.

604   https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01719939

605 34. Anand AAP, Vennison SJ, Sankar SG, et al (2010) Isolation and Characterization of

606   Bacteria from the Gut of *Bombyx mori* that Degrade Cellulose, Xylan, Pectin and

607   Starch and Their Impact on Digestion. J Insect Sci 10:1–20.

608   https://doi.org/10.1673/031.010.10701

609 35. Kelvin Lee KW, Hoong Yam JK, Mukherjee M, et al (2016) Interspecific diversity

610   reduces and functionally substitutes for intraspecific variation in biofilm communities.

611   ISME J 10:846–857. https://doi.org/10.1038/ismej.2015.159

612 36. Peng T, Thorn K, Schroeder T, et al (2017) A BaSiC tool for background and shading

613   correction of optical microscopy images. Nat Commun 8:14836.

614   https://doi.org/10.1038/ncomms14836

615 37. Preibisch S, Saalfeld S, Tomancak P (2009) Globally optimal stitching of tiled 3D

616   microscopic image acquisitions. Bioinformatics 25:1463–5.

617   https://doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/btp184

618 38. Schneider CA, Rasband WS, Eliceiri KW (2012) NIH Image to ImageJ: 25 years of

619   image analysis. Nat Methods 9:671–675. https://doi.org/10.1038/nmeth.2089

620 39. Barthelme S (2018) imager: Image Processing Library Based on "CImg".

40. Landini G, Randell DA, Fouad S, Galton A (2017) Automatic thresholding from the

gradients of region boundaries. J Microsc 265:185–195.

https://doi.org/10.1111/jmi.12474

41. Whitchurch CB, Hobbs M, Livingston SP, et al (1991) Characterisation of a

Pseudomonas aeruginosa twitching motility gene and evidence for a specialised

protein export system widespread in eubacteria. Gene 101:33–44.

https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-1119(91)90221-V

42. Whitchurch CB, Mattick JS (1994) Characterization of a gene, pilU, required for

twitching motility but not phage sensitivity in Pseudomonas aeruginosa. Mol

Microbiol 13:1079–1091. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2958.1994.tb00499.x

43. Hallatschek O, Hersen P, Ramanathan S, Nelson DR (2007) Genetic drift at expanding

frontiers promotes gene segregation. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A 104:19926–30.

https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0710150104

44. Blanchard AE, Lu T (2015) Bacterial social interactions drive the emergence of

differential spatial colony structures. BMC Syst Biol 9:59.

https://doi.org/10.1186/s12918-015-0188-5

45. Rudge TJ, Federici F, Steiner PJ, et al (2013) Cell Polarity-Driven Instability

Generates Self-Organized, Fractal Patterning of Cell Layers. ACS Synth Biol 2:705–

714. https://doi.org/10.1021/sb400030p

46. Mitri S, Clarke E, Foster KR (2016) Resource limitation drives spatial organization in

microbial groups. ISME J 10:1471–1482. https://doi.org/10.1038/ismej.2015.208

47. Gloag ES, Turnbull L, Huang A, et al (2013) Self-organization of bacterial biofilms is

facilitated by extracellular DNA. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A 110:11541–6.

https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1218898110

48.   Kim W, Levy SB, Foster KR (2016) Rapid radiation in bacteria leads to a division of labour. Nat Commun 7:10508. https://doi.org/10.1038/ncomms10508

49.   Turnbull L, Toyofuku M, Hynen AL, et al (2016) Explosive cell lysis as a mechanism for the biogenesis of bacterial membrane vesicles and biofilms. Nat Commun 7:11220. https://doi.org/10.1038/ncomms11220

50.   Murray TS, Kazmierczak BI (2008) Pseudomonas aeruginosa exhibits sliding motility in the absence of type IV pili and flagella. J Bacteriol 190:2700–8. https://doi.org/10.1128/JB.01620-07

51.   Xiong L, Cao Y, Cooper R, et al (2020) Flower-like patterns in multi-species bacterial colonies. Elife. https://doi.org/10.7554/eLife.48885

52.   Semmler ABT, Whitchurch CB, Mattick JS (1999) A re-examination of twitching motility in Pseudomonas aeruginosa. Microbiology 145:2863–2873. https://doi.org/10.1099/00221287-145-10-2863

53.   An D, Danhorn T, Fuqua C, Parsek MR (2006) Quorum sensing and motility mediate interactions between Pseudomonas aeruginosa and Agrobacterium tumefaciens in biofilm cocultures. Proc Natl Acad Sci 103:3828–33. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0511323103

54.   Yang L, Liu Y, Markussen T, et al (2011) Pattern differentiation in co-culture biofilms formed by *Staphylococcus aureus* and *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*. FEMS Immunol Med Microbiol 62:339–347. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1574-695X.2011.00820.x

55.   Rendueles O, Ghigo J-MJ-M (2015) Mechanisms of competition in biofilm communities. Microbiol Spectr 3:. https://doi.org/10.1128/microbiolspec.MB-0009-

667  2014

668 56. Kim W, Racimo F, Schluter J, et al (2014) Importance of positioning for microbial

669   evolution. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A 111:E1639-47.

670   https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1323632111

671 57. Jayathilake PG, Jana S, Rushton S, et al (2017) Extracellular Polymeric Substance

672   Production and Aggregated Bacteria Colonization Influence the Competition of

673   Microbes in Biofilms. Front Microbiol 8:1865.

674   https://doi.org/10.3389/fmicb.2017.01865

675 58. Yannarell SM, Grandchamp GM, Chen SY, et al (2019) A dual-species biofilm with

676   emergent mechanical and protective properties. In: Journal of Bacteriology

677 59. Martin M, Dragoš A, Hölscher T, et al (2017) De novo evolved interference

678   competition promotes the spread of biofilm defectors. Nat Commun 8:15127.

679   https://doi.org/10.1038/ncomms15127

680 60. Nadell CD, Drescher K, Wingreen NS, Bassler BL (2015) Extracellular matrix

681   structure governs invasion resistance in bacterial biofilms. ISME J 9:1700–1709.

682   https://doi.org/10.1038/ismej.2014.246

683 61. Greenberg EP, Canale-Parola E (1977) Motility of flagellated bacteria in viscous

684   environments. J Bacteriol 132:356–8

685 62. Pliego C, de Weert S, Lamers G, et al (2008) Two similar enhanced root-colonizing

686   *Pseudomonas* strains differ largely in their colonization strategies of avocado roots and

687   *Rosellinia necatrix* hyphae. Environ Microbiol 10:3295–3304.

688   https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1462-2920.2008.01721.x

689 63. Stephens WZ, Wiles TJ, Martinez ES, et al (2015) Identification of Population

Bottlenecks and Colonization Factors during Assembly of Bacterial Communities

within the Zebrafish Intestine. MBio 6:e01163-15.

https://doi.org/10.1128/mBio.01163-15

64. Wright KJ, Seed PC, Hultgren SJ (2005) Uropathogenic Escherichia coli flagella aid in

efficient urinary tract colonization. Infect Immun 73:7657–68.

https://doi.org/10.1128/IAI.73.11.7657-7668.2005

65. Chiang P, Burrows LL (2003) Biofilm formation by hyperpiliated mutants of

Pseudomonas aeruginosa. J Bacteriol 185:2374–8.

https://doi.org/10.1128/JB.185.7.2374-2378.2003

66. Déziel E, Comeau Y, Villemur R (2001) Initiation of biofilm formation by

Pseudomonas aeruginosa 57RP correlates with emergence of hyperpiliated and highly

adherent phenotypic variants deficient in swimming, swarming, and twitching

motilities. J Bacteriol 183:1195–1204. https://doi.org/10.1128/JB.183.4.1195-

1204.2001

67. Seminara A, Angelini TE, Wilking JN, et al (2012) Osmotic spreading of Bacillus

subtilis biofilms driven by an extracellular matrix. Proc Natl Acad Sci.

https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1109261108