

Microbial wars: Competition in ecological niches and within the microbiome

Maria A. Bauer¹, Katharina Kainz¹, Didac Carmona-Gutierrez^{1,*} and Frank Madeo^{1,2,*}

¹Institute of Molecular Biosciences, University of Graz, Graz, Austria.

²BioTechMed Graz, Graz, Austria.

* Corresponding Authors:

Didac Carmona-Gutierrez: Institute of Molecular Biosciences, University of Graz, Graz, Austria; E-mail: carmonag@uni-graz.at;

Frank Madeo: Institute of Molecular Biosciences, University of Graz, Graz, Austria; E-mail: madeo@uni-graz.at

Many microbial communities live in highly competitive surroundings, in which the fight for resources determines their survival and genetic persistence. Humans live in a close relationship with microbial communities, which includes the health- and disease-determining interactions with our microbiome. Accordingly, the understanding of microbial competitive activities are essential at physiological and pathophysiological levels. Here we provide a brief overview on microbial competition and discuss some of its roles and consequences that directly affect humans.

The earth is inhabited by a vast quantity of diverse microorganisms. The relationship between them is determined by the fundamental drive of each species and strain to promote its own survival. For instance, some strains may live in tightly associated up to symbiotic relationships, thus heavily relying on their allies. Conversely, others may engage in ferocious competition, resulting in a relentless war to win over finite resources such as nutrients, light or territory.

According to Ghoul and Mitri, a strain is competitive if it shows phenotypes that cause a fitness decrease in a competitor strain [1]. Characteristically, such phenotypes (e.g., secretion of digestive enzymes, production of antibiotics or inhibition of quorum sensing) have mostly evolved because of biotic competition rather than environmental pressure. Competing strains may be distantly related species or, in contrast, only differ by a single mutation: to be competitors, they must but overlap in resource use. If that is the case, competition may be either passive or active. During passive competition, one strain harms another one through resource consumption, whereas during active competition, individual cells of two contending strains damage one another through direct and active interference [1].

In the frame of passive competition, a strain may restrict the competitor's access to nutrients, e.g. via secretion of digestive enzymes [2, 3] or siderophores [4, 5]. It may also enhance its own nutrient utilization by altering its metabolic regulation [6]. Strains may also gain advantage through reduced expression of costly genes by exploiting the expression products of other strains, often referred to as "cheating" [2, 4, 7]. Finally, microorganisms can compete passively by gaining enhanced access to a given space. This may occur through production of molecules that impact space structure and/or microbial motility, such as surfactants, rhamnolipids, adhesion and anti-adhesion molecules or extracellular polysaccharids [8–12].

In settings of active competition (or "interference competition"), rival cells damage each other actively or through chemical warfare with the final goal to eliminate the competitor [1]. One strategy to achieve this goal includes using the contact-dependent type IV secretion system, whereby cells inject toxins or other molecules into neighbouring adversaries to promote cell lysis [13–15]. In fact, the production of antimicrobials ranging from strain-specific bacteriocins to more broad-spectrum antibiotics and peptides is the classical example of interference competition. A more subtle (but also effective) strategy used for active competition is the active disruption of signalling molecules through quorum quenching [16, 17].

The evolutionary emergence and preservation of numerous competition strategies reflect their central role in the microbial ecosystem. But is competition also common? Do microorganisms fight each other exceptionally or routinely? Interestingly, quantification attempts regarding the competitive properties of microbes show, for example, that 25% of gram-negative bacteria possess genes coding for a Type VI secretion system [18]. Also, 5–10% of the genomes of nearly all actinomycetes code for secondary metabolites [19], including antibiotics or other possibly dam-

doi: 10.15698/mic2018.05.628

Received 23.04.2018, Accepted 03.05.2018, Published 07.05.2018.

Keywords: passive competition, active competition, microbiome, selection, niche, probiotics, antibiotics, ecological stability, *Candida*, *Escherichia coli*.

aging molecules. However, the function of these metabolites and the percentage that is actually aggressive still needs to be revealed. Moreover, similar analyses in other microbial groups are still pending. In addition, the occurrence of competition depends on the prevailing environmental conditions. Criteria that promote competition include (i) a high overlap between coexisting strains in their metabolic and/or spatial niche accompanied by the requirement of similar resources, (ii) a relatively high cell density rate relative to the available resources leading to their limitation and (iii) an adequate intermixture of populations, which increases the possibility of interaction, shared nutrients and joint secretions [1, 20–22].

In general, it is difficult to address the complexity of a microbial community, which covers many influencing components, ranging from environmental to genetic factors. Accordingly, competitive aspects of such communities are duly intricate. In an attempt to assess the extent of exploitative competition, simulations of competitive activity using theoretical metabolic models of different bacteria have been run based on available sequence data [23, 24]. Despite the limitations of such simulated interactions (e.g. no consideration of the natural environment or actual expression of identified genes), they do provide relevant insight into competitive dynamics. One of the early studies using this approach pre-estimates excessive competition between many bacterial species but few cooperative interactions [23]. Additionally, many other studies support the prevalence of competition, which has been recently reviewed [1].

An example for the complexity of microbial communities is the human microbiome. Its different microbial societies need to function steadily in order to support the host's life and health for the final sake of the individual strains' survival. Hence, ecological stability in the different microbiota in and on our bodies is essential. But how does competition influence the stability of a microbial community? Generally, it increases ecological stability as well as it leads to a local decrease of microbial diversity [25], "local" meaning the range in which microorganisms influence each other's fitness. Of note, bacteriophages can impact microbial competition and promote diversity by driving horizontal gene transfer and giving rarer species an advantage [26]. Horizontal gene transfer occurs rarely but can have major effects by moving single functions (e.g. antibiotic resistance) horizontally through different strains and species [27, 28].

There are three established possible long-term consequences of microbial competition that are ecologically stable [1]:

a) *A winner is declared.* One competitive strain dominates the community whereas the "weaker" strain goes extinct [29, 30].

b) *A metabolic niche is established.* The competitors are able to coexist because they specialize on different resource types and therefore occupy different metabolic niches. For instance, when distinct bacterial isolates of tree-holes (aquatic ecosystems created for example by a

deformed trunk) are brought into co-culture, they initially tend to compete with one another. Eventually, however, they diverge in their use of resources (e.g. using each other's waste products) as they coevolve [31, 32]. This leads to a niche differentiation where finally competition leads to symbiotic relationships or productive communities [32].

c) *Territorial niches are assigned.* The competitors separate into different territorial niches or patches. This outcome may happen in solid or semi-solid structures such as the soil, mucus or an agar surfaces. This phenomenon has been extensively investigated for microbial colonies, which start as well mixed competitive populations and finally form clonal patches onto the agar surface [33, 34].

As mentioned above, competition - with some exceptions - reduces diversity but increases local ecological stability. However, the resulting long-term outcomes in each competitive scenario likely depends on the selection pressures of the surrounding environment. Of note, selection may lead to a microbial arms race, competitive exclusion as well as synergistic division of labour, all in the same environment but in different areas [35]. Exactly how diversity, stability and the prevalence of competition and cooperation is influenced needs to be further addressed in future research [1].

Interestingly, in this issue of *Microbial Cell*, Cabral et al. address the intestinal microbiome's ecological stability in a broader sense [36]. The intestinal microbiome is a complex community of bacteria, viruses, fungi and some parasitic eukaryotes [37]. This complex community and its interactions have co-evolved, maintaining relative homeostasis, which is beneficial for the host as well as for each strain within its niche [37]. Therefore, it is of utmost importance for the host but also for every established part of the microbiome that the communal equilibrium remains stable [38]. As mentioned, competition promotes ecological stability, which also applies for the intestinal microbiome [25]. Interestingly, Cabral et al. found *Escherichia coli* to out-compete and kill the opportunistic fungal pathogen *Candida albicans in vitro* by secreting a soluble fungicidal factor [36]. This factor is inhibited by magnesium, and future work will address the connection between intestinal changes in magnesium levels and microbial homeostasis. Importantly, the secretion of this fungicidal factor could be one of the strategies that have evolved in the intestinal microbiome to prevent *Candida* overgrowth [39]. *C. albicans* is found in the gastrointestinal flora of most healthy humans and was long thought to exist in our gut merely as a commensal resident or as an opportunistic pathogen. Indeed, *C. albicans* is responsible for more than 400.000 life-threatening infections per year, worldwide [40]. However, additional roles of *C. albicans* within the gut are becoming evident that emerge from its interaction with bacterial communities. On the one hand, it is implicated in the promotion of bacterial host colonization and virulence upon bacterial co-infection [41]. On the other hand, recent findings suggest that *C. albicans* might have beneficial effects for the host upon intestinal infections with bacterial pathogens through an increase of a protective immune

response in the host [42]. Altogether, intestinal *Candida*-bacteria (competitive) interactions certainly contribute to human health and disease.

The identification of a novel fungicidal factor by Cabral *et al.* exemplifies the potential of such investigations to uncover possible new treatment strategies or drugs against dangerous infections. In fact, the study of microbial competition (within our bodies and in the environment) engages many areas of biology and medicine. For instance, competition between co-evolving bacterial strains may lead to antibiotic resistance [43], and the development of biofilms, promoted by bacterial competition, also hampers the effective treatment of bacterial infections [44]. Given that antibiotic resistance has developed into a global medical threat, mainly due to an irresponsible use of antibiotics, a deeper understanding of how microbial competition contributes to this problem is needed [45]. Moreover, gut dysbiosis may be treated by the (personalized) administration of probiotics [46], microorganisms that provide health benefits when consumed [47]. For the successful design of new, functional probiotics, more knowledge about how bacteria compete is warranted. If a probiotic strain is not competitive in all ecosystems it will only occasionally implement its desired function [48]. Hence, understanding competition ameliorates the chances to cure dysbiosis. For example, it has been proposed that probiotic action can be enhanced by making the gut temporarily susceptible to invasion [48]. Other examples for the importance to study microbial competition include industrial applications, e.g. in animal husbandry [49] and evolutionary aspects. In fact, studying microbial competition in the context of group level processes helps to gain insight into the competition-driven evolutionary transition to multicellularity [50].

Charles Darwin noted that “If it could be proved that any part of the structure of any one species had been formed for the exclusive good of another species, it would

annihilate my theory, for such could not have been produced through natural selection.” [51]. Accordingly, microbial wars are an integral part of interspecies equilibrium that affect us both through our environment and within our own microbiome. Further understanding of these competitive interactions will thus not only provide deep insight into different aspects of biology but also shape new advancements in therapeutic approaches.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

FM is grateful to the Austrian Science Fund FWF (Austria) for grants, P29262, P29203 P27893, and ‘SFB Lipotox’ (F3012), grant DK Metabolic and Cardiovascular Diseases (W 1226) funded by the FWF to K.K. and F.M. as well as to BMFWF and the Karl-Franzens University for grants ‘Unkonventionelle Forschung’ and flysleep. FM acknowledges support from NAWI Graz and the BioTechMed-Graz flagship project “EPIAge”.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

COPYRIGHT

© 2018 Bauer *et al.* This is an open-access article released under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license, which allows the unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are acknowledged.

Please cite this article as: Maria A. Bauer, Katharina Kainz, Didac Carmona-Gutierrez and Frank Madeo (2018). Microbial wars: Competition in ecological niches and within the microbiome. *Microbial Cell* 5(5): 215-219. doi: 10.15698/mic2018.05.628

REFERENCES

- Ghoul M, and Mitri S (2016). The Ecology and Evolution of Microbial Competition. *Trends Microbiol* 24(10): 833–845. doi: 10.1016/j.tim.2016.06.011
- Diggel SP, Griffin AS, Campbell GS, and West SA (2007). Cooperation and conflict in quorum-sensing bacterial populations. *Nature* 450(7168): 411–414. doi: 10.1038/nature06279
- Rendueles O, and Ghigo J-M (2012). Multi-species biofilms: how to avoid unfriendly neighbors. *FEMS Microbiol Rev* 36(5): 972–989. doi: 10.1111/j.1574-6976.2012.00328.x
- Griffin AS, West SA, and Buckling A (2004). Cooperation and competition in pathogenic bacteria. *Nature* 430(7003): 1024–1027. doi: 10.1038/nature02744
- Scholz RL, and Greenberg EP (2015). Sociality in *Escherichia coli*: Enterochelin Is a Private Good at Low Cell Density and Can Be Shared at High Cell Density. *J Bacteriol* 197(13): 2122–2128. doi: 10.1128/JB.02596-14
- Ackermann M (2015). A functional perspective on phenotypic heterogeneity in microorganisms. *Nat Rev Microbiol* 13(8): 497–508. doi: 10.1038/nrmicro3491
- Gore J, Youk H, and van Oudenaarden A (2009). Snowdrift game dynamics and facultative cheating in yeast. *Nature* 459(7244): 253–256. doi: 10.1038/nature07921
- An D, Danhorn T, Fuqua C, and Parsek MR (2006). Quorum sensing and motility mediate interactions between *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* and *Agrobacterium tumefaciens* in biofilm cocultures. *Proc Natl Acad Sci* 103(10): 3828–3833. doi: 10.1073/pnas.0511323103
- Kim W, Racimo F, Schluter J, Levy SB, and Foster KR (2014). Importance of positioning for microbial evolution. *Proc Natl Acad Sci* 111(16): E1639–E1647. doi: 10.1073/pnas.1323632111
- Nadell CD, and Bassler BL (2011). A fitness trade-off between local competition and dispersal in *Vibrio cholerae* biofilms. *Proc Natl Acad Sci* 108(34): 14181–14185. doi: 10.1073/pnas.1111147108

11. Schluter J, Nadell CD, Bassler BL, and Foster KR (2015). Adhesion as a weapon in microbial competition. *ISME J* 9(1): 139–149. doi: 10.1038/ismej.2014.174
12. Mignot T, and Nöllmann M (2017). New insights into the function of a versatile class of membrane molecular motors from studies of *Myxococcus xanthus* surface (gliding) motility. *Microb Cell* 4(3): 98–100. doi: 10.15698/mic2017.03.563
13. Basler M, Ho BT, and Mekalanos JJ (2013). Tit-for-Tat: Type VI Secretion System Counterattack during Bacterial Cell-Cell Interactions. *Cell* 152(4): 884–894. doi: 10.1016/j.cell.2013.01.042
14. MacIntyre DL, Miyata ST, Kitaoka M, and Pukatzki S (2010). The *Vibrio cholerae* type VI secretion system displays antimicrobial properties. *Proc Natl Acad Sci* 107(45): 19520–19524. doi: 10.1073/pnas.1012931107
15. Russell AB, Peterson SB, and Mougous JD (2014). Type VI secretion system effectors: poisons with a purpose. *Nat Rev Microbiol* 12(2): 137–148. doi: 10.1038/nrmicro3185
16. Christiaen SEA, Brackman G, Nelis HJ, and Coenye T (2011). Isolation and identification of quorum quenching bacteria from environmental samples. *J Microbiol Methods* 87(2): 213–219. doi: 10.1016/j.mimet.2011.08.002
17. Dong Y-H, Gusti AR, Zhang Q, Xu J-L, and Zhang L-H (2002). Identification of Quorum-Quenching N-Acyl Homoserine Lactonases from *Bacillus* Species. *Appl Environ Microbiol* 68(4): 1754–1759. doi: 10.1128/AEM.68.4.1754-1759.2002
18. Boyer F, Fichant G, Berthod J, Vandenbrouck Y, and Attree I (2009). Dissecting the bacterial type VI secretion system by a genome wide in silico analysis: what can be learned from available microbial genomic resources? *BMC Genomics* 10: 104. doi: 10.1186/1471-2164-10-104
19. Nett M, Ikeda H, and Moore BS (2009). Genomic basis for natural product biosynthetic diversity in the actinomycetes. *Nat Prod Rep* 26(11): 1362–1384. doi: 10.1039/B817069J
20. van Gestel J, Weissing FJ, Kuipers OP, and Kovács ÁT (2014). Density of founder cells affects spatial pattern formation and cooperation in *Bacillus subtilis* biofilms. *ISME J* 8(10): 2069–2079. doi: 10.1038/ismej.2014.52
21. Kerr B, Neuhauser C, Bohannan BJM, and Dean AM (2006). Local migration promotes competitive restraint in a host–pathogen “tragedy of the commons”. *Nature* 442(7098): 75–78. doi: 10.1038/nature04864
22. Lloyd DP, and Allen RJ (2015). Competition for space during bacterial colonization of a surface. *J R Soc Interface* 12(110): 20150608. doi: 10.1098/rsif.2015.0608
23. Freilich S, Zarecki R, Eilam O, Segal ES, Henry CS, Kupiec M, Gophna U, Sharan R, and Ruppin E (2011). Competitive and cooperative metabolic interactions in bacterial communities. *Nat Commun* 2: 589. doi: 10.1038/ncomms1597
24. O’Brien EJ, Monk JM, and Palsson BO (2015). Using Genome-scale Models to Predict Biological Capabilities. *Cell* 161(5): 971–987. doi: 10.1016/j.cell.2015.05.019
25. Coyte KZ, Schluter J, and Foster KR (2015). The ecology of the microbiome: Networks, competition, and stability. *Science* 350(6261): 663–666. doi: 10.1126/science.aad2602
26. Ghoul M., West S. A., Diggle S. P., and Griffin A. S. (2014). An experimental test of whether cheating is context dependent. *J Evol Biol* 27(3): 551–556. doi: 10.1111/jeb.12319
27. Harcombe William (2010). Novel cooperation experimentally evolved between species. *Evolution* 64(7): 2166–2172. doi: 10.1111/j.1558-5646.2010.00959.x
28. Shou W, Ram S, and Vilar JMG (2007). Synthetic cooperation in engineered yeast populations. *Proc Natl Acad Sci* 104(6): 1877–1882. doi: 10.1073/pnas.0610575104
29. Hardin G (1960). The Competitive Exclusion Principle. *Science* 131(3409): 1292–1297. doi: 10.1126/science.131.3409.1292
30. Louca S, and Doebeli M (2016). Transient dynamics of competitive exclusion in microbial communities. *Environ Microbiol* 18(6): 1863–1874. doi: 10.1111/1462-2920.13058
31. Fiegna F, Moreno-Letelier A, Bell T, and Barraclough TG (2015). Evolution of species interactions determines microbial community productivity in new environments. *ISME J* 9(5): 1235–1245. doi: 10.1038/ismej.2014.215
32. Rivett DW, Scheuerl T, Culbert CT, Mombrikotb SB, Johnstone E, Barraclough TG, and Bell T (2016). Resource-dependent attenuation of species interactions during bacterial succession. *ISME J* 10(9): 2259–2268. doi: 10.1038/ismej.2016.11
33. Korolev KS, Müller MJ, Karahan N, Murray AW, Hallatschek O, and Nelson DR (2012). Selective sweeps in growing microbial colonies. *Phys Biol* 9(2): 026008. doi: 10.1088/1478-3975/9/2/026008
34. Mitri S, Clarke E, and Foster KR (2016). Resource limitation drives spatial organization in microbial groups. *ISME J* 10(6): 1471–1482. doi: 10.1038/ismej.2015.208
35. Thompson JN (2005). *The Geographic Mosaic of Coevolution*. University of Chicago Press.
36. Cabral DJ, Penumutthu S, Norris C, Morones-Ramirez JR, and Belenky P (2018). Microbial competition between *Escherichia coli* and *Candida albicans* reveals a soluble fungicidal factor. *Microb Cell* 5(5): 249–255. doi: 10.15698/mic2018.05.631
37. The Human Microbiome Project Consortium et al. (2012). Structure, function and diversity of the healthy human microbiome. *Nature* 486(7402): 207–214. doi: 10.1038/nature11234
38. Korpela K, and de Vos WM (2016). Antibiotic use in childhood alters the gut microbiota and predisposes to overweight. *Microb Cell* 3(7): 296–298. doi: 10.15698/mic2016.07.514
39. Suhr MJ, and Hallen-Adams HE (2015). The human gut mycobiome: pitfalls and potentials—a mycologist’s perspective. *Mycologia* 107(6): 1057–1073. doi: 10.3852/15-147
40. Brown GD, Denning DW, Gow NAR, Levitz SM, Netea MG, and White TC (2012). Hidden killers: human fungal infections. *Sci Transl Med* 4(165): 165rv13. doi: 10.1126/scitranslmed.3004404
41. Morales DK, and Hogan DA (2010). *Candida albicans* interactions with bacteria in the context of human health and disease. *PLoS Pathog* 6(4): e1000886. doi: 10.1371/journal.ppat.1000886
42. Markey L, Shaban L, Green ER, Lemon KP, Meccas J, and Kumamoto CA (2018). Pre-colonization with the commensal fungus *Candida albicans* reduces murine susceptibility to *Clostridium difficile* infection. *Gut Microbes* 18:0. doi: 10.1080/19490976.2018.1465158
43. Koch G, Yepes A, Förstner KU, Wermser C, Stengel ST, Modamio J, Ohlsen K, Foster KR, and Lopez D (2014). Evolution of Resistance to a Last-Resort Antibiotic in *Staphylococcus aureus* via Bacterial Competition. *Cell* 158(5): 1060–1071. doi: 10.1016/j.cell.2014.06.046
44. Oliveira NM, Martinez-Garcia E, Xavier J, Durham WM, Kolter R, Kim W, and Foster KR (2015). Biofilm Formation As a Response to Ecological Competition. *PLOS Biol* 13(7): e1002191. doi: 10.1371/journal.pbio.1002191
45. Rowan AD, Cabral DJ, and Belenky P (2016). Bactericidal antibiotics induce programmed metabolic toxicity. *Microb Cell* 3(4): 178–180. doi: 10.15698/mic2016.04.493

46. Sánchez B, Delgado S, Blanco-Míguez A, Lourenço A, Gueimonde M, and Margolles A (2017). Probiotics, gut microbiota, and their influence on host health and disease. **Mol Nutr Food Res** 61(1): 1600240. doi: 10.1002/mnfr.201600240
47. Ayala FR, Bauman C, Cogliati S, Leñini C, Bartolini M, and Grau R (2017). Microbial flora, probiotics, *Bacillus subtilis* and the search for a long and healthy human longevity. **Microb Cell** 4(4): 133–136. doi: 10.15698/mic2017.04.569
48. Foster KR, Schluter J, Coyte KZ, and Rakoff-Nahoum S (2017). The evolution of the host microbiome as an ecosystem on a leash. **Nature** 548(7665): 43–51. doi: 10.1038/nature23292
49. Weimer PJ (2015). Redundancy, resilience, and host specificity of the ruminal microbiota: implications for engineering improved ruminal fermentations. **Front Microbiol** 6: 296. doi: 10.3389/fmicb.2015.00296
50. Hibbing ME, Fuqua C, Parsek MR, and Peterson SB (2010). Bacterial competition: surviving and thriving in the microbial jungle. **Nat Rev Microbiol** 8(1): 15–25. doi: 10.1038/nrmicro2259
51. Darwin C (1859). On the Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection, or the Preservation of Favoured Races in the Struggle for Life. **J. Murray, London**.