Costless metabolic secretions as drivers of interspecies interactions in microbial ecosystems

Pacheco *et al*.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION

SUPPLEMENTARY FIGURES

Supplementary Figure 1 Three modes of *in silico* metabolite secretion by *E. coli* (iJO1366) in anoxic conditions as defined by FBA. What makes a metabolite costless is dependent on the environment. **a** Increasing the secretion flux of a 'costly' product, such as succinate, imposes a reduction in growth rate when glucose and glycerol are supplied as carbon sources. When the carbon sources are replaced with citrate and trehalose, succinate is secreted without a cost to growth rate. **b** With glucose and glycerol as carbon sources, *E. coli* is predicted to have a wide range of fluxes at which formate can be secreted without a cost to its growth rate. Formate would, according to our definition, be secreted 'costlessly' by *E. coli* under the applied environmental conditions. **c** Some costlessly-secreted metabolites must be secreted at a given rate in order to maximize growth. If an upper bound is placed on acetate secretion, *E. coli* must allocate resources away from biomass in order to cope with its limited ability to secrete fermentation byproducts. Acetate would therefore also be considered a costlessly-secreted metabolite by our definition.

Supplementary Figure 2 Detailed example of single *in silico* experiment, illustrating three phases. Initialization: A minimal medium M_{min} common to all simulated conditions (composed of salts, metals, vitamins, as well as nitrogen, phosphorous, and sulphur sources) is defined prior to execution of the pipeline. This medium is supplemented with two carbon sources, α and β . The Boolean variable $\Omega = \{0,1\}$ defines whether or not oxygen is present in the environment. Here, $\Omega = 1$. These together define the initial medium set, M_0 . Expansion: The function F is applied to genome-scale metabolic models of two organisms (i,j) in a series of iterations, c . In each iteration, F simulates the growth of both organisms in the current medium condition and returns the Boolean growth statuses $g_c = \{g_i, g_j\}$ of both organisms and the set of any costlessly-secreted metabolites, σ_c . Here, in the first iteration, $g_1 = \{1,0\}$ since organism *i* grew but organism *j* did not. Since at least one organism in the pair grew, the medium is updated ($M_{c+1} = M_c + \sigma_c$) and F is applied again until no new metabolites are secreted. Completion: When no new metabolites are added to the medium, the experiment is complete. The last iteration with any new secreted metabolites is defined as c_{s} .

Supplementary Figure 3 Correlation between total number of metabolites secreted costlessly and the number of expansions in each *in silico* experiment. **a**,**b** correlation for simulations with (**a**) and without (**b**) oxygen. We observe a poor correlation between number of secreted metabolites and number of expansions in both oxic and anoxic simulations. This lack of correlation suggests a lower rate of metabolite exchange with increasing iterations, with most organisms quickly stabilizing their environment within one or two expansions. With oxygen, for example, only the *K. pneumoniae* and *Synechocystis* pair exhibited more than three medium expansions, with acetate, formate, citrate, and L-malate being the only metabolites secreted at these iterations. These scenarios accounted for only 40 simulations. Without oxygen, there were 697 simulations that reached more than three medium expansions, with 10 organisms being represented. However, this anaerobic set was dominated by the *S. cerevisiae*-*P. aeruginosa* pair, with fermentation byproducts being secreted at late iterations.

Supplementary Figure 4 Range of costlessly-secreted and exchanged metabolites. **a** Cumulative sum of *in silico* experiments in which metabolite was secreted (top), and sorted heatmap of metabolites secreted in at least one simulation, arranged by secreting organism (bottom). **b** Cumulative sum of *in silico* experiments in which each secreted metabolite was taken up by another organism (top), and sorted heatmap of metabolites secreted and taken up in at least one simulation, arranged by secreting organism (bottom).

Supplementary Figure 5 Comparison of secretion profiles under alternative objective functions. The three alternative objectives (minimization of growth "Min Growth," maximization of ATP production "Max ATP," and minimization of ATP production "Min ATP") are compared to the growth maximization "Max Growth" objective. *N*^S is defined as the number of simulations in which a metabolite was secreted. **a**,**b**,**c** Comparison of values of *N*^S between Max Growth and Min Growth (**a**), Max ATP (**b**), and Min ATP (**c**), respectively. Secretion profiles predicted under Max Growth were robust, with metabolite secretion frequencies correlating highly between it and Min Growth ($R^2 = 0.95$), Max ATP ($R^2 = 0.99$), and Min ATP ($R^2 = 0.95$). The most similar condition to Max Growth was Max ATP, with only one metabolite (5'-Deoxyadenosine) being reported under Max Growth and not under Max ATP. We observed greater differences in predicted secretions between the maximization and minimization objectives, with 9 metabolites reported under Max Growth and Max ATP that were not present under Min Growth or Min ATP (Supplementary Table 5). **d** Heatmap showing differences in N_S by organism ($\mu = 0.002 + 0.033$). Differences are normalized by the values of N_S under growth maximization for each organism.

Supplementary Figure 6 Clustered Spearman correlation of secreted metabolites for simulation set. **a** Clustered correlations for simulations with oxygen. A strong co-occurrence of carbon-containing compounds (e.g. acetate, succinate, glycerol, lactate, malate) is observed. Positive correlations between these molecules and central carbon intermediates (e.g. citrate, fumarate, 2-oxoglutarate) are also present, in addition to co-secretion of nitrogen-containing compounds (e.g. ammonium, nitrate, urea). **b** Clustered correlations for simulations without oxygen. Strong correlations in secretion are observed between fermentation products and nitrogen-containing compounds, as well as among some amino acids (e.g. cysteine, methionine, alanine).

Supplementary Figure 7 Habitat-specific secretion patterns, growth outcomes, and interaction patterns. **a** Growth outcomes of all simulations, grouped by pairwise growth phenotype. Exchange of costlesslysecreted metabolic products can allow for substantial increases in the ability of organisms to survive (increases in growth-supporting environments of 65.5% in aquatic habitats, 55.5% in soil habitats, and 50.7% in gut habitats). **b**-**d** Categories of secreted metabolites for aquatic, soil, and gut-associated microbes respectively. Percentages are relative to the number of simulations in which both organisms grew. **e**-**f** Overall distributions of competitive/noncompetitive interactions for aquatic, soil, and gut-associated microbes respectively. **h**-**j** Overall distributions of general interactions mediated by costless metabolites for aquatic, soil, and gut-associated microbes respectively. These interactions at the level of secreted metabolites exist simultaneously with competition or no competition for a primary carbon source.

Supplementary Figure 8 Cooperativity indices of all carbon source pairs. **a, b** Cooperativity indices for simulations with (**a**) and without oxygen (**b**). Heatmaps are clustered by average carbon source cooperativity index. We find that simple sugars generally exhibit relatively low cooperativity indices, meaning that they are able to sustain growth efficiently on their own. More complex molecules and dipeptides exhibit higher average cooperativity indices, indicating they are more effective in allowing for organism growth when in the presence of another carbon source. Distinct clusters of carbohydrates and amino acids appear, suggesting carbon sources have similar cooperative effects by type. Carbon sources are listed in Supplementary Table 6 for enhanced visibility, in the order they are displayed here.

Supplementary Figure 9 Example of chemostat dynamical modeling for motif M1b (mutualism with one carbon source consumed and competition). **a** Schematic of motif, demonstrating all state variables and direction of metabolite flow. **b** Differential equations for modeling the motif. The organism abundances are defined by a maximum specific growth rate, μ_{max} , as well as the availabilities of the carbon sources and exchanged metabolites on which they depend. Carbon source abundances are defined by a constant influx rate, $I_{\rm m}$, and by the consumption rate of each organism. Exchange metabolite abundances are defined by the abundance and secretion rate of the producing organism, as well as by the consumption rate of the consuming organism. All quantities are also governed by a dilution rate in a simulated chemostat. **c** Trajectories of state variables under two conditions, each defined by the maximum specific growth rates of the organisms. Condition 1: $\mu_{\text{max},1} = 0.25 \text{ hr}^{-1}$, $\mu_{\text{max},2} = 0.8 \text{ hr}^{-1}$; Condition 2: $\mu_{\text{max},1} = 0.15 \text{ hr}^{-1}$, $\mu_{\text{max},2} =$ $0.8 \,\mathrm{hr}^{-1}$. The dilution rate is set to $0.2 \,\mathrm{hr}^{-1}$ in both conditions and the remaining parameters and initial conditions are defined in Supplementary Table 3. Condition 1 shows a stabilization of the system with both organisms reaching similar abundances at equilibrium. This occurs despite organism 2 having a much higher maximum specific growth rate than organism 1, as organism 2 must scale its effective growth rate down to account for its dependence on the secreted metabolite from organism 1 (\tilde{m}_1) . In condition 2, although the maximum specific growth rate of organism 2 is high, the maximum specific growth rate of organism 1 is less than the dilution rate. This difference leads to organism 1 being eliminated from the system, which, in turn, eliminates organism 2 due to its dependence on organism 1.

SUPPLEMENTARY TABLES

Supplementary Table 1: Carbon sources used in pairwise simulations. Metabolite names follow the naming convention used by the BIGG database 1, a collection of curated genome-scale metabolic models.

Supplementary Table 2: Minimal medium components

Supplementary Table 3: Dynamical modeling parameters and initial conditions

Supplementary Table 5: List of metabolites predicted under growth maximization objective (maxGro) but not under one or more of the following objective functions: growth minimization (minGro), ATP maximization (maxATP), and ATP minimization (minATP). *NS* is defined as the total number of simulations in which a metabolite was secreted.

Supplementary Table 6: Metabolite exchange frequencies for habitat-specific simulations. NE is defined as the total number of simulations in which a metabolite was exchanged. In total, there were 72,026, 94,269, and 120,662 simulations in which there was at least one metabolite exchanged in aquatic, soil, and gut habitats respectively.

Supplementary Table 7: Carbon sources listed according to cooperativity index clustering for oxic and anoxic simulations. List order follows clustering in Supplementary Figure 8 (down y-axis, across x-axis).

SUPPLEMENTARY REFERENCES

- 1. King, Z. A. *et al.* BiGG Models: A platform for integrating, standardizing and sharing genome-scale models. *Nucleic Acids Res.* **44,** D515–D522 (2016).
- 2. Paczia, N. *et al.* Extensive exometabolome analysis reveals extended overflow metabolism in various microorganisms. *Microb. Cell Fact.* **11,** 1–14 (2012).
- 3. Smith, M. G., Des Etages, S. G. & Snyder, M. Microbial synergy via an ethanoltriggered pathway. *Mol. Cell. Biol.* **24,** 3874–84 (2004).
- 4. Swenson, T. L., Karaoz, U., Swenson, J. M., Bowen, B. P. & Northen, T. R. Linking soil biology and chemistry in biological soil crust using isolate exometabolomics. *Nat. Commun.* **9,** (2018).
- 5. Morris, B. E. L., Henneberger, R., Huber, H. & Moissl-Eichinger, C. Microbial syntrophy: Interaction for the common good. *FEMS Microbiol. Rev.* **37,** 384–406 (2013).
- 6. Embree, M., Liu, J. K., Al-Bassam, M. M. & Zengler, K. Networks of energetic and metabolic interactions define dynamics in microbial communities. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **112,** 15450–15455 (2015).
- 7. Airich, L. G. *et al.* Membrane topology analysis of the Escherichia coli aromatic amino acid efflux protein YddG. *J. Mol. Microbiol. Biotechnol.* **19,** 189–97 (2010).
- 8. Dassler, T., Maier, T., Winterhalter, C. & Bock, A. Identification of a major facilitator protein from Escherichia coli involved in efflux of metabolites of the cysteine pathway. *Mol. Microbiol.* **36,** 1101–1112 (2000).
- 9. Velasco, I., Tenreiro, S., Calderon, I. L. & André, B. Saccharomyces cerevisiae Aqr1 is an internal-membrane transporter involved in excretion of amino acids. *Eukaryot. Cell* **3,** 1492–503 (2004).
- 10. Lindell, D. & Post, A. F. Ecological Aspects of *ntcA* Gene Expression and Its Use as an Indicator of the Nitrogen Status of Marine *Synechococcus* spp. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* **67,** 3340–3349 (2001).
- 11. Glibert, P. M. & Ray, R. T. Different patterns of growth and nitrogen uptake in two clones of marineSynechococcus spp. *Mar. Biol.* **107,** 273–280 (1990).
- 12. Stadie, J., Gulitz, A., Ehrmann, M. A. & Vogel, R. F. Metabolic activity and symbiotic interactions of lactic acid bacteria and yeasts isolated from water kefir. *Food Microbiol.* **35,** 92–98 (2013).
- 13. Ponomarova, O. *et al.* Yeast Creates a Niche for Symbiotic Lactic Acid Bacteria through Nitrogen Overflow. *Cell Syst.* **5,** 345–357.e6 (2017).