



Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences (KNAW) KONINKLIJKE NEDERLANDSE AKADEMIE VAN WETENSCHAPPEN

Microbe-driven chemical ecology – past, present and future

Schmidt, R.L.; Ulanova, D.; Wick, L.Y.; Bode, Helge B; Garbeva, P.V.

published in

ISME Journal

2019

DOI (link to publisher)

[10.1038/s41396-019-0469-x](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41396-019-0469-x)

document version

Peer reviewed version

[Link to publication in KNAW Research Portal](#)

citation for published version (APA)

Schmidt, R. L., Ulanova, D., Wick, L. Y., Bode, H. B., & Garbeva, P. V. (2019). Microbe-driven chemical ecology – past, present and future. *ISME Journal*, 13, 2656-2663. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41396-019-0469-x>

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the KNAW public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain.
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the KNAW public portal.

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

E-mail address:

pure@knaw.nl

1 **Microbe-driven chemical ecology: past, present and future**

2

3 Ruth Schmidt^{*1,2}, Dana Ulanova^{*3,4}, Lukas Y. Wick⁵, Helge B. Bode⁶, Paolina Garbeva⁷

4 ¹ INRS-Institut Armand-Frappier, Laval, H7V 1B7, Canada

5 ² Quebec Center for Biodiversity Sciences (QCBS), H3A 1B1, Montréal, Canada

6 ³ Faculty of Agriculture and Marine Science, Kochi University, Kochi, 783-8502, Japan

7 ⁴ Center for Advanced Marine Core Research, Kochi University, Kochi, 783-8502, Japan

8 ⁵ Department of Environmental Microbiology, Helmholtz Centre for Environmental
9 Research – UFZ, D-04318, Leipzig, Germany

10 ⁶ Molecular Biotechnology, Department of Biosciences and Buchmann Institute for Molecular
11 Life Sciences (BMLS), Goethe Universität Frankfurt, Frankfurt am Main, 60438, Germany

12 ⁷ Netherlands Institute of Ecology, Wageningen, 6708 PB, The Netherlands

13

14 Corresponding author: Paolina Garbeva

15 Address: Droevendaalsesteeg 10, 6708 PB Wageningen, The Netherlands

16 Tel: +31 (0)317 47 34 00

17 E-mail: p.garbeva@nioo.knaw.nl

18

19 *These authors contributed equally to this work

20

21 Running title: Microbial Chemical Signaling

22

23

24 **Abstract**

25 Recent developments in microbiome biology and chemical analytics have revealed the relevance
26 of microbial chemical communication and its networks for microbial ecology. Deciphering
27 chemical interactions, however, is challenging and our understanding of Microbial Chemical
28 Ecology (MCE) under natural conditions still remains fragmented. Here, we aim to summarize
29 what is currently known in the field of MCE. We highlight new tools and methodological
30 challenges and discuss future perspectives of this emerging field. We describe the factors
31 affecting the production and environmental transport of signalling molecules, evaluate their
32 metabolic and ecological functions, and discuss approaches to address future challenges in MCE.
33 Our summary commends that future developments in the field of MCE will need to include
34 studies involving organisms of all levels, and consider mechanisms underlying the
35 communication including viruses, micro and macro-organisms in their natural environments.

36

37 **Background**

38 Chemical ecology first appeared as a keystone discipline in the early 1950's, advancing our
39 understanding of insect communication and plant chemical defenses [1]. However, chemical
40 communication is not restricted to plant-insect and plant-plant interactions. In fact, chemically
41 mediated relationships are now being recognized as common in the microbial world across
42 terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems (Figure 1). Bonnie Bassler is one of the pioneers of microbial
43 chemical communication being amongst the first to discover bacterial intra-specific quorum
44 sensing via autoinducing chemical compounds. This mechanism is now proving to play a
45 fundamental role in both intraspecific and interspecific interactions [2, 3]. Prof. Bassler coined
46 the term “microbial language” and it was her initial work and the numerous follow-up studies
47 that brought chemical communication between microbes into the spotlight. Researchers in the
48 field of microbial ecology are recognizing the important roles that chemical communication and
49 interactions play across all ecosystems (reviewed in [4]). In fact, the oldest form of
50 communication is probably the chemical communication between microorganisms and only
51 later evolved in plants, insects and other higher organisms [5]. Thus, by deciphering the chemical
52 language, we will be able to better understand how species interact in their ecosystems.
53 However, understanding the theoretical foundations of chemical language (its origin and
54 diversity) is challenging and has been rarely studied.

55 Until now, the topic of Microbial Chemical Ecology (MCE) has been largely neglected by
56 microbiologists. The reason stems from methodological constraints concerning the analysis of
57 microbiological communities under natural conditions. Furthermore, most of the research for
58 natural products is focused on chemical and biochemical approaches and drug discovery with a
59 less of an emphasis on ecological aspects. The traditional separation of disciplines limits our

60 understanding and ultimately hinders scientific advances. Recent developments in genome
61 sequencing and chemico-analytical tools enabling us to uncover the chemical communication
62 networks of the microbial world, as well as cross-disciplinary collaborations between research
63 fields will make MCE a central field within microbial ecology.

64 In order to raise awareness of the importance of MCE in the field of microbial ecology, we
65 hosted a roundtable session entitled “Microbial chemical ecology: intra- and interspecies
66 communication” during the ISME17 meeting in Leipzig, Germany (August 2018). The
67 discussion raised several crucial points that will be addressed in this paper. We will also address
68 recent breakthrough discoveries, methodological challenges and future perspectives in this
69 rapidly evolving field.

70 **Microbial chemical diversity**

71 Microorganisms produce a wide array of secondary metabolites with a variety of physico-
72 chemical and biological properties. In recent years, these molecules have been increasingly
73 referred to as specialized metabolites (SMs) in order to emphasize their important role in
74 microbial ecology (Table 1 keyword definition) [6]. Most microorganisms produce both, volatile
75 and water-soluble (non-volatile) compounds (reviewed in [7]). However, so far, most studies
76 have focused on either volatile or soluble compounds and have ignored the fact that these
77 compounds are usually produced simultaneously, sometimes by enzymes encoded in the same
78 biosynthetic gene cluster [8]. Additionally, the same molecule can be functional in both, gas and
79 liquid phases. For example, naphthalene acts as an attractant for *Pseudomonas putida* bacteria in
80 liquid media, while air-born naphthalene acts as a repellent for the same strain [9].

81 Water-soluble compounds from terrestrial and aquatic microorganisms are increasingly gaining
82 attention as compared to volatiles, mostly due to relatively simple extraction and detection

83 methodology, and due to the fact that many of the soluble compounds have potent bioactive
84 properties. Soluble compounds serve as antimicrobial weapons in antagonistic interactions, as
85 well as signaling compounds within the same or between different species of free-living or host-
86 associated microbial communities. In contrast to soluble compounds, volatile organic compounds
87 can diffuse easily through air- and gas-filled pores and play an important role in long-distance
88 interactions between microorganisms [10]. Recently, Schulz-Bohm et al. have shown that
89 volatile compounds can diffuse within 20 minutes over distance of >12cm, which is a veritable
90 distance for most soil microorganisms [11]. Despite their mostly hydrophobic nature, volatiles
91 are widely produced in both terrestrial and aquatic environments by marine plankton, algae,
92 animals and marine bacteria [12-15].

93 Interestingly, although the ability of microorganisms to produce structurally diverse volatile
94 compounds has been known for decades [16], their antimicrobial activities have only recently
95 attracted attention making them potential candidates for future drug development (reviewed in
96 [17]). In addition, volatiles can have synergistic effects with soluble antimicrobials. For example,
97 hydrophilic antibiotics such as vancomycin and β -lactams that have marginal inhibitory effects
98 on Gram-negative bacteria, exhibit enhanced antibacterial activity when the exposed strains are
99 pre-treated with the volatile phenylpropanoid eugenol [18]. Due to their lipophilic nature,
100 volatiles may interfere with membrane structures causing depolarization of the cell membrane
101 thus, leading to a higher sensitivity towards the more polar antibiotics.

102 The microbial dialogue may also involve small inorganic molecules such as HCN, ammonia,
103 others. For example, stimulation of NO production in *Streptomyces* by fungal bacteriostatic
104 compound followed by NO-mediated transcriptional activation of fungistatic heronapyrrole

105 biosynthesis [19]. Another study reported that nitrite produced in nitrogen oxide cycle functioned
106 as an intercellular communication molecule in *Streptomyces coelicolor* [20].

107 **Factors affecting the production of SMs**

108 The production of both, soluble and volatile SMs, is influenced by various environmental biotic
109 and abiotic factors. Playing with abiotic factors such as nutrients, light, temperature, pH,
110 moisture, salinity and others, one can trigger the expression of genes leading to the production of
111 diverse and novel SMs in terrestrial and marine microorganisms. There are several examples
112 revealing chemical diversity of single isolate by applying different cultivation parameters using
113 so-called OSMAC (one strain-many compounds) approach [21] [22]. Molecular mechanisms of
114 SM regulation by nutrients are best-described for major nutrient sources, such as carbon,
115 nitrogen, phosphate and a few selected micronutrients, such as the trace metals like iron, copper,
116 and zinc (reviewed in [23, 24]). However, these molecular mechanisms have been mostly studied
117 in isolated microorganisms cultivated as pure cultures and little is known about how nutrients
118 and other abiotic factors influence SM production in microbial communities under natural
119 conditions. As an example, a higher proportion of bioactive actinomycetes strains were
120 repeatedly reported in alkaline soils [25, 26]. However, in a later study, actinomycetes isolated
121 from the acidic soil samples produced a higher number of low-molecular-weight compounds as
122 compared to alkaline sites. This result indicates that acidic soils may be a reservoir for novel
123 actinobacterial strains [26]. Yet, so far, little is known about the selective pressure pH plays on
124 SM evolution.

125 Interspecific interactions and competitor sensing are considered the main biotic factors
126 affecting the production of SMs [7]. The non-antibiotic producing soil bacteria can be triggered
127 to produce broad-spectrum antibiotics when confronted with unrelated bacterial species. For

128 example, when *Pseudomonas fluorescens* Pf0-1 is confronted with taxonomically different
129 bacterial species, it can produce broad-spectrum antimicrobial compounds with activity against a
130 range of plant pathogenic fungi, making fungi the victim of this particular bacterial-bacterial
131 interaction [27].

132 Microbial communication by autoinducers and autoregulatory factors/microbial hormones was
133 initially considered to be an intra-specific microbial communication mechanism, which
134 influenced a range of physiological responses to microbial density environmental changes, such
135 as antibiotic and toxin production, biofilm formation etc. (reviewed in [28, 29]). However, it has
136 been demonstrated that inter-specific communication between closely related and distant
137 microbial species using species-specific signaling molecule is possible under laboratory
138 conditions [30] (reviewed in [31]). Thus, such interspecies signaling may also take place in
139 nature.

140 Another interesting example of interspecific interaction is cell-to-cell contact between mycolic
141 acid-containing actinomycete and other non-mycolic actinomycete species in a combined
142 culture. This direct interaction induces SM production in non-mycolic actinomycete by an
143 unknown mechanism [32]. However, it has been found that mycolic acid-containing bacteria
144 need to be alive since dead cells do not induce compound production in combined culture [33].
145 In addition to the ecological aspect, the understanding of factors affecting SM production has
146 also an applicational impact. The compounds acting as signal molecules can be used as elicitors
147 of silent natural product biosynthetic gene clusters that might have potential applications as
148 drugs [34]. Similarly, co-cultivation with other microorganisms and modification of abiotic
149 cultivation factors is an important tool for natural product discovery (reviewed in [35]).

150 **Transport in the natural environment**

151 To elicit an effect, chemicals need to physically reach their potential recipients, i.e. need to
152 become accessible and available at sufficient concentrations [36]. Hence, transport and
153 accessibility of chemical signals is an important and often overlooked factor in chemical ecology.
154 Following the definitions used in the risk assessment of environmental chemicals [37], the term
155 bioavailability refers to the degree of interaction of chemicals with living organisms and includes
156 two major exposure scenarios. First, if a chemical gets transformed by the recipient, the
157 bioavailability is a dynamic feature and bioavailable (steady-state) concentrations are determined
158 by the rate of mass transfer of a compound to the recipient and the recipient's intrinsic catabolic
159 activity to degrade the compound [38]. Second, if chemicals act by non-consumptive processes,
160 their equilibrium concentration at the recipient will be effect determining. In either of the
161 scenarios, the transport of the chemical from the source to the recipient is driven by its molecular
162 reactivity and physical-chemical properties as well the prevailing environmental conditions.
163 Hence, the bioavailability of any chemical should be perceived as a habitat-specific rather than
164 solely a compound property. For chemical communication to develop, microbes should be within
165 communication distances. For instance in soil, typical inter-cell distances of 10-20 μm [39], and
166 cell-to-cell communication distances of soluble chemicals of up to 78 μm have been described
167 [40]. The soil structure and its complex pore space are another driver of cell to cell
168 communication and microbial functioning. The diffusion rate of volatile compounds throughout
169 the porous network of the soil is influenced by the physical properties of the soil, including shape
170 and size of soil aggregates as well as chemical parameters, such as soil moisture, pH and
171 temperature. Arrangement, size, and composition of particles influence the retention capacity of
172 water and nutrients [41] and provide pathways for the exchange of cells and vapor- or water
173 bound communication signals. Compound molecules are typically transported by diffusion,

174 advection or by biological transport vectors. While volatile chemicals have been considered as
175 the ‘lingua franca’ [42] for long distance signaling through the air-phase, diffusive transport of
176 water-born chemicals is often restricted to short distances, as molecular diffusion coefficients
177 generally are 10^3 - 10^4 lower in water than in air. Moreover, transport of non-volatile water-
178 soluble chemicals requires continuous liquid phases and thus, may be restricted by air-filled
179 pores. However, a study by Barto et al. has shown that information-carrying chemicals may be
180 transmitted at long distances by mycorrhizal networks acting as below ground information
181 networks between plants [43]. Efficient resource translocation at velocities up to $600 \mu\text{m min}^{-1}$ in
182 their mycelia enables fungi to grow even in air-filled, heterogeneous habitats. Thereby, mycelia
183 also enable bacterial activity by cm-range metabolite, nutrient and water transfer to bacteria in
184 the hyphosphere as was shown by a combination of stable isotope probing and chemical
185 microscopy [44]. Via their hyphal transport (‘hyphal pipelines’) [45], they may also transport
186 hydrophobic chemicals to distant bacteria up to 100 fold better than diffusion would do.

187 Another option for the exchange of information carriers and microbial chemical interaction is the
188 transport of microorganisms themselves. Microorganisms may contain information carriers such
189 as plasmids, prophages or endobacteria [46] and interact with neighboring recipients as agents of
190 horizontal gene transfer (HGT) or by the exchange of smaller signals. As for chemicals microbial
191 dispersal may take place via (i) advective or quasi-diffusive transport in air or water, (ii) intrinsic
192 random or targeted cellular motility, or (iii) by deposition to abiotic or biotic transport vectors
193 such as colloidal particles or the micro- or macro fauna. For instance, research on bacterial
194 fungal interactions has highlighted the role of hyphae and the mycosphere as a hotspot of
195 microbial transport and activity [47]. Hyphae enable the directed and random transport of less
196 immobilized bacteria in heterogeneous (soil) habitats. Hyphae also serve as scaffolds for

197 bacterial transport [48], as well as presumed habitat for preferential horizontal gene transfer [49-
198 51].

199 **Ecological function of microbial natural products**

200 The chemical diversity of microbial natural products is so immense, yet most of them still remain
201 unknown. Widespread soil bacteria like *Streptomyces* or myxobacteria might encode >30
202 biosynthetic gene clusters for the production of several structurally different polyketides,
203 peptides or terpenes in a single strain (not counting SM derivatives derived from the same
204 biosynthetic gene cluster) [52]. While the number of putative natural product families correlates
205 with the number of biosynthetic gene clusters that can easily be predicted from the bacterial
206 genome sequence, in most cases, only a small fraction of these natural products have been
207 identified. Even for the natural products that have been well-known for decades, we often know
208 more about their potential use (as anti-infectives or other drugs) than about their original
209 ecological function. Several clinically used antibiotics of microbial origin have been shown to
210 act as signaling molecules at sub-inhibitory concentrations [53, 54]. Assuming that the true target
211 is addressed clinically (and not an off-target effect), these examples show that the metabolite
212 concentration matters. The phenomena of low-dose stimulation/signaling and high-dose toxicity
213 by the same molecule is called hormesis and is very common for microbial natural products [55].
214 In contrast to the much higher concentrations that are often used in the clinical situations, these
215 low concentrations might be more relevant in nature. For example, in terrestrial ecosystems,
216 microbial biomass can be triggered by trace concentrations of low-molecular weight compounds,
217 so-called “trigger solutions” [56].

218 Bacteria always live in a complex environment surrounded by several other organisms including
219 other bacteria, fungi, protozoa, as well as complex multicellular organisms such as insects,

220 mammals and plants. Assuming that many of the required organismic interactions are being
221 mediated by natural products, we can expect toxic or beneficial compounds, signals or
222 metallophores, along with compounds enabling UV-protection, swarming motility or sporulation
223 [7]. If we look into bacterial quorum sensing enabling the communication within but also among
224 microbial species [57], it is obvious that we have identified only a small fraction of the natural
225 communication systems in some model systems that often have not been analyzed with respect to
226 other microbes present in these environments [58]. Moreover, we need more information
227 concerning the regulatory mechanisms and triggers (signals/elicitors) that are required for the
228 production of natural products. Transcription factors (often encoded in the respective
229 biosynthetic gene clusters) that mediate the activation or repression of biosynthetic gene clusters
230 often require specific ligands, which might be difficult to identify due to their low abundance.
231 With respect to other regulatory elements as regulatory sRNAs, riboswitches or DNA-binding
232 proteins that interfere with transcription, we have hardly started to identify them.

233 **New tools to address methodological challenges in MCE**

234 Understanding the natural metabolites that mediate interactions between organisms is key to
235 deciphering chemical communication and interactions. Unfortunately, the detection and
236 identification of the compounds that mediate these interactions still remains challenging. The
237 two principal methods in metabolomics used to detect and structurally elucidate metabolites are
238 Mass Spectrometry (MS) and Nuclear Magnetic Resonance (NMR). However, NMR is difficult
239 to use in an ecological context and one must distinguish between the analysis of ecologically
240 relevant mixtures (done by MS) and NMR used for pure compounds, but being the ultimate
241 proof for compound structure. The emerging mass spectrometry imaging (MSI) provides new
242 opportunities to study environmentally relevant metabolites in their spatial and temporal context

243 [59] This approach helps to overcome limitations in traditional MS-based metabolomics
244 techniques that require extraction and ample amounts of sample preparation. . MSI techniques
245 are excellent tools for monitoring metabolic processes and for studying chemical communication
246 in an ecological context. For example, MALDI-IMS analysis of *Streptomyces coelicolor* staged
247 with other actinomycetes revealed the production of many interaction-specific metabolites that
248 were not produced in monoculture [60].

249 The biggest methodological challenge in MCE is to mimic natural environmental conditions in
250 the laboratory. Recent approaches in creating optically transparent microcosms for long-term
251 observations of cell-cell interactions [61] or mesocosms to test the SM effect on the microbial
252 community [62] have opened up new opportunities for carrying out microbial interaction studies.

253 Artificial microcosm systems (“designer” ecosystems) bring the advantage of studying
254 microbial interactions on a molecular level while creating controlled environments that mimic
255 environmental conditions [63]. As such, the 3D printing of soil structures or microfluidic
256 techniques prove to be promising approaches to studying microbial chemical interactions [64].
257 Borer et al. developed glass-etched pore networks based on soil-aggregate cross sections that are
258 used to study microbial interactions in response to O and C gradients [65]. The ‘lab-on-a-chip’
259 technology is another promising platform to study microbial chemical interactions due to its
260 compatibility with flow cytometry and mass spectrometry tools [66]. A range of model
261 microbiome systems have been developed that have the capability of mimicking the complexity
262 of natural environments while testing hypotheses with statistical power in a controlled setting
263 [67].

264 **Future trends and perspectives**

265 Great progress has been made in understanding uni-directional chemical responses without
266 considering the dialogues and bi-directional interaction between organisms. Current studies are
267 often focused on SM(s) produced by a single organism and the responses of a perceiving
268 organism. However, chemical communications taking place in nature are complex and may play
269 a role in almost every possible interaction between the member of the community . Most
270 microorganisms produce a multitude of metabolites into their environment but probably only a
271 few of these have a true communicative function. Nevertheless, substances emitted for non-
272 communicative purposes can provide multiple starting points for the evolution of chemical
273 communication.

274 Several compounds, such as terpenoids, sulfur compounds, indole, others are commonly
275 produced by different microorganisms and even plants and insects. Analyses of such chemical
276 compounds in a phylogenetic context could be very helpful for understanding the evolution of
277 chemical communication. In addition, important factor to improve our understanding of the
278 evolution of chemical communication is the expansion of our current knowledge of receptors and
279 olfactory systems that are responsible for signal perception.

280 Chemical interaction processes are not restricted to prokaryotes and eukaryotes only. Recent
281 studies revealed that viruses (phages) use phage-produced communication peptide or host-
282 produced quorum sensing autoinducer to control phage lysis-lysogeny decisions [68, 69]. To
283 counteract, bacteria developed a natural product-based defense mechanism against phage
284 infections [70]. However, the role of viruses in microbial chemical communication has been
285 rarely tackled and so far, largely unexplored. Thus, future directions of MCE will ideally involve
286 studies on all organismal levels, and consider mechanisms underlying the communication
287 including viruses, micro and macro-organisms in their natural environment.

288 Another important direction of MCE is to study how climate change (e.g. low/high temperatures,
289 drought/flooding) will affect SM production and their function in the changing natural
290 environment. A final, yet important question is “How to promote chemical studies in the course
291 of microbial ecological work and vice versa?” Traditionally, microbiology and microbial ecology
292 have been separated from the field of chemical ecology, with the latter focusing mainly on
293 above-ground communication. However, since recent advance have shown the importance of
294 chemical interactions in the microbial world as part of a bigger communication network with
295 their host, we argue for a merge of disciplines and integrate functional, evolutionary,
296 physiological and ontogenetic levels [71, 72].

297 Understanding the various chemical interactions between microbes and their plant host will
298 have important implications for agriculture to counteract drought and increased pathogen
299 pressure. One promising solution stems from microbial engineering of the holobiont- the
300 inseparable unit of the host and its microbiome [73]. Moreover, volatiles can play important roles
301 in suppressing pathogens in disease suppressive soils [74, 75]. Thus, future studies could usefully
302 address the underlying mechanisms of microbial communication and pathogen control via
303 volatiles in the plant holobiont, which will help linking genes to enzymes and metabolites and set
304 the basis for microbial engineering strategies.

305 Finally, advances in MCE will help to uncover mechanisms driving human-microbiome
306 interactions that influence our health. Till today, only a small fraction of chemistry carried out in
307 this microbial habitat has been characterized [76, 77]. A critical step in understanding human gut
308 microbial interactions is linking metabolites with specific microbial genes and enzymes.
309 Artificial systems that mimic gut conditions, such as the “Robogut” [78] or microfluidic devices

310 such as the HuMiX (human–microbial crosstalk) [79] system combined with metabolomics and
311 transcriptomics approaches will be essential tools to close the knowledge gap and to develop
312 strategies for improved health and treatment of infectious diseases.

313 Whether in human or any other environment, deep understanding of the complex microbially-
314 mediated chemical interactions remains a large and intricate puzzle that will require efficient
315 collaborative effort.

316 **Acknowledgements**

317 The authors would like to thank all participants of the roundtable session “Microbial chemical
318 ecology: intra- and interspecies communication” at ISME 17 for the fruitful discussion.

319 We acknowledge funding from the Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology Ministry
320 of Japan special project costs Four-Dimensional Kuroshio Marine Science (4D-KMS) Project
321 and Japan Society for the Promotion of Science (JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number 16K18678) to
322 DU. HBB acknowledges support from the State of Hesse for the LOEWE TBG research center.
323 LYW acknowledges support from the Collaborative Research Centre AquaDiva (CRC 1076
324 AquaDiva) at the Friedrich Schiller University Jena and the Helmholtz Centre for Environmental
325 Research – UFZ, funded by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG). PG acknowledges the
326 Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research (NWO), VIDI personal grant (864.11.015).
327 This is publication 6750 of the NIOO-KNAW.

328 **Competing interest**

329 The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

330

331 **References**

- 332 1. Hartmann T. The lost origin of chemical ecology in the late 19th century. *Proc Natl Acad*
333 *Sci U S A*. 2008;105:4541-4546.
- 334 2. Bassler BL. How bacteria talk to each other: regulation of gene expression by quorum
335 sensing. *Curr Opin Microbiol*. 1999;2:582-587.
- 336 3. Bassler BL, Greenberg EP, Stevens AM. Cross-species induction of luminescence in the
337 quorum-sensing bacterium *Vibrio harveyi*. *J Bacteriol*. 1997;179:4043-4045.
- 338 4. Atkinson S, Williams P. Quorum sensing and social networking in the microbial world. *J*
339 *R Soc Interface*. 2009;6:959-978.
- 340 5. Mithofer A, Boland W. Do you speak chemistry? Small chemical compounds represent
341 the evolutionary oldest form of communication between organisms. *EMBO Rep*. 2016;17:626-
342 629.
- 343 6. Davies J. Specialized microbial metabolites: functions and origins. *J Antibiot (Tokyo)*.
344 2013;66:361-364.
- 345 7. Tyc O, Song C, Dickschat JS, Vos M, Garbeva P. The Ecological Role of Volatile and
346 Soluble Secondary Metabolites Produced by Soil Bacteria. *Trends Microbiol*. 2017;25:280-292.
- 347 8. Riclea R, Aigle B, Leblond P, Schoenian I, Spiteller D, Dickschat JS. Volatile lactones
348 from streptomycetes arise via the antimycin biosynthetic pathway. *Chembiochem*.
349 2012;13:1635-1644.
- 350 9. Hanzel J, Harms H, Wick LY. Bacterial chemotaxis along vapor-phase gradients of
351 naphthalene. *Environ Sci Technol*. 2010;44:9304-9310.
- 352 10. Schmidt R, Cordovez V, de Boer W, Raaijmakers J, Garbeva P. Volatile affairs in
353 microbial interactions. *ISME J*. 2015;9:2329-2335.
- 354 11. Schulz-Bohm K, Gerards S, Hundscheid M, Melenhorst J, de Boer W, Garbeva P.
355 Calling from distance: attraction of soil bacteria by plant root volatiles. *ISME J*. 2018;12:1252-
356 1262.
- 357 12. Fink P. Ecological functions of volatile organic compounds in aquatic systems. *Marine*
358 *and Freshwater Behaviour and Physiology*. 2007;40:155-168.
- 359 13. Groenhagen U, Leandrini De Oliveira AL, Fielding E, Moore BS, Schulz S. Coupled
360 Biosynthesis of Volatiles and Salinosporamide A in *Salinispora tropica*. *Chembiochem*.
361 2016;17:1978-1985.
- 362 14. Harig T, Schlawis C, Ziesche L, Pohlner M, Engelen B, Schulz S. Nitrogen-Containing
363 Volatiles from Marine *Salinispora pacifica* and *Roseobacter-Group* Bacteria. *J Nat Prod*.
364 2017;80:3289-3295.
- 365 15. Thiel V, Brinkhoff T, Dickschat JS, Wickel S, Grunenberg J, Wagner-Dobler I, et al.
366 Identification and biosynthesis of tropone derivatives and sulfur volatiles produced by bacteria of
367 the marine *Roseobacter* clade. *Org Biomol Chem*. 2010;8:234-246.
- 368 16. Wheatley RE. The consequences of volatile organic compound mediated bacterial and
369 fungal interactions. *Antonie Van Leeuwenhoek*. 2002;81:357-364.
- 370 17. Avalos M, van Wezel GP, Raaijmakers JM, Garbeva P. Healthy scents: microbial
371 volatiles as new frontier in antibiotic research? *Curr Opin Microbiol*. 2018;45:84-91.
- 372 18. Hemaiswarya S, Doble M. Synergistic interaction of eugenol with antibiotics against
373 Gram negative bacteria. *Phytomedicine*. 2009;16:997-1005.
- 374 19. Khalil ZG, Cruz-Morales P, Licon-Cassani C, Marcellin E, Capon RJ. Inter-Kingdom
375 beach warfare: Microbial chemical communication activates natural chemical defences. *ISME J*.
376 2019;13:147-158.
- 377 20. Sasaki Y, Oguchi H, Kobayashi T, Kusama S, Sugiura R, Moriya K, et al. Nitrogen oxide
378 cycle regulates nitric oxide levels and bacterial cell signaling. *Sci Rep*. 2016;6:22038.

- 379 21. Bode HB, Bethe B, Hofs R, Zeeck A. Big effects from small changes: possible ways to
380 explore nature's chemical diversity. *Chembiochem*. 2002;3:619-627.
- 381 22. Romano S, Jackson SA, Patry S, Dobson ADW. Extending the "One Strain Many
382 Compounds" (OSMAC) Principle to Marine Microorganisms. *Mar Drugs*. 2018;16.
- 383 23. Locatelli FM, Goo KS, Ulanova D. Effects of trace metal ions on secondary metabolism
384 and the morphological development of streptomycetes. *Metallomics*. 2016;8:469-480.
- 385 24. van der Heul HU, Bilyk BL, McDowall KJ, Seipke RF, van Wezel GP. Regulation of
386 antibiotic production in Actinobacteria: new perspectives from the post-genomic era. *Nat Prod*
387 *Rep*. 2018;35:575-604.
- 388 25. Gonzalez I, Niebla A, Lemus M, Gonzalez L, Iznaga IO, Perez ME, et al. Ecological
389 approach of macrolide-lincosamides-streptogramin producing actinomycetes from Cuban soils.
390 *Lett Appl Microbiol*. 1999;29:147-150.
- 391 26. Sagova-Mareckova M, Ulanova D, Sanderova P, Omelka M, Kamenik Z, Olsovska J, et
392 al. Phylogenetic relatedness determined between antibiotic resistance and 16S rRNA genes in
393 actinobacteria. *BMC Microbiol*. 2015;15:81.
- 394 27. Garbeva P, Tyc O, Remus-Emsermann MN, van der Wal A, Vos M, Silby M, et al. No
395 apparent costs for facultative antibiotic production by the soil bacterium *Pseudomonas*
396 *fluorescens* Pf0-1. *PLoS One*. 2011;6:e27266.
- 397 28. Daniel-Ivad M, Pimentel-Elardo S, Nodwell JR. Control of Specialized Metabolism by
398 Signaling and Transcriptional Regulation: Opportunities for New Platforms for Drug Discovery?
399 *Annu Rev Microbiol*. 2018;72:25-48.
- 400 29. Miller MB, Bassler BL. Quorum sensing in bacteria. *Annu Rev Microbiol*. 2001;55:165-
401 199.
- 402 30. Nguyen TB, Kitani S, Shimma S, Nihira T. Butenolides from *Streptomyces albus* J1074
403 Act as External Signals To Stimulate Avermectin Production in *Streptomyces avermitilis*. *Appl*
404 *Environ Microbiol*. 2018;84.
- 405 31. Ryan RP, Dow JM. Diffusible signals and interspecies communication in bacteria.
406 *Microbiology*. 2008;154:1845-1858.
- 407 32. Onaka H, Mori Y, Igarashi Y, Furumai T. Mycolic acid-containing bacteria induce natural-
408 product biosynthesis in *Streptomyces* species. *Appl Environ Microbiol*. 2011;77:400-406.
- 409 33. Asamizu S, Ozaki T, Teramoto K, Satoh K, Onaka H. Killing of Mycolic Acid-Containing
410 Bacteria Aborted Induction of Antibiotic Production by *Streptomyces* in Combined-Culture. *PLoS*
411 *One*. 2015;10:e0142372.
- 412 34. Abdelmohsen UR, Grkovic T, Balasubramanian S, Kamel MS, Quinn RJ, Hentschel U.
413 Elicitation of secondary metabolism in actinomycetes. *Biotechnol Adv*. 2015;33:798-811.
- 414 35. Zhu H, Sandiford SK, van Wezel GP. Triggers and cues that activate antibiotic
415 production by actinomycetes. *J Ind Microbiol Biotechnol*. 2014;41:371-386.
- 416 36. Semple KT, Doick KJ, Wick LY, Harms H. Microbial interactions with organic
417 contaminants in soil: Definitions, processes and measurement. *Environmental Pollution*.
418 2007;150:166-176.
- 419 37. Ortega-Calvo JJ, Harmsen J, Parsons JR, Semple KT, Aitken MD, Ajao C, et al. From
420 Bioavailability Science to Regulation of Organic Chemicals. *Environ Sci Technol*.
421 2015;49:10255-10264.
- 422 38. Johnsen AR, Wick LY, Harms H. Principles of microbial PAH-degradation in soil.
423 *Environmental Pollution*. 2005;133:71-84.
- 424 39. Raynaud X, Nunan N. Spatial ecology of bacteria at the microscale in soil. *PLoS One*.
425 2014;9:e87217.
- 426 40. Gantner S, Schmid M, Durr C, Schuegger R, Steidle A, Hutzler P, et al. In situ
427 quantitation of the spatial scale of calling distances and population density-independent N-
428 acylhomoserine lactone-mediated communication by rhizobacteria colonized on plant roots.
429 *FEMS Microbiol Ecol*. 2006;56:188-194.

- 430 41. Tecon R, Or D. Biophysical processes supporting the diversity of microbial life in soil.
431 *FEMS Microbiol Rev.* 2017;41:599-623.
- 432 42. Schmidt R, Etalo DW, de Jager V, Gerards S, Zweers H, de Boer W, et al. Microbial
433 Small Talk: Volatiles in Fungal-Bacterial Interactions. *Frontiers in Microbiology.* 2016;6:12.
- 434 43. Barto EK, Weidenhamer JD, Cipollini D, Rillig MC. Fungal superhighways: do common
435 mycorrhizal networks enhance below ground communication? *Trends Plant Sci.* 2012;17:633-
436 637.
- 437 44. Worrlich A, Stryhanyuk H, Musat N, Konig S, Banitz T, Centler F, et al. Mycelium-
438 mediated transfer of water and nutrients stimulates bacterial activity in dry and oligotrophic
439 environments. *Nat Commun.* 2017;8:15472.
- 440 45. Furuno S, Foss S, Wild E, Jones KC, Semple KT, Harms H, et al. Mycelia Promote
441 Active Transport and Spatial Dispersion of Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbons. *Environmental*
442 *Science & Technology.* 2012;46:5463-5470.
- 443 46. Torres-Cortes G, Ghignone S, Bonfante P, Schussler A. Mosaic genome of endobacteria
444 in arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi: Transkingdom gene transfer in an ancient mycoplasma-fungus
445 association. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A.* 2015;112:7785-7790.
- 446 47. Deveau A, Bonito G, Uehling J, Paoletti M, Becker M, Bindschedler S, et al. Bacterial-
447 fungal interactions: ecology, mechanisms and challenges. *FEMS Microbiol Rev.* 2018;42:335-
448 352.
- 449 48. Kohlmeier S, Smits TH, Ford RM, Keel C, Harms H, Wick LY. Taking the fungal
450 highway: mobilization of pollutant-degrading bacteria by fungi. *Environ Sci Technol.*
451 2005;39:4640-4646.
- 452 49. Berthold T, Centler F, Hubschmann T, Remer R, Thullner M, Harms H, et al. Mycelia as
453 a focal point for horizontal gene transfer among soil bacteria. *Sci Rep.* 2016;6:36390.
- 454 50. Pratama AA, van Elsas JD. A novel inducible prophage from the mycosphere inhabitant
455 *Paraburkholderia terrae* BS437. *Sci Rep.* 2017;7:9156.
- 456 51. Zhang M, Visser S, Pereira e Silva MC, van Elsas JD. IncP-1 and PromA group
457 plasmids are major providers of horizontal gene transfer capacities across bacteria in the
458 mycosphere of different soil fungi. *Microb Ecol.* 2015;69:169-179.
- 459 52. Nett M, Ikeda H, Moore BS. Genomic basis for natural product biosynthetic diversity in
460 the actinomycetes. *Nat Prod Rep.* 2009;26:1362-1384.
- 461 53. Romero D, Traxler MF, Lopez D, Kolter R. Antibiotics as signal molecules. *Chem Rev.*
462 2011;111:5492-5505.
- 463 54. Traxler MF, Kolter R. Natural products in soil microbe interactions and evolution. *Nat*
464 *Prod Rep.* 2015;32:956-970.
- 465 55. Davies J, Spiegelman GB, Yim G. The world of subinhibitory antibiotic concentrations.
466 *Curr Opin Microbiol.* 2006;9:445-453.
- 467 56. De Nobile M, Contin M, Mondini C, Brookes PC. Soil microbial biomass is triggered into
468 activity by trace amounts of substrate. *Soil Biology and Biochemistry.* 2001;33:1163-1170.
- 469 57. Abisado RG, Benomar S, Klaus JR, Dandekar AA, Chandler JR. Bacterial Quorum
470 Sensing and Microbial Community Interactions. *MBio.* 2018;9.
- 471 58. Brameyer S, Bode HB, Heermann R. Languages and dialects: bacterial communication
472 beyond homoserine lactones. *Trends Microbiol.* 2015;23:521-523.
- 473 59. Stasulli NM, Shank EA. Profiling the metabolic signals involved in chemical
474 communication between microbes using imaging mass spectrometry. *FEMS Microbiol Rev.*
475 2016;40:807-813.
- 476 60. Traxler MF, Watrous JD, Alexandrov T, Dorrestein PC, Kolter R. Interspecies
477 interactions stimulate diversification of the *Streptomyces coelicolor* secreted metabolome. *MBio.*
478 2013;4.
- 479 61. Shank EA. Considering the Lives of Microbes in Microbial Communities. *mSystems.*
480 2018;3.

- 481 62. Patin NV, Schorn M, Aguinaldo K, Lincecum T, Moore BS, Jensen PR. Effects of
482 Actinomycete Secondary Metabolites on Sediment Microbial Communities. *Appl Environ*
483 *Microbiol.* 2017;83.
- 484 63. Connell JL, Ritschdorff ET, Whiteley M, Shear JB. 3D printing of microscopic bacterial
485 communities. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A.* 2013;110:18380-18385.
- 486 64. Rangel DP, Superak C, Bielschowsky M, Farris K, Falconer RE, Baveye PC. Rapid
487 Prototyping and 3-D Printing of Experimental Equipment in Soil Science Research. *Soil Science*
488 *Society of America Journal.* 2013;77:54-59.
- 489 65. Borer B AM, Hatzimanikatis V, Or D. Integrating metabolic networks into an individual
490 based model of bacterial life in soil (conference poster). *ISME17.* 2018.
- 491 66. Aleklett K, Kiers ET, Ohlsson P, Shimizu TS, Caldas VE, Hammer EC. Build your own
492 soil: exploring microfluidics to create microbial habitat structures. *ISME J.* 2018;12:312-319.
- 493 67. Pessotti RC, Hansen BL, Traxler MF. In Search of Model Ecological Systems for
494 Understanding Specialized Metabolism. *mSystems.* 2018;3.
- 495 68. Erez Z, Steinberger-Levy I, Shamir M, Doron S, Stokar-Avihail A, Peleg Y, et al.
496 Communication between viruses guides lysis-lysogeny decisions. *Nature.* 2017;541:488-493.
- 497 69. Silpe JE, Bassler BL. A Host-Produced Quorum-Sensing Autoinducer Controls a Phage
498 Lysis-Lysogeny Decision. *Cell.* 2019;176:268-280 e213.
- 499 70. Kronheim S, Daniel-Ivad M, Duan Z, Hwang S, Wong AI, Mantel I, et al. A chemical
500 defence against phage infection. *Nature.* 2018;564:283-286.
- 501 71. Traxler MF, Kolter R. A massively spectacular view of the chemical lives of microbes.
502 *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A.* 2012;109:10128-10129.
- 503 72. Watrous J, Roach P, Alexandrov T, Heath BS, Yang JY, Kersten RD, et al. Mass
504 spectral molecular networking of living microbial colonies. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A.*
505 2012;109:E1743-1752.
- 506 73. Rosenberg E, Sharon G, Atad I, Zilber-Rosenberg I. The evolution of animals and plants
507 via symbiosis with microorganisms. *Environ Microbiol Rep.* 2010;2:500-506.
- 508 74. Carrion VJ, Cordovez V, Tyc O, Etalo DW, de Bruijn I, de Jager VCL, et al. Involvement
509 of Burkholderiaceae and sulfurous volatiles in disease-suppressive soils. *ISME J.*
510 2018;12:2307-2321.
- 511 75. Cordovez V, Carrion VJ, Etalo DW, Mumm R, Zhu H, van Wezel GP, et al. Diversity and
512 functions of volatile organic compounds produced by *Streptomyces* from a disease-suppressive
513 soil. *Front Microbiol.* 2015;6:1081.
- 514 76. Joice R, Yasuda K, Shafquat A, Morgan XC, Huttenhower C. Determining microbial
515 products and identifying molecular targets in the human microbiome. *Cell Metab.* 2014;20:731-
516 741.
- 517 77. The Human Microbiome Project C, Huttenhower C, Gevers D, Knight R, Abubucker S,
518 Badger JH, et al. Structure, function and diversity of the healthy human microbiome. *Nature.*
519 2012;486:207.
- 520 78. McDonald JA, Fuentes S, Schroeter K, Heikamp-deJong I, Khursigara CM, de Vos WM,
521 et al. Simulating distal gut mucosal and luminal communities using packed-column biofilm
522 reactors and an in vitro chemostat model. *J Microbiol Methods.* 2015;108:36-44.
- 523 79. Shah P, Fritz JV, Glaab E, Desai MS, Greenhalgh K, Frachet A, et al. A microfluidics-
524 based in vitro model of the gastrointestinal human-microbe interface. *Nat Commun.*
525 2016;7:11535.

526
527
528

529

530

531

532

533 **Figure 1: Patterns of microbial communication across terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems.**

534 Cues - provide unintentional information; signals - provide intentional information and chemical

535 weapons/antimicrobial- are produced targeted.

1 **Table 1 Keyword definitions**

Keyword	Definition
Infochemicals	<p>Chemical compounds released by microbes, animals and plants into their environment and used as signals.</p> <p>The term “infochemical” generally indicates low-weight SMs. However, macromolecules, such as DNA, can also serve as an information carrier in a form of mobile genetic elements (plasmids, transposons and bacteriophages) via horizontal gene transfer. These elements, especially plasmids, carrying genes for antibiotic resistance, virulence or nitrogen fixation contribute to microbial community fitness and interaction with a host.</p>
Microbial chemical interaction	<p>Process in which a chemical signal (“infochemical”) from one organism has an effect on the counterpart behavior and physiology. The interaction can occur directly cell-to-cell, or signals can be spread on short and long distances. The signal may or may not activate the “feedback” signal production in the counterpart.</p>
Microbial chemical communication	<p>An active exchange of (targeted) chemical signals, where signals of one organism activate response in the counterpart.</p>
Secondary (specialized) metabolites	<p>Historical name for metabolites produced by microorganisms mostly in the stationary phase of growth in laboratory cultivations and considered to be non-essential for survival (in contrast to primary metabolites). However, the term “secondary” does</p>

	neither reflect the real function nor the timing of production of several of these metabolites in nature. For this reason the term “specialized” is increasingly used in connection with metabolites functioning as signals in microbial interactions.
Volatile organic compound	Small molecular weight compounds with low boiling points and a high vapor pressure.
Quorum sensing	Mechanism how microorganisms sense community and coordinate its behavior by production of chemical compounds (autoinducers, peptides and microbial hormones).
Hormesis	A process in a cell or organism that exhibits biphasic dose response to an environmental compound - low dose has stimulating or beneficial effect and a high dose inhibitory or toxic effect.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8