

# Cellular potlatch: the advantage of leakage of essential metabolites and resultant symbiosis of diverse species

Jumpei F Yamagishi\*

*College of Arts and Sciences, The University of Tokyo,  
3-8-1 Komaba, Meguro-ku, Tokyo 153-8902, Japan*

Nen Saito†

*Graduate School of Science, The University of Tokyo,  
7-3-1 Hongo, Bunkyo-ku, Tokyo 113-8656, Japan*

Kunihiko Kaneko‡

*Research Center for Complex Systems Biology, Universal Biology Institute,  
The University of Tokyo, 3-8-1 Komaba, Tokyo 153-8902, Japan*

(Dated: February 4, 2022)

Microbial communities display extreme diversity. A variety of strains or species coexist even when limited by a single resource. It has been argued that metabolite secretion creates new niches and facilitates such diversity. Nonetheless, it is still a controversial topic why cells secrete even essential metabolites so often; in fact, even under isolation conditions, microbial cells secrete a variety of metabolites, including those essential for their growth. First, we demonstrate that the leakage of essential metabolites can be advantageous. If the intracellular chemical reactions include multibody reactions, in particular, catalytic reactions, this advantageous leakage of essential metabolites is shown to be possible and indeed typical for most of metabolic networks via a mechanism termed as “catalytic flux control.” Counterintuitively, the mechanism can work even when the supplied resource is scarce. Next, when such cells are crowded, the presence of another cell type, which takes up and consumes the leaked chemicals is beneficial for both cell types, so that their coexistence enhances the growth of both. The latter part of the paper is devoted to the analysis of such unusual form of symbiosis: “consumer” cell types benefit from the uptake of metabolites secreted by “leaker” cell types, and such consumption reduces the concentration of metabolites accumulated in the environment; this environmental change enables further secretion from the leaker cell types. This situation leads to frequency-dependent coexistence of several cell types, as supported by extensive simulations. A new look at the diversity in a microbial ecosystem is thus presented.

In microbial communities, extremely diverse strains or species coexist [1–3]. Even when limited by a single nutrient, a variety of species coexist rather than a single fittest type competitively excludes all others [4, 5]. It has been argued that metabolite secretion can in principle create new niches and allow for their coexistence [5–8], whereas the competitive exclusion principle suggests that multiple species cannot coexist when the growth is limited by the same single environmental resource [9, 10], known also as Gause’s limit [11]. Nonetheless, it is still unclear why cells secrete produced metabolites so often.

Indeed, even under isolation conditions, microbial cells secrete various metabolites, despite the naïve expectation that leakage and loss of metabolites will hinder cellular volume growth. Of course, it is evident that every cell should dispose of toxic compounds [12, 13] or, according to classical syntrophy, inhibitory or waste byproducts [14–16]. Recent studies on the exometabolome [17], however, revealed that many microorganisms leak (and take up) a variety of metabolites that are necessary for growth,

including most intermediates of central metabolism [18]. Although some metabolic intermediates are considered possibly inhibitory at a substrate excess [19], the leakage of various metabolites is observed even when the supplied resource is scarce [18]. Why do cells secrete even essential metabolites so often? A simplistic answer is that small metabolites inevitably leak, regardless of whether the leakage inhibits cell growth. An alternative possibility, however, is that there are some benefits for cells when they leak chemicals necessary for their growth. Is such advantageous leakage really possible for a class of intracellular metabolic reactions, and if so, how is it possible and how general is it? These questions are addressed in the first part of this paper.

To answer the questions, we analytically and numerically investigated dynamical-system models of a cell with simple metabolic reactions. We show that the leakage of essential chemicals can counterintuitively enhance the cell growth even during nutrient limitation. Such advantageous leakage can generally work in metabolic reaction networks consisting of many components and can be explained by the basic mechanism termed as “catalytic flux control.”

In the first part, the cell growth promotion by leakage of metabolites is considered for an isolated cell in a given chemical medium. On the other hand, the medium

---

\* yamagishi@complex.c.u-tokyo.ac.jp

† saito@ubi.s.u-tokyo.ac.jp

‡ kaneko@complex.c.u-tokyo.ac.jp

changes as metabolites are secreted by some cells, which will then affect the growth of other cells in the same medium. Now the second set of questions we address are at the level of a microbial community: how the cell–cell interaction mediated by this advantageous leakage influences the community of cells of different types, and whether it can lead to stable coexistence of diverse cell types (e.g., different species, strains, or mutants [20, 21]) rather than the dominance of a single fittest type.

Let us consider the situation where many cells of the same type exist in a medium. Then, the leaked chemical will gradually accumulate in the medium, and this change in the medium will hinder further leakage and suppress cell growth. At this stage, the presence of another cell type that consumes the leaked chemical will be beneficial for the leaker cell. In contrast, sustained chemical supply from the leaker cell of course is useful to the consumer cell type. If this is the case, leaker–consumer mutualism can be established even if the two cell types have different growth rates in isolation. Here we will address the question whether such coexistence by mutualism is really possible and under what conditions it emerges.

In fact, the origins of (and possible mechanisms allowing for) the microbial community of diverse cell types have often been discussed. A constructive laboratory experiment has revealed that stronger cells with higher glutamine synthetase activity coexist with weaker cells, via leakage of glutamine synthesized by the former [21]. Lenski et al. have stressed the importance of chemical leakage by proposing the black queen hypothesis, a theory on the evolution of metabolic dependency based on gene loss [22, 23]. In these studies, however, whether the leakage is beneficial for the stronger leaker cells is not addressed. Leakage is simply assumed to be inevitable due to the properties of a permeable membrane [23–25], even though it may be disadvantageous. In this sense, there is no reciprocity between the leaker and the other cells; then why have the stronger cells not evolved to decrease the leakiness? In contrast, the present paper shows that cells tend to actively secrete essential metabolites for increasing their growth rate, and this metabolic secretion facilitates the invasion of other cell types that can utilize the secreted metabolites.

As a consequence of each cell’s optimization of its own growth, various types of cells actively leak and take up a variety of essential metabolites as if cells practice so-called “potlatch,” the ritual competition in gift-giving [26, 27], eventually leading to symbiotic coexistence and prosperity of diverse cell types. This novel scenario will explain why the single strongest type does not dominate as a result of evolution.

## THE MODEL OF LEAKAGE BY AN ISOLATED CELL

Let us consider an isolated cell that contains  $n$  kinds of chemical components as in Refs. [28–30]. The cellular

state is expressed by concentrations of the  $n$  components,  $\mathbf{x} = {}^t(x_0, x_1, \dots, x_{n-1})$ . In the cell, chemical  $i$  is synthesized and decomposed by a set of intracellular reactions with rate  $F_i(\mathbf{x})$  and is exchanged with the environment at rate  $f_i(\mathbf{x}; D_i, x_i^{(\text{env})})$ ; if  $f_i$  is positive, then chemical  $i$  flows in from the environment, and if it is negative, chemical  $i$  is leaked out.  $D_i$  is a positive parameter characterizing the flow rate of each component  $i$ , called the diffusion coefficient. Fixed non-negative parameter  $x_i^{(\text{env})}$  represents the  $i$ th chemical’s concentration in the environment: if chemical  $i$  is an externally supplied nutrient, then  $x_i^{(\text{env})}$  is positive. For example, the flow rate of chemical  $i$  is given by  $f_i(\mathbf{x}; D_i, x_i^{(\text{env})}) = D_i(x_i^{(\text{env})} - x_i)$  for passive diffusion; for active transport, the uptake and secretion proceed in ways like  $f_i(\mathbf{x}; D_i, x_i^{(\text{env})}) = D_i x_i^{(\text{env})}$  and  $= -D_i x_i$ , respectively [29].

Then, the time-dependent change in the  $i$ th chemical’s concentration,  $x_i$ , can be written as

$$\dot{x}_i = F_i(\mathbf{x}) + f_i(\mathbf{x}; D_i, x_i^{(\text{env})}) - \mu(\mathbf{x})x_i$$

where  $\mu(\mathbf{x})$  is the growth rate of cell volume, and the third term represents the dilution of each chemical owing to this cellular volume growth. We assume that a steady state (i.e., a stable fixed point)  $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{x}^*$  exists, where  $\mathbf{x}^*$  satisfies  $\mathbf{G}(\mathbf{x}^*; \mathbf{D}, \mathbf{x}^{(\text{env})}) = \mathbf{0}$  with  $G_i(\mathbf{x}; D_i, x_i^{(\text{env})}) \equiv F_i(\mathbf{x}) + f_i(\mathbf{x}; D_i, x_i^{(\text{env})}) - \mu(\mathbf{x})x_i$ .

Now consider an infinitesimal change in diffusion coefficients:  $\mathbf{D} \rightarrow \mathbf{D} + \delta\mathbf{D}$ , where  $\delta D_i \geq 0$  if chemical  $i$  is not nutrient and  $\delta D_i = 0$  otherwise. As long as chemical component  $i$  is not externally supplied into the environment, an increase in the diffusion coefficient of non-nutrient chemical  $i$  leads to its additional leakage. Through this change, the steady state and growth rate also change as  $\mathbf{x}^* \rightarrow \mathbf{x}^* + \delta\mathbf{x}$  and  $\mu^* \equiv \mu(\mathbf{x}^*) \rightarrow \mu^* + \delta\mu$ . We consider infinitesimal  $\delta\mathbf{D}$  and analyze the value of  $\delta\mathbf{x}$  and  $\delta\mu$  by linearizing the equation  $\dot{\mathbf{x}} = \mathbf{G}_i(\mathbf{x}; D_i, x_i^{(\text{env})})$ .

By means of the Jacobi matrix  $J = \partial\mathbf{G}/\partial\mathbf{x}|_{\mathbf{x}=\mathbf{x}^*}$ ,  $\delta\mathbf{x}$  and  $\delta\mu$  are derived as follows (see SI for the derivation):

$$\begin{aligned} \delta\mathbf{x} &= -J^{-1} \frac{\partial\mathbf{f}}{\partial\mathbf{D}} \delta\mathbf{D}, \\ \delta\mu &= \frac{\partial\mu}{\partial\mathbf{x}} \cdot \delta\mathbf{x} = -\frac{\partial\mu}{\partial\mathbf{x}} \cdot J^{-1} \frac{\partial\mathbf{f}}{\partial\mathbf{D}} \delta\mathbf{D}. \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

Because  $\mathbf{x}^*$  is a stable fixed point, all the eigenvalues of  $J$  are negative; that is,  $J$  is a negative definite matrix. Thus, the determinant of  $J$  is nonzero, and the inverse matrix of  $J$  exists. The negative definiteness of  $J$  also causes the concentration of the single leaked chemical to always decrease, as proven in SI.

We will study how the infinitesimal leakage of a chemical can promote cell growth, via analytical and numerical calculation of  $\delta\mu$ . The results can be straightforwardly applied to multiple-chemical cases because the change due to leakage of multiple chemicals equals the sum of the changes due to leakage of each chemical if it is small.




FIG. 1. Catalytic flux control: the mechanism underlying the leak advantage of a necessary chemical. (A) Schematic illustration of catalytic flux control. Leakage of catalyst  $k$  decreases the flux of catalytic reaction  $i + k \rightarrow j + k$ , thereby decreasing the abundance of product  $j$  but increasing that of substrate  $i$ . Consequently, it possibly increases the reaction rate of biomass synthesis (i.e., the growth rate) if  $i$  also serves as a substrate or enzyme in another reaction. (B) The reaction network of Example 1. Leakage of enzyme  $E$  can enhance the cell growth. (C) The relation between  $D_E$  and growth ratio  $\mu(\mathbf{x}(D_E))/\mu(\mathbf{x}(D_E = 0))$  in Example 1. Blue, orange, and green dots respectively depict growth rates with  $S_{\text{env}} = 1, 2, 3$ .  $D_S$  is set to 1.0. (D) A phase diagram of the leak advantage in Example 1. According to numerical simulations from Eq. (1), infinitesimal leakage of  $E$  is advantageous at  $(S_{\text{env}}, D_S)$  of red dots. The orange curve presents the analytical result derived from the self-consistent equation approach. (E) A phase diagram of the growth rate depending on  $S_{\text{env}}$  and  $D_S$  in Example 1 with the same parameters as those in (D). The brighter the background color, the higher growth rate  $\mu$  is. In (C)–(E), numerical simulations are conducted with rate constants  $k_{S \rightarrow E} = 0.85, k_{S \rightarrow P} = k_{P \rightarrow M} = 1$ .

## ADVANTAGEOUS LEAKAGE OF A NECESSARY CHEMICAL BY AN ISOLATED CELL: THE MECHANISM AND SIMPLE EXAMPLES

We now investigate how  $\delta\mu$  can be made positive by leakage of a necessary chemical, whereas leakage of unnecessary chemicals is evidently advantageous, as seen in classical syntrophy (see also SI). Here, a chemical is defined as unnecessary if the cellular growth rate is maximal when its concentration is fixed at zero. In contrast, we refer to necessary chemicals as “leak-advantage” chemicals when their leakage promotes the cell growth.

For simplicity, we assume that the cell growth is determined only by the synthesis of biomass or membrane component(s) and that no chemicals directly retard the cell growth because we are not concerned with unnecessary chemicals. It follows that growth rate  $\mu(\mathbf{x})$  is an increasing function of the concentrations of precursors of biomass or membrane and does not explicitly depend on the concentrations of the other chemicals:  $\frac{\partial \mu}{\partial x_i} \geq 0$  for  $\forall i$ . Even in this case, we will demonstrate that leakage of essential chemicals can promote the cell growth because of the mechanism which we call as catalytic flux control (Fig. 1A).

## The Mechanism behind the Leak Advantage

First of all, we show that leakage cannot promote the cell growth if intracellular chemical reactions include only one-body reactions like  $i \rightarrow j$  (or, in general,  $i \rightarrow j_1 + j_2 + \dots + j_m$ ). Considering each elementary reaction, the additional leakage of substrate  $i$  decreases the abundance levels of substrate  $i$  and product  $j$ . Likewise, the leakage of product  $j$  simply decreases its concentration without changing  $x_i$ . Because additional leakage of chemical  $i$  or  $j$  cannot increase their concentrations, in a system consisting of a combination of such one-body elementary reactions, concentrations of any chemicals cannot be increased by leakage. Thus, leakage cannot increase the reaction rate of biomass synthesis, that is, the growth rate of the system. This intuitive explanation is analytically proven in SI.

On the other hand, if the intracellular metabolism includes multibody reactions such as catalytic reactions, then the situation is different. We explain the mechanism by considering catalytic reaction  $i + k \rightarrow j + k$ , where  $i$  also works as the substrate or catalyst of some other reaction(s) (Fig. 1A). Since the leakage of enzyme  $k$  lowers its concentration  $x_k$ , it reduces the reaction rate from  $i$  to  $j$ . It thus decreases  $x_j$ , but increases  $x_i$ ; as a result, the flux of another reaction with  $i$  can be enhanced.


The leakage of enzyme  $k$  thus increases the growth rate if chemical  $i$  is the substrate or enzyme of another reaction that contributes to biomass synthesis more than the reaction(s) with chemical  $j$  do. This way, the leakage of  $k$  controls the metabolic fluxes and can be advantageous when the flux of reaction  $i + k \rightarrow j + k$  is too fast compared with that of another reaction with  $i$ . We call this mechanism as catalytic flux control.

The leak advantage can generally appear in other multibody reactions. In general, an elementary multibody reaction can be expressed as  $i_1 + \dots + i_n + k_1 + \dots + k_{n'} \rightarrow j_1 + \dots + j_m + k_1 + \dots + k_{n'}$  ( $n + n' \geq 2$ ;  $n, m \geq 1, n' \geq 0$ ). Although the leakage of products  $j_i$  cannot directly increase concentrations of any chemicals, the leakage of catalysts  $k_i$  can increase the concentrations of the reactants. The flux of the biomass synthesis reaction therefore can be increased by catalytic flux control. It is noteworthy that if multiple reactants are present (i.e.,  $n \geq 2$ ) like  $i_1 + i_2 \rightarrow j$ , the leakage of a reactant (e.g.,  $i_1$ ) can increase the concentration of the other reactant(s) (e.g.,  $i_2$ ). This mechanism can work even without a catalyst, that is,  $n' = 0$ ; however, this paper does not consider multibody reactions without a catalyst.

### Examples of Catalytic Flux Control

We here explain the catalytic flux control mechanism by reviewing specific examples, where cell growth is promoted by increasing the diffusion coefficient of a necessary non-nutrient chemical, from zero to positive. In the following examples,  $\mathbf{x}^{(\text{env})}$  is assumed to be  $x_i^{(\text{env})} = S_{\text{env}}$  if chemical  $i$  is a nutrient, and  $x_i^{(\text{env})} = 0$  otherwise. Here, we assume passive diffusion,  $f_i(\mathbf{x}; D_i, x_i^{(\text{env})}) = D_i(x_i^{(\text{env})} - x_i)$ . Note, however, that catalytic flux control works even for active transport of chemicals.

The first example consists of substrate  $S$ , enzyme  $E$ , biomass precursor  $P$ , biomass  $M$ , and the following reactions (Fig. 1B):



The evolution of the concentrations is given by

$$\begin{cases} \dot{x}_S = -k_{S \rightarrow E} x_S x_E - k_{S \rightarrow P} x_S + D_S(S_{\text{env}} - x_S) - \mu(\mathbf{x})x_S \\ \dot{x}_E = k_{S \rightarrow E} x_S x_E - D_E x_E - \mu(\mathbf{x})x_E \\ \dot{x}_P = k_{S \rightarrow P} x_S - k_{P \rightarrow M} x_P x_E - D_P x_P - \mu(\mathbf{x})x_P \end{cases}$$

where the growth rate is defined as the synthesis rate of biomass  $M$  from biomass precursor  $P$ , so that  $\mu(\mathbf{x}) \equiv k_{P \rightarrow M} x_P x_E$ .

The change in growth owing to leakage,  $\delta\mu$ , is obtained by numerically calculating the steady state  $\mathbf{x}^*$  and Eq. (1). Figures 1C and 1D show that the leakage of enzyme  $E$  is beneficial within a wide range of parameters, although all chemicals— $S$ ,  $E$ , and  $P$ —are necessary for the cell growth. In this Example 1, a leak advantage appears when  $S_{\text{env}}$  is large, i.e., when the supplied nutrient is abundant (Figs. 1D and 1E).




FIG. 2. Catalytic flux control by the leak of an enzyme-producing chemical. (A) The reaction network of Example 2. The leakage of intermediate  $I$  or enzyme  $E$  can be advantageous. (B) A phase diagram of the leak advantage in Example 2. The leakage of  $I$  or  $E$  is beneficial in the red region of  $(S_{\text{env}}, D_S)$ . (C) A phase diagram of the growth rate depending on  $S_{\text{env}}$  and  $D_S$  in Example 2. The brighter the background color, the higher growth rate  $\mu$  is. The numerical simulations are carried out by means of rate constants  $k_{S \rightarrow I} = k_{S \rightarrow P} = 1, k_{I \rightarrow E} = k_{P \rightarrow M} = 0.5$ .


Here, chemical  $S$  corresponds to  $i$  in Fig. 1A, whereas  $E$  corresponds to both  $j$  and  $k$  therein. The leakage of  $E$  (i.e., an increase in  $D_E$ ) decreases  $x_E$  and the flux from  $S$  to  $E$  and thus raises  $x_S$ , leading to upregulation of the flux from  $S$  to  $P$  and  $x_P$ . This way, growth rate  $\mu(\mathbf{x}) = k_{P \rightarrow M} x_P x_E$  increases if the rate constant of reaction  $S + E \rightarrow E + E$ ,  $k_{S \rightarrow E}$ , is relatively large (Fig. S1).

When  $\mathbf{x}^*$  of a system can be explicitly solved as a function of  $\mu$  and  $\mathbf{D}$ , one can analytically determine whether  $\delta\mu$  is positive or not as follows. In Example 1 with  $D_P = 0$ ,  $x_S^*$ ,  $x_E^*$ , and  $x_P^*$  are analytically solved as functions of  $\mu$  and  $D_E$ , from the stationary condition  $\dot{x}_S = \dot{x}_E = \dot{x}_P = 0$ . Substituting them into  $\mu = k_{P \rightarrow M} x_P x_E$ , we obtain the following self-consistent equation:

$$\mu = k_{P \rightarrow M} \left( \frac{k_{S \rightarrow P} \mu + D_E}{k_{S \rightarrow E} \mu} - 1 \right) \left( \frac{D_S S_{\text{env}}}{\mu + D_E} - \frac{k_{S \rightarrow P} + \mu + D_S}{k_{S \rightarrow E}} \right)$$

The right-hand side, denoted by  $g(\mu, D_E)$ , is a decreasing function of  $\mu$  for  $\mu > 0$  and  $D_E \geq 0$ . Accordingly, the sign of partial derivative  $\frac{\partial}{\partial D_E} g(\mu^*(D_E = 0), 0)$  equals the sign of  $\delta\mu$ . In Example 1,  $\mu^*(D_E = 0)$  and  $\frac{\partial}{\partial D_E} g(\mu^*, 0)$  are analytically determined as described in SI; this analytical calculation is in good agreement with the result of numerical simulations (Fig. 1D).

Actually, the present catalytic flux control mechanism can work indirectly through leakage of a chemical (that serves for the synthesis of an enzyme) instead of the enzyme itself. As an example, consider a network where intermediate chemical  $I$  is added to the reaction network of Example 1 (Fig. 2A):



In this Example 2, the leakage of intermediate  $I$  (or enzyme  $E$ ) reduces the abundance of  $E$ , thereby leading to the promotion of cell growth in the same way as in Example 1.




FIG. 3. Statistics of the leak advantage for randomly generated networks. Six hundred networks were randomly generated for each set of parameters. (A) Path density dependence of the proportion of leak-advantage networks. The number of chemicals  $n$  is set to 20. The dark-purple and purple bars show the proportion of leak-advantage networks with and without unnecessary chemicals, respectively. Blue bars indicate networks without leak-advantage chemicals; light-blue and blue bars represent the proportion of networks without and with unnecessary chemicals, respectively. (B) The dependence on  $n$  of the proportion of leak-advantage networks (top) and of the average number of leak-advantage chemicals (bottom). Average path density  $\rho$  is set to 3. The error bars indicate one standard error.

In Example 2, the smaller the substrate concentration  $S_{\text{env}}$ , the broader is the parameter region for the leak advantage (Fig. 2B and 2C). This case reveals that the leak advantage due to catalytic flux control appears not because the substrate is in excess; it can work even when the influx of the substrate is low. This situation is in contrast to the obvious expectation that metabolite secretion may be beneficial only when the substrate is abundant [19, 31].

Note that although Examples 1 and 2 include branching reactions, e.g.,  $S \rightarrow P$  and  $S + E \rightarrow I + E$ , such ramification is not necessary for catalytic flux control to work. It can function even for chain-structured networks as presented in SI.

Another possibility of catalytic flux control is to explicitly consider the formation of a complex, as is adopted in Michaelis–Menten kinetics. In this case, competitive inhibition takes place when an enzyme catalyzes multiple reactions because the formation of a complex between a substrate and enzyme suppresses the other reactions involving them. The leakage of a competing substrate or enzyme can reduce this competitive inhibition, thus possibly promoting the cell growth (see SI). In this paper, however, we assume that complexes are not formed during catalytic reactions for simplicity, and the reactions proceed simply according to the law of mass action. Hence the mechanism involving the competitive inhibition is ruled out.

## STATISTICS OF RANDOMLY GENERATED NETWORKS FOR ISOLATED CELL'S LEAKAGE

We thus far explained the elementary mechanism by which leakage of a necessary metabolite promotes cell growth, via simple examples. The present section indicates that a leak advantage is common even among complicated reaction networks. For this purpose, we randomly generated thousands of catalytic reaction networks including biomass synthesis, which determines the growth of cell volume (see SI for details). In the environmental condition fixed as  $S_{\text{env}} = 0.1$  and  $D_S = 1$ , we checked whether the growth with each network is enhanced by increasing the diffusion coefficient,  $D_i$ , of each non-nutrient component  $i$ .

Figure 3A depicts the proportion of networks having a leak-advantage chemical, plotted as a function of path density  $\rho$ . Here, path density  $\rho$  is defined as the number of all the reactions divided by the number of chemicals  $n$ , such that every chemical is involved in  $2\rho$  reactions on average either as a substrate or enzyme.

Remarkably, the proportion of leak-advantage networks is greater than 50% at  $\rho = 2.5, 3$  in the case of  $n = 20$  (Fig. 3A), and Fig. 3B suggests that this proportion gradually increases with  $n$ . Hence, the presence of leak-advantage chemicals seems to be a generic property of complicated catalytic reaction networks.

Figure 3B also presents the average number of leak-advantage chemicals, which also increases with  $n$ . When  $n \geq 20$ , each randomly generated network contains more than one leak-advantage chemical on average. Because metabolic networks in the cell contain a large number of chemical components, it is likely that leak-advantage chemicals are common.

In Fig. 3A, the proportion of leak-advantage networks has a peak at finite  $\rho$ , and this situation is explained as follows. If path density is too low, each chemical is rarely involved in multiple reactions, whereas a chemical must contribute to multiple reactions for the catalytic flux control mechanism to work. On the other hand, if path density is too high, all the chemical reactions are extremely tangled, and the leakage of a chemical will reduce the flux of almost all reactions, thereby leading to a decrease in the growth rate.

## SYMBIOSIS AND LEAKAGE IN ECOLOGY

As discussed thus far, the growth rate of an isolated cell can be increased by leakage of some necessary chemicals. Given such advantageous leakage, cells will adopt a strategy to actively secrete metabolites into the environment to optimize their growth; this optimization may result from adaptation within a generation or evolution over generations. When cells of only one type that has a leak-advantage chemical are present, the secreted chemical accumulates in the environment so that further secretion turns out to be harder. Then, if there are cells of a




FIG. 4. An example of leaker–consumer mutualism: symbiosis between two cell types. (A) Schematic illustration of the mutualism between leaker (left) and consumer (right) cells. Both have the network structure described in Example 1. (B) A phase diagram of symbiosis depending on  $D_E^{(\text{leaker})}$  and  $D_E^{(\text{consumer})}$ . The environmental parameters are set as follows:  $V_{\text{env}} = 1$  and  $R_{\text{deg}} = 0.04$ . The background color denotes growth rate  $\mu$ : a brighter color corresponds to higher  $\mu$ . (C) A phase diagram of symbiosis depending on environmental parameters,  $R_{\text{deg}}$  and  $V_{\text{env}}$ . The diffusion coefficients of enzyme  $E$  are fixed:  $D_E^{(\text{leaker})} = D_E^{(\text{consumer})} = 0.35$ . In both (B) and (C), red, green, and black diamonds represent mutualism, parasitism, and noncoexistence, respectively. The other parameters are set as  $S_{\text{env}} = D_S = 1$ .

different type that benefit from consuming the secreted chemical, the concentration of the accumulated chemical diminishes, facilitating leakage from the former (secreting cells). On the other hand, such additional leakage also promotes the growth of the cells that consume the leaked chemical. This way, mutualism can be achieved via a secreted metabolite, and the growth rates of different cell types finally become equal. This state of affairs will make the coexistence of different strains or species possible, leading to the symbiosis of multiple cell types.

To consider the cell–cell interaction by the transport of chemicals via the environment, external concentrations  $\mathbf{x}^{(\text{env})}$  are regarded as a variable. We then investigate the population dynamics of multiple cell types with different reaction networks and test whether they coexist in the common environment; the volume of the environment relative to the total volume of all the coexisting cells is designated as  $V_{\text{env}}$ . The population fraction of cell type  $j$ , given by  $p_j$ , evolves according to the equation

$$\dot{p}_j = (\mu_j - \bar{\mu})p_j \quad (2)$$

where  $\mu_j$  is the growth rate of each cell type and  $\bar{\mu} \equiv \sum_j p_j \mu_j$  is the averaged growth rate [32]. In the external medium, the secreted components are weakly degraded or flowed out at rate  $R_{\text{deg}}$ , so that the concentration changes as

$$\dot{x}_i^{(\text{env})} = \sum_j p_j D_i^{(j)} (x_i^{(j)} - x_i^{(\text{env})}) / V_{\text{env}} - R_{\text{deg}} x_i^{(\text{env})}$$

if chemical  $i$  is not a nutrient. If chemical  $i$  is a nutrient, it is supplied into the environment via simple diffusion, so that the term  $D_i^{(\text{env})} (S_{\text{env}} - x_i^{(\text{env})})$  is added to the right-hand side of the above equation.

### An Example of Leaker–Consumer Mutualism: Symbiosis between Two Cell Types

We first consider the simplest situation: symbiosis between two cell types in which the leaker cells secrete a metabolite and the consumer cells take it up and consume it to grow.

For simplicity’s sake, the network structure of Example 1 is adopted both for the leaker and consumer cell types, whereas rate constants  $k_{S \rightarrow E}$  are different between the two (Fig. 4A):  $k_{S \rightarrow E} = 0.9$  for the leaker and  $k_{S \rightarrow E} = 0.1$  for the consumer, so that the leakage is beneficial only for the former type. The rate constants are chosen so that the leaker’s growth rate  $\mu^{(\text{leaker})}$  with optimal diffusion coefficient  $D_E^{(\text{leaker})}$  is higher than the consumer’s growth rate  $\mu^{(\text{consumer})}$  with  $D_E^{(\text{consumer})} = 0$ ; otherwise,  $\mu^{(\text{consumer})}$  is always greater than  $\mu^{(\text{leaker})}$  and the consumer cell type is dominant in the environment.

Numerical simulations showed that the mutualism between leaker and consumer cell types is actually achievable: with the diffusion coefficients corresponding to the red diamonds in Fig. 4B, the leaker and consumer cells coexist (i.e., the growth rates of the two cell types are consistent) and the growth rate during coexistence is higher than that for the case where cells of only one type are present. When  $D_E^{(\text{leaker})}$  and  $D_E^{(\text{consumer})}$  are large, the leaker and consumer cell types can still coexist, but the leaker’s growth rate is lower than that in the case where only the leaker cell type is present, that is, parasitism rather than mutualism is realized; this is because too much leakage of necessary chemical  $E$  is disadvantageous to the leaker. Figure 4B, however, also indicates that the fastest growth is achieved by mutualism for both cell types. Accordingly, if both cell types adaptively alter their diffusion coefficients, parasitic coexistence is impossible, but mutualistic coexistence follows naturally.

Figure 4C reveals that the leaker–consumer symbiosis




FIG. 5. Statistics of symbiosis among randomly generated networks. Approximately 50 independent trials were conducted for each set of parameters. (A) The dependence of the frequency of coexistence on  $V_{\text{env}}$ . (B) The dependence of the population ratio on  $n$ .  $V_{\text{env}}$  is set to 5. In both panels (A) and (B), the colored bars illustrate the frequency of symbiosis among two to six species, whereas the gray bar shows that of noncoexistence; the frequency is calculated from random implementations where the cell type with the fastest growth in isolation has a leak-advantage chemical in its reaction network. (C) Examples of metabolic exchange via the environment among five (i) and six (ii) coexisting cell types at  $n = 20$ . Symbiosis among multiple cell types raises growth rate  $\mu_{\text{symbiosis}}$  higher than that in the case where a single cell type is present,  $\mu_{\text{single}}$ . Pink and light-blue arrows respectively indicate leakage and uptake of each chemical component. In all the numerical simulations, the other parameters are fixed:  $S_{\text{env}} = 0.1$ ,  $D_{\text{S}}^{(\text{env})} = 10$ ,  $D_{\text{S}} = 1$ ,  $R_{\text{deg}} = 1 \times 10^{-5}$ ,  $\rho = 2.5$ .

is achieved if  $R_{\text{deg}}$  and  $V_{\text{env}}$  are not so large, that is, if the secreted metabolite is efficiently transported to the other cell type. When degradation rate  $R_{\text{deg}}$  and environment size  $V_{\text{env}}$  are too large for the secreted metabolite to sufficiently accumulate in the environment, the cell types no longer coexist, and only the leaker cell type survives.

### Symbiosis among Randomly Generated Networks

In the last subsection, coexistence of multiple cell types via secreted metabolites can be stably achieved when each cell type changes its diffusion coefficients through adaptation. Indeed, the transport of chemicals between leaker and consumer cell types can be bidirectional if various chemicals are permeable, thus leading to more complicated forms of symbiosis.

To investigate the possibility of symbiosis among more cell types, we extended the model of the last subsection to include a variety of cell types with different catalytic networks. New cell types with  $N = 50$  randomly generated networks are added into the environment one by one; then, the new cell type optimizes the diffusion coefficients so that its growth rate is maximal at environmental concentration  $\mathbf{x}^{(\text{env})}$ . After the addition of each cell type, the population dynamics of Eq. (2) are computed over sufficiently long period  $T$ , until the population distribution reaches a steady state; here some (most) cell types may become extinct. After this procedure, each surviving cell type can gradually alter its diffusion coefficients so that

its growth rate increases; all the coexisting cells simultaneously alter their diffusion coefficients until convergence (see SI for details).

The above model was numerically studied to test whether symbiosis among cells with randomly chosen different networks is achievable. Figure 5A illustrates the dependence of the proportion of samples manifesting symbiosis upon the size of the environment  $V_{\text{env}}$ . As  $V_{\text{env}}$  is decreased, the cell-cell interactions become stronger because the secreted chemicals are less diluted. Hence  $1/V_{\text{env}}$  serves as an indicator of the strength of cell-cell interaction. Indeed, for smaller  $V_{\text{env}}$ , symbiosis is achieved more frequently by exchange of metabolites via the environment. Note that when  $V_{\text{env}}$  is too small ( $V_{\text{env}} \simeq 1$ , i.e., the total volume of cells equals that of the environment), the environmental concentration is sensitively affected by the addition of new cell types, and therefore coexistence of multiple cell types tends to be unstable.

For  $V_{\text{env}} = 5$ , symbiosis of multiple cell types in a single-nutrient condition is achieved in more than two-thirds of the trials as long as the strongest cell type has a leak-advantage chemical (Fig. 5A). Figure 5B shows that the frequency of symbiosis tends to increase as the number of chemicals  $n$  grows. This result suggests that symbiosis among multiple cell types via a leak advantage is commonly achievable for typical microbes that contain many chemical components.

By examining how metabolites are exchanged via the environment (Fig. 5C), we demonstrate that coexistence

of multiple cell types in a single-nutrient condition is achieved by the leakage and uptake of multiple metabolites. In an example of symbiosis among five cell types in Fig. 5C(i), the leaker–consumer relations via metabolic exchanges are hierarchical and cyclic: chemical 13 unidirectionally flows into the strongest cell type from another type. Two cell types use the common leaked chemical (15) that leaks out from the strongest leaker cell type, whereas three cell types, including the above two, cyclically exchange different chemicals (3, 6, 8) to optimize their growth. Some chemicals (4, 14, 17) are leaked, but no cell types consume them. Another example of symbiosis among six cell types is shown in Fig. 5C(ii).

## DISCUSSION

In this paper, we first demonstrated that microbial cells can optimize their growth by increasing the leakage of essential metabolites, rather than by changing the enzymatic activity. The basic mechanism behind the leak advantage is catalytic flux control: by reducing a flux in a catalytic reaction path through passive or active secretion, another flux leading to cell growth is enhanced. Even though the growth promotion by the leakage of essential components is counterintuitive, it has been elucidated both by analytical and numerical analyses of models of simple intracellular reaction dynamics as well as of randomly chosen reaction networks.

In fact, many kinds of microorganisms secrete a variety of essential metabolites such as central-metabolic intermediates [18] and vitamins [33] as well as hundreds of amino acids and sugars [34–36]; an archaeon transfers lipids and possibly even ATP [14, 37]. The present study suggests that the leakage of such metabolites indeed can be beneficial for cellular growth, and the control of leakage provides a possible means of adaptation. The present leak-advantage theory can be verified in bacterial and other microbial experiments by fixing the concentration of such secreted chemicals in the culture medium by means of a chemostat and by measuring the dependence of the cellular growth rate upon the extracellular concentration.

In the latter part of the paper, we showed that symbiosis among cells of different types can be achieved by employing the leak advantage. As the density of cells is increased, the metabolites secreted by leaker cells accumulate in the environment, thereby preventing further leakage; even with active transport, metabolite accumulation causes higher costs for leakage because of the increase in the chemical potential. The cell growth is thus suppressed. Consequently, coexistence with a different cell type that consumes the leaked chemical for its growth is of benefit for the leaker cells, whereas the growth of the consumer cells is supported by the leaker cells. Both cell types increase their growth rates through cell–cell interaction mediated by the secreted metabolites. Indeed, facilitation of the growth by coexistence of differ-

ent strains or species in several experiments has been reported [20, 36, 38, 39]. From the theoretical perspective, it should be noted that the coexistence of diverse cell types here is attained and analyzed only by adopting multilevel dynamics between intercellular population dynamics and intracellular metabolic dynamics and cannot be captured by the standard population dynamics of the Lotka–Volterra type.

In the leaker–consumer mutualism, the benefit for leaker cell types is indirect; it is due to the consumption of accumulated chemicals by consumer cell types, which is favorable when the density of leaker cells is high enough. The leaker–consumer mutualism is thus frequency dependent; whether it works depends on the degree of interaction via the secreted chemicals. In the present model, this degree depends on the relative volume of the medium toward that of a cell  $V_{\text{env}}$  (i.e., the inverse of cell density), and on the degradation rate of chemicals in the medium  $R_{\text{deg}}$ . If  $V_{\text{env}}$  and  $R_{\text{deg}}$  are large enough, the leaker cells can continue to leak chemicals efficiently without the consumer cells, so that there is no room for synergy. In this sense, the leaker–consumer mutualism is different from ordinary forms of cooperation or division of labor [30, 42]. In some cases, however, each cell can simultaneously play roles of a leaker and consumer for different chemicals; consequently, metabolic division of labor is achieved.

Furthermore, the symbiosis through the leak advantage sheds new light on the black queen hypothesis [22, 23], in which chemicals that are secreted by a species support the growth of the other ones, as in the present study. This hypothesis, however, does not tell us anything about whether the leakage of the chemicals offers some advantage for the leaker cells, where the leakage is simply assumed to be inevitable due to the properties of a permeable cell membrane. That is, the black queen scenario is for evolution of parasitism or free riding, does not deal with mutualism, and assumes that one species, called the black queen, is forced to leak chemical products even without any advantage for itself. Although this assumption is not unreasonable and is consistent with some empirical observations [23, 40, 41], it does not explain why the cells have not evolved mechanisms to suppress the leakage. In contrast, our results point to another possibility: that some microbial cells secrete chemicals just because this process is beneficial for them. In this sense, the “richer” cells “donate” their products to “poorer” cells or dispose of these products, whereas this donation or disposal is also advantageous for the richer cells themselves, as if the cells are practicing a kind of “potlatch” often seen in human society [26, 27].

Indeed, the coexistence of multiple species via active secretion of chemicals has been discussed as classical syntrophy [14, 15] in microbial communities; however, it is generally assumed that the leaked chemicals are useless or inhibitory to the leaking species itself but are useful for the other species. Such chemicals could surely exist, but more frequently, the leaked chemicals are useful for



both species. The present study considers the latter case, whereas the former case is not ruled out either.

Finally, let us discuss if and how a leak advantage has been acquired in the course of evolution. Although genetic regulation of enzymatic activity is a well-known means to optimize cell growth [43], cell growth can be also optimized by altering the leakiness in passive and active transport that possibly works during one or several generations. Nevertheless, one might naïvely expect that evolutionary change in the enzymatic activity will lead to optimized growth without leakiness. Still, these optimized intracellular dynamics generally depend on the environmental conditions; as the cell number increases, the environment inevitably becomes crowded, and cell-cell interactions through secreted chemicals cannot be disregarded. Then optimization under isolation conditions no longer works, unless cells find an optimized solution without any secretion of chemicals. Finding such a solution, even if it exists, via evolution may take many generations; before such isolated optimization is reached, other cell types that consume secreted chemicals will either emerge through evolution or invade from elsewhere, thereby also enhancing the growth of the leaker species. A symbiotic relationship with different cell types will then develop. There will be many such possibilities, as revealed in this paper. If the evolution of symbiosis with cell-cell interaction sets in, further complexification by additional species will evolve as we saw in the last sub-

section. Once this evolution with coexistence of multiple species occurs, it would be more and more difficult to find through evolution the fittest solution for the single species during isolation that excludes all other species. Indeed, in some experiments, coexistence via metabolite secretion emerges *de novo* [36, 44, 45], whereas nonspecific metabolic cross-feeding is reported to lead to coexistence of different phenotypes in such a community [5, 46].

To sum up, we have shown that leakage of essential chemicals from cells can facilitate their growth, and such leaker cells can establish a symbiotic relationship with other cell types that use the leaked chemicals for their growth. This “cellular potlatch” generally emerges when the intracellular metabolic network is complex, which will provide a basis for a complex microbial ecosystem with diversity of strains.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The authors would like to thank Chikara Furusawa for useful comments. This research was partially supported by a Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research (S) (15H05746) and Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research on Innovative Areas (17H06386) from the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT) of Japan.

- 
- [1] Lozupone CA, Stombaugh JI, Gordon JI, Jansson JK, Knight R (2012) Diversity, stability and resilience of the human gut microbiota. *Nature* 489(7415):220-230.
  - [2] Curtis TP, Sloan WT, Scannell JW (2002) Estimating prokaryotic diversity and its limits. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 99(16): 10494-10499.
  - [3] Datta MS, Sliwerska E, Gore J, Polz MF, Cordero OX (2016) Microbial interactions lead to rapid micro-scale successions on model marine particles. *Nat Commun* 7:1-7.
  - [4] Rosenzweig RF, Sharp RR, Treves DS, Adams J (1994) Microbial evolution in a simple unstructured environment: Genetic differentiation in *Escherichia coli*. *Genetics* 137(4):903-917.
  - [5] Goldford JE, et al. (2018) Emergent simplicity in microbial community assembly. *Science* 361(6401):469-474.
  - [6] Goyal A, Maslov S (2018) Diversity, Stability, and Reproducibility in Stochastically Assembled Microbial Ecosystems. *Phys Rev Lett* 120(15):158102.
  - [7] Zelezniak A, et al. (2015) Metabolic dependencies drive species co-occurrence in diverse microbial communities. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 112(20): 6449-6454.
  - [8] Marsland R, et al. (2018) Available energy fluxes drive a transition in the diversity, stability, and functional structure of microbial communities. arXiv:1805.12516. Preprint, posted May 31, 2018.
  - [9] Hardin G (1964) The competitive exclusion principle. *Science* 131:1292-1297.
  - [10] MacArthur R, Levins R (1964) Competition, habitat selection, and character displacement in a patchy environment. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 51:1207-1210.
  - [11] Gause G (1932) Experimental studies on the struggle for existence I. Mixed population of two species of yeast. *J Exp Biol* 9:389-402.
  - [12] Wilkinson TG, Topiwala HH, Hamer G (1974) Interactions in a mixed bacterial population growing on methane in continuous culture. *Biotechnol Bioeng* 16:41-59.
  - [13] Lilja EE, Johnson DR (2016) Segregating metabolic processes into different microbial cells accelerates the consumption of inhibitory substrates. *ISME J* 10(7):1568-1578.
  - [14] Morris BEL, Henneberger R, Huber H, Moissl-Eichinger C (2013) Microbial syntrophy: interaction for the common good. *FEMS Microbiol Rev* 37:384-406.
  - [15] Cavaliere M, Feng S, Soyer OS, Jiménez JI (2017) Cooperation in microbial communities and their biotechnological applications. *Environ Microbiol* 19(8):2949-2963.
  - [16] Schink B (1997) Energetics of syntrophic cooperation in methanogenic degradation. *Microbiol Mol Biol Rev* 61(2):262-280.
  - [17] Silva LP, Northen TR (2015) Exometabolomics and MSI: Deconstructing how cells interact to transform their small molecule environment. *Curr Opin Biotechnol* 34:209-216.
  - [18] Paczia N, et al. (2012) Extensive exometabolome analysis reveals extended overflow metabolism in various microorganisms. *Microb Cell Fact* 11:1-14.

- [19] Pfeiffer T, Bonhoeffer S (2004) Evolution of crossfeeding in microbial populations. *Am Nat* 163(6):E126-E135.
- [20] Kosina SM, et al. (2016) Exometabolomics assisted design and validation of synthetic obligate mutualism. *ACS Synth Biol* 5(7):569-576.
- [21] Kashiwagi A, et al. (2001) Plasticity of fitness and diversification process during an experimental molecular evolution. *J Mol Evol* 52(6):502-509.
- [22] Morris JJ, Lenski RE, Zinser ER (2012) The black queen hypothesis: evolution of dependencies through adaptive gene loss. *MBio* 3(2):1-7.
- [23] Morris JJ (2015) Black queen evolution: the role of leakiness in structuring microbial communities. *Trends Genet* 31(8):475-482.
- [24] Großkopf T, et al. (2016) Metabolic modelling in a dynamic evolutionary framework predicts adaptive diversification of bacteria in a long-term evolution experiment. *BMC Evol Biol* 16(1):1-15.
- [25] Zomorodi AR, Segré D (2017) Genome-driven evolutionary game theory helps understand the rise of metabolic interdependencies in microbial communities. *Nat Commun* 8(1):1-11.
- [26] Mauss M (1954) *The Gift: Forms and Functions of Exchange in Archaic Societies* (Free Press, New York).
- [27] Bataille G (1988) *The Accursed Share: an Essay on General Economy, Vol. 1: Consumption* (Zone Books, New York).
- [28] Furusawa C, Kaneko K (1998) Emergence of rules in cell society: differentiation, hierarchy, and stability. *Bull Math Biol* 60(4):659-687.
- [29] Furusawa C, Kaneko K (2012) Adaptation to optimal cell growth through self-organized criticality. *Phys Rev Lett* 108(20): 208103.
- [30] Yamagishi JF, Saito N, Kaneko K (2016) Symbiotic cell differentiation and cooperative growth in multicellular aggregates. *PLoS Comput Biol* 12(10):1-17.
- [31] Basan M, et al. (2015) Overflow metabolism in *Escherichia coli* results from efficient proteome allocation. *Nature* 528(7580):99-104.
- [32] Kaneko K (2016) A Scenario for the Origin of Multicellular Organisms: Perspective from Multilevel Consistency Dynamics. *Multicellularity: Origins and Evolution*. eds Niklas KJ, Newman SA (MIT Press, Cambridge), pp 201-224.
- [33] Zengler K, Zaramela LS (2018) The social network of microorganisms - how auxotrophies shape complex communities. *Nat Rev Microbiol* 16(6):383-390.
- [34] Baran R, et al. (2015) Exometabolite niche partitioning among sympatric soil bacteria. *Nat Commun* 6:1-9.
- [35] Embree M, Liu JK, Al-Bassam MM, Zengler K (2015) Networks of energetic and metabolic interactions define dynamics in microbial communities. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 112(50):15450-15455.
- [36] Ponomarova O, et al. (2017) Yeast creates a niche for symbiotic lactic acid bacteria through nitrogen overflow. *Cell Syst* 5(4):345-357.e6.
- [37] Huber H, Kuper U, Daxer S, Rachel R (2012) The unusual cell biology of the hyperthermophilic crenarchaeon *Ignicoccus hospitalis*. *Antonie van Leeuwenhoek, Int J Gen Mol Microbiol* 102(2):203-219.
- [38] Wintermute EH, Silver PA (2010) Emergent cooperation in microbial metabolism. *Mol Syst Biol* 6(407):1-7.
- [39] Pande S, et al. (2014) Fitness and stability of obligate cross-feeding interactions that emerge upon gene loss in bacteria. *ISME J* 8(5):953-962.
- [40] Gore J, Youk H, van Oudenaarden A (2009) Snowdrift game dynamics and facultative cheating in yeast. *Nature* 459(7244):253-256.
- [41] Wang Z, Goldenfeld N (2011) Theory of cooperation in a micro-organismal snowdrift game. *Phys Rev E Stat Nonlin Soft Matter Phys* 84(2 Pt 1):020902(R).
- [42] Flores E, Herrero A (2010) Compartmentalized function through cell differentiation in filamentous cyanobacteria. *Nat Rev Microbiol* 8(1):39-50.
- [43] Jacob F, Monod J (1961) Genetic regulatory mechanisms in the synthesis of proteins. *J Mol Biol* 3:318-356.
- [44] Le Gac M, Plucain J, Hindré T, Lenski RE, Schneider D (2012) Ecological and evolutionary dynamics of coexisting lineages during a long-term experiment with *Escherichia coli*. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 109(24):9487-9492.
- [45] Hom EF, Murray AW (2014) Plant-fungal ecology. Niche engineering demonstrates a latent capacity for fungal-algal mutualism. *Science* 345(6192):94-98.
- [46] Ponomarova O, Patil KR (2015) Metabolic interactions in microbial communities: untangling the Gordian knot. *Curr Opin Microbiol* 27:37-44.