Antibacterial Weapons: Targeted Destruction in the Microbiota

Benoit Chassaing, E. Cascales

► To cite this version:

Benoit Chassaing, E. Cascales. Antibacterial Weapons: Targeted Destruction in the Microbiota. Trends in Microbiology, 2018, 26 (4), pp.329 - 338. 10.1016/j.tim.2018.01.006 . hal-01780757

HAL Id: hal-01780757

<https://hal-amu.archives-ouvertes.fr/hal-01780757>

Submitted on 27 Apr 2018

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Antibacterial weapons: targeted destruction in the microbiota

Benoit Chassaing^{1,2} and Eric Cascales³

¹ Neuroscience Institute, Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA, USA

² Institute for Biomedical Sciences, Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA, USA

³ Laboratoire d'Ingénierie des Systèmes Macromoléculaires (LISM), Institut de Microbiologie de la Méditerranée (IMM), Aix-Marseille Univ – Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique (CNRS) UMR7255, Marseille, France

Key Words: Microbiota, competition, type VI secretion system, bacteriocin, niche colonization.

Running Title: Antibacterial competition in the intestinal microbiota

Corresponding Authors:

Eric Cascales, PhD
Laboratoire d'Ingénierie des Systèmes Macromoléculaires
Institut de Microbiologie de la Méditerranée
Aix-Marseille Univ – CNRS UMR7255
Marseille, France
E-mail: cascales@imm.cnrs.fr

Benoit Chassaing, PhD
Neuroscience Institute & Institute for Biomedical Sciences
Georgia State University
Atlanta GA 30303
E-mail: bchassaing@gsu.edu

30 **Abstract**

31 The intestinal microbiota plays an important role in health, particularly in promoting intestinal
32 metabolic capacity and in maturing the immune system. The intestinal microbiota also
33 mediates colonization resistance against pathogenic bacteria, hence protecting the host from
34 infections. On the other hand, some bacterial pathogens deliver toxins that target
35 phylogenetically related or distinct bacterial species in order to outcompete and establish
36 within the microbiota. The most widely distributed weapons include bacteriocins, as well as
37 contact-dependent growth inhibition and type VI secretion systems. In this review, we discuss
38 important advances about the impact of such antibacterial systems on shaping the intestinal
39 microbiota.

The intestinal microbiota: our best frenemy

The mammalian intestine is inhabited by a large and diverse community of microbes, referred to as the gut microbiota. The human gut microbiota, also referred to as a "microbial organ", weights 1-2 kg, and consists of approximately 100 trillion (10^{14}) bacteria representing 6-10 phyla, including two predominant phyla – Bacteroidetes and Firmicutes –, and about 500-1000 distinct species [1]. This highly complex **microbial community** (see Glossary) is controlled by various factors, such as host genetics and environmental factors. Moreover, microbiota diversity and composition is influenced by host diet as well as by positive and antagonistic interactions between bacteria within the microbiota.

The intestinal microbiota has an overall beneficial impact on its host, by providing metabolic activities within the intestine and favoring the development of the **intestinal immune system** [2] (**Figure 1**). Exemplifying this notion is the observation that the immune responses in mice housed in germ-free conditions are abnormal compared to conventionally-colonized mice [3, 4]. Therefore, early exposure to microbes in the intestine is a critical factor to modulate intestinal immune responses [5], and a well-documented example of a single microbial member playing a central role in shaping the intestinal immune system is segmented filamentous bacteria (SFB), which can promote the robust differentiation of Th17 cells [6-8]. Moreover, if not well managed, the gut microbiota can become deleterious, for example by inducing uncontrolled intestinal inflammation. In light of the benefits the microbiota confers and on its potential to harm its host, the gut microbiota has previously been referred as the host's best frenemy [9].

Collectively, the microbiota and its derived metabolites are critical components for the maturation of host intestinal immunity, and research has accumulated on the central role played by the intestinal microbiota in the protection of the host intestine against pathogens, a phenomenon called colonization resistance [10-12]. Bacterial competition occurs either by depleting nutrients from the milieu (exploitation competition) or by deploying antibacterial

weapons to specifically eliminate target cells (interference competition) (**Figure 1**). Many bacteria can directly prevent intestinal pathogens colonization or overgrowth by consuming common limited resources, hence inducing starvation of competing pathogens. One example highlighting this mechanism of exploitation competition is the finding that the commensal *Bacteroides thetaiotaomicron* consumes carbohydrates used by the pathogen *Citrobacter rodentium*, thus leading to a competitive exclusion of the pathogen from the intestine [13, 14] (**Figure 1**). Through the production of specific metabolites, the intestinal microbiota can also modify the host environmental conditions, then compromising pathogen growth and/or virulence. Butyrate, a short-chain fatty acid (SCFA) produced by the intestinal microbiota, downregulates the expression of several virulence genes of *Salmonella enterica* serovar Enteritidis (*S. Enteritidis*) and Typhimurium (*S. Typhimurium*) [15] and inhibits the growth of enterohemorrhagic *Escherichia coli* (EHEC) [16] (**Figure 1**). Finally, members of the microbiota can affect the growth of other cells by producing and releasing inhibitory substances, such as antibiotics and peptide antibiotics, or by injecting antibacterial effectors into target cells. Here we will briefly describe the various mechanisms evolved by bacteria to destroy rivals and we will review recent studies on how these systems contribute to reshaping bacterial communities *in vivo*.

Bacterial weapons in the intestine

To combat competitors, bacteria deploy a broad arsenal of antibacterial weapons. These weapons vary in terms of mechanism of action, toxin targets, and mode of penetration, and hence limit the acquisition of mechanism of resistance by competitors. The most widely distributed weapons in Enterobacteria are microcins and bacteriocins [17], contact-dependent growth inhibition (CDI) [18] and Type VI secretion systems (T6SS) [19] (**Figure 2**). Other mechanisms, such as Type I, Type IV and Type VII secretion systems or outer membrane

exchange, have also been recently shown to mediate toxin delivery into competitors or to promote contact-dependent killing [20-25].

Bacteriocins are a group containing a large variety of proteinaceous antibiotics of various lengths: microcins are 15-60 amino-acid peptides, lantibiotics are peptide containing a modified amino-acid (lanthionine), whereas colicin-like proteins are > 40 kDa multidomain proteins and tailocins are high molecular weight multiprotein complexes resembling bacteriophage tails [26-29]. Bacteriocins are produced upon stress conditions, and share a similar mechanism of action. After release, they bind to an outer membrane receptor and parasitize cell envelope components for penetration [26, 27, 30] (**Figure 2**). The exploitation of specific reception and translocation machineries restrict the action of these toxins to the same or phylogenetically related species. Cell toxicity is conferred by pore-forming activity that collapses the membrane potential at the inner membrane, by digestion or cleavage of nucleic acids or of cell wall precursors [26, 30]. Bacteriocins include S-type pyocins liberated by *Pseudomonas* species, and colicins that are produced by enteric strains such as *E. coli*, *C. rodentium* and *Enterobacter* species [26, 30].

By contrast to bacteriocins that are diffusible toxins, CDI and T6SSs are cell-cell contact-dependent mechanisms. CDI is a variant of two-partner secretion, a family of Type V secretion systems widely represented in Proteobacteria [31-33]. It comprises two proteins: the CdiB outer membrane transporter translocates the CdiA protein to the cell surface. CdiA are usually elongated spring-like β -helical structures that carry a C-terminal toxin domain. The C-terminal domain mediates target cell recognition, penetration and toxicity (**Figure 2**). Similar to bacteriocins, the requirements for specific receptors and target cell factors restrict the action of CDI to close relatives [18, 31, 34, 35].

T6SS is a more complex machinery, broadly distributed in Proteobacteria and Bacteroidetes. Its assembly requires at least 13 components to form a speargun-like weapon [19, 36, 37]. T6SS could be considered as a bacteriophage-like contractile tail structure

117 anchored to the cell envelope [19, 38, 39]. The tail is constituted of an effector-loaded syringe
118 wrapped by the sheath that is built under a metastable, extended conformation [19, 36, 37, 40-
119 42]. Contraction of the sheath presumably propels the syringe towards the rival cell, and thus
120 delivers effectors to cause cell damages [40, 42-46] (**Figure 2**). How the target cell is sensed
121 and how cell-cell contact triggers T6SS assembly or firing is largely unknown but in certain
122 cases, transcriptional, post-transcriptional or post-translational regulatory cascades, cell-
123 envelope damage or the presence of kin cell components in the milieu trigger a T6SS
124 response to attacks [44, 46-52]. By contrast to bacteriocins and CDI, T6SSs do not exploit
125 specific receptors, and hence target a broader range of bacteria, although no T6SS-dependent
126 damages of Gram-positive bacteria have been observed [53]. T6SS antibacterial effectors
127 include peptidoglycan-acting enzymes (amidases, glycosyl hydrolases), membrane-targeting
128 proteins (phospholipases and pore-forming), nucleases and NAD(P)(+) glycohydrolases [53-
129 59]. Interestingly, the T6SS is also capable of delivering effectors into eukaryotic cells,
130 including single-celled microorganisms and animal tissues [54, 60]. Phospholipases and
131 nucleases can act as trans-kingdom effectors, but specialized toxins, such as those interfering
132 with cytoskeleton or tubule dynamics, have been identified and characterized [60-67].

133 For all these systems, attacker bacteria are protected from self-intoxication and
134 intoxication by kin cells by the production of immunity proteins that usually bind with high
135 affinity and inhibit the catalytic activity of the cognate effector [26, 31, 34, 54, 55, 68, 69].

136 In addition, some enteric pathogens can produce broadly bioactive small molecules
137 such as antibiotics, non-ribosomal peptide antibiotics, sactibiotics and lantibiotics [70-72],
138 that may act toward other members of the intestinal microbiota and/or toward enteric
139 pathogens. Finally, other extracellular contractile injection systems such as R-pyocins, anti-
140 feeding prophages (Afp) and Afp-like particles have antibacterial or antimicrobial activities
141 [73-75].

Although the role of these systems in antibacterial competition is well documented *in vitro*, studies have only begun to investigate their contribution in *in vivo* animal models.

Role of bacterial competition in the intestinal microbiota

The gut microbiota is a very stable ecosystem [1]. However, the invasion or overgrowth of pathogens induces **dysbiosis**, an instability that may alter the composition of the microbiota but also host physiology [11, 76-78]. It is now well appreciated that interference competition between members of the microbiota, in addition to indirect competition such as exploitation competition, plays a central role in microbiota ecology [78].

Until recently, the role of interbacterial competition in shaping bacterial communities has been underestimated [79]. However, antibacterial weapons are key players in the control of bacterial populations, and a summary of known examples of *in vivo* bacterial competition is presented in **Table 1**. The importance of these weapons *in vivo* is supported by the estimation that more than 10^9 T6SS firing events occur per minute per gram of colonic contents [80]. T6SS gene clusters are highly represented in Bacteroidales strains, which account for a large portion of the gut microbiota [81, 82]. In addition, many Gram-negative enteric pathogens, including *Vibrio cholerae*, *S. Typhimurium*, *C. rodentium*, and *Shigella sonnei* utilize functional T6SSs to fire against other species *in vitro* [83, 84]. In agreement with the concept that T6SSs are important players in bacterial competition within the intestine, a number of enterobacterial T6SS gene clusters are upregulated in conditions encountered in the gut or when a threshold of cell density is reached [85]. The *V. cholerae* T6SS is activated by mucins and microbiota-modified bile salt [86]; the *S. Typhimurium* T6SS is activated by bile salts [87]; and the enteroaggregative *E. coli* Sci-1 T6SS is responsive to iron starvation [88].

V. cholerae, *S. Typhimurium* and *S. sonnei* deploy their T6SSs to kill or displace commensal bacteria, allowing a successful colonization of the host and an increased

persistence in experimental models [89-92]. Using transposon insertion site sequencing (Tn-Seq) to identify *V. cholerae* mutants that exhibit a colonization defect in the rabbit intestine, Fu *et al.* found *tsiV3*, encoding immunity to the T6SS VgrG3 peptidoglycan hydrolase effector [93]. Interestingly, a recent study demonstrated that *V. cholerae* T6SS-mediated colonization specifically occurs in intestinal microenvironments, such as the middle small intestine, suggesting that T6SS effectors might target specific species [94]. The antagonistic behavior of *V. cholerae* in the gut triggers intestinal colonization, virulence gene expression, and host innate immune response [95]. In a recent study, Sana and collaborators demonstrated that the successful establishment of *S. Typhimurium* in the mouse intestine requires the T6SS Tae4 amidase effector [87]. Thus, the observation that bacterial-specific effectors are required for efficient colonization demonstrates that the T6SS mediates antagonistic interbacterial interactions during infection. It is not yet known whether T6SS specifically targets certain species, but the observation that *S. Typhimurium* targets *Klebsiella oxytoca* and has only weak impact on other species suggests that the T6SS does not fire randomly [87]. Interestingly, *S. Typhimurium* and *K. oxytoca* utilize the same carbon sources and thus the specific elimination of a metabolic competitor may provide a better access to the available nutritional resources [79]. Another example of T6SS-mediated metabolic competition is the secretion of manganese- and zinc-scavenging enzymes by pathogens such as *Burkholderia thailandensis* [96, 97]. In addition, EHEC uses its T6SS to secrete catalases, thus providing a higher resistance to reactive oxygen species produced by the host [98]. A recent example of the importance of the T6SS in intestinal colonization is related to the increased prevalence of *S. sonnei* infections over that of the close relative *Shigella flexneri*. By contrast to *S. flexneri*, the genome of *S. sonnei* encodes a functional T6SS that confers a competitive advantage by outcompeting *S. flexneri in vitro* as well as in the mouse gut [90]. Interestingly, *S. sonnei* also encodes the ColE1 colicin that enables *E. coli* elimination [90]. Those recent findings are in agreement with the observation that colicinogenic *E. coli* cells present an increased intestinal

persistence compared to the isogenic *E. coli* strain unable to produce colicins [99, 100]. Other bacteriocins and R-pyocins have the ability to destroy rivals in biofilm or mixed communities, and to specifically eliminate bacterial species after therapeutic administration; and hence are proposed to be viable alternatives to antibiotics [101-105].

While the above examples showed that antibacterial weapons are used by pathogens to colonize their hosts, the gut microbiota also exerts an important control to prevent colonization by pathogens [106, 107]. Indeed, many commensal strains produce those weapons and therefore protect the niche against the invasion of external microbes or against the overgrowth of indigenous pathogens. An elegant example is the recent observation that the probiotic strain *E. coli* Nissle uses microcins M and H47 to limit the expansion of competing Enterobacteriaceae, including pathogens such as adherent-invasive *E. coli* (AIEC) and *S. Typhimurium* during intestinal inflammation [108]. Another example is *Bacillus thuringiensis*, a bacterium able to secrete a bacteriocin (thuricin CD) that directly targets spore-forming Bacilli and Clostridia, including *Clostridium difficile* [109].

Other commensals, such as those of the Bacteroidales order, antagonize gut microbiota using secreted antimicrobial proteins or T6SS [56, 110-113]. Interestingly, it has been shown that intense transfer of genetic material occurs between Bacteroidales species in the gut [82]. As a consequence, Bacteroidales have accumulated genes encoding immunity proteins to T6SS effectors they do not encode [80], and thus maintain a stable balance in the microbiota by preventing their own elimination. In addition, the symbiotic *Bacteroides fragilis* strain was shown to use the T6SS to harm enterotoxigenic *B. fragilis* cells, demonstrating that the activity of Bacteroidales T6SSs may protect the host against intestinal inflammatory diseases [114]. Altogether, these data demonstrate that a broad range of competitive mechanisms occurs within the intestinal microbiota and plays a role in microbiota composition, establishment, stability, and evolution.

Concluding Remarks

Future studies will be needed to further characterize mechanisms by which bacteria compete within the intestinal tract, with a particular focus on long-lasting consequences on microbiota composition and host physiology (see Outstanding Questions). Long-term experiments are also required to understand the real contribution of antibacterial weapons in shaping microbial communities. At present, it is not clear whether being well armed represents a true advantage, as antibacterial weapons have limited impact on well-structured communities [115]. In addition, microbial communities are subjected to a rock-paper-scissor game, in which the production of these weapons is energetically consuming, and hence attacker cells might be defeated by professional cheaters or by strains with a better fitness [116, 117].

Another important field of research that needs further investigation is the impact that such antimicrobial systems may have on both microbiota composition and host physiology in the long term. An example highlighting the importance of interbacterial competition in long term dysbiosis is the observation that intestinal colonization of AIEC, an *E. coli* pathovar associated with Crohn's disease, causes alteration of microbiota composition and chronic colitis in mice, with both phenotypes persisting well beyond AIEC clearance [118]. Hence, in addition to their own virulence potential, AIEC bacteria are able to induce chronic inflammation by detrimentally altering the intestinal microbiota composition [118]. While the precise role played by antibacterial systems in such long-term alterations still needs to be investigated, they may further highlight the unappreciated importance of such bacteria/bacterial competition in microbiota stability and host physiology.

Finally, such antibacterial mechanisms may be tailored in a near future as an alternative or complementary approach to the use of antibiotics. A few bacteriocins, such as nisin, have been validated by the FDA and are used as food preservatives [119]. While such compounds are used to extend shelf life, we still ignore their impact on the intestinal

microbiota. In addition, colicins, R-pyocins, CdiA and T6SS effectors are modular proteins and hence might be genetically engineered to specifically target bacterial populations of interest. Modified colicins, R-pyocins or T6SS effectors have already been demonstrated to be efficiently delivered into target cells or to destroy specific species without affecting the gut microbiota diversity [87, 95, 120-124]. One may predict that these initial attempts will be actively pursued to deliver toxins or CRISPR/Cas system into specific species, with the ultimate goal to prevent intestinal colonization or to beneficially reshape an altered microbial ecosystem.

Acknowledgements

We thank the members of the Chassaing and Cascales laboratories for insightful discussions, and the anonymous reviewers for helpful comments. This review is dedicated to Arlette Darfeuille-Michaud, in loving memory. B.C. is a recipient of the Career Development Award from the Crohn's and Colitis Foundation and an Innovator Award from the Rainin Foundation. Work in E.C. laboratory is supported by the Aix-Marseille Université, the Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique and by grants from the Agence Nationale de la Recherche (ANR-14-CE14-0006-02 and ANR-15-CE11-0019-01). The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

1. Lozupone, C.A. et al. (2012) Diversity, stability and resilience of the human gut microbiota. *Nature* 489 (7415), 220-30.
2. Wostmann, B.S. et al. (1983) Dietary intake, energy metabolism, and excretory losses of adult male germfree Wistar rats. *Laboratory animal science* 33 (1), 46-50.
3. Mazmanian, S.K. et al. (2005) An immunomodulatory molecule of symbiotic bacteria directs maturation of the host immune system. *Cell* 122 (1), 107-118.
4. Cahenzli, J. et al. (2013) Intestinal microbial diversity during early-life colonization shapes long-term IgE levels. *Cell Host Microbe* 14 (5), 559-70.

273 5. Ohnmacht, C. et al. (2015) Mucosal immunology. The microbiota regulates type 2
274 immunity through RORgammat(+) T cells. *Science* 349 (6251), 989-93.

275 6. Ivanov, II et al. (2009) Induction of intestinal Th17 cells by segmented filamentous
276 bacteria. *Cell* 139 (3), 485-98.

277 7. Goto, Y. et al. (2014) Segmented filamentous bacteria antigens presented by intestinal
278 dendritic cells drive mucosal Th17 cell differentiation. *Immunity* 40 (4), 594-607.

279 8. Geem, D. et al. (2014) Specific microbiota-induced intestinal Th17 differentiation requires
280 MHC class II but not GALT and mesenteric lymph nodes. *J Immunol* 193 (1), 431-8.

281 9. Chassaing, B. and Gewirtz, A.T. (2014) Gut microbiota, low-grade inflammation, and
282 metabolic syndrome. *Toxicol Pathol* 42 (1), 49-53.

283 10. Buffie, C.G. and Pamer, E.G. (2013) Microbiota-mediated colonization resistance against
284 intestinal pathogens. *Nat Rev Immunol* 13 (11), 790-801.

285 11. Kim, S. et al. (2017) The intestinal microbiota: antibiotics, colonization resistance, and
286 enteric pathogens. *Immunol Rev* 279 (1), 90-105.

287 12. Pickard, J.M. et al. (2017) Gut microbiota: role in pathogen colonization, immune
288 responses, and inflammatory disease. *Immunol Rev* 279 (1), 70-89.

289 13. Kamada, N. et al. (2012) Regulated virulence controls the ability of a pathogen to
290 compete with the gut microbiota. *Science* 336 (6086), 1325-9.

291 14. Kamada, N. et al. (2013) Control of pathogens and pathobionts by the gut microbiota. *Nat*
292 *Immunol* 14 (7), 685-90.

293 15. Gantois, I. et al. (2006) Butyrate specifically down-regulates *Salmonella* pathogenicity
294 island 1 gene expression. *Appl Environ Microbiol* 72 (1), 946-9.

295 16. Shin, R. et al. (2002) Influence of intestinal anaerobes and organic acids on the growth of
296 enterohaemorrhagic *Escherichia coli* O157:H7. *J Med Microbiol* 51 (3), 201-6.

297 17. Kleanthous, C. (2010) Swimming against the tide: progress and challenges in our
298 understanding of colicin translocation. *Nat Rev Microbiol* 8 (12), 843-8.

299 18. Ruhe, Z.C. et al. (2013) Bacterial contact-dependent growth inhibition. *Trends Microbiol*
300 21 (5), 230-7.

301 19. Zoued, A. et al. (2014) Architecture and assembly of the type VI secretion system.
302 *Biochim Biophys Acta* 1843 (8), 1664-73.

303 20. Souza, D.P. et al. (2015) Bacterial killing via a type IV secretion system. *Nat Commun* 6,
304 6453.

305 21. García-Bayona, L. et al. (2017) Contact-dependent killing by *Caulobacter crescentus* via
306 cell surface-associated, glycine zipper proteins. *Elife* 6, pii: e24869.

307 22. Cao, Z, et al. (2016) The type VII secretion system of *Staphylococcus aureus* secretes a
308 nuclease toxin that targets competitor bacteria. *Nat Microbiol* 2, 16183.

309 23. Whitney, J.C. et al. (2017) A broadly distributed toxin family mediates contact-dependent
310 antagonism between gram-positive bacteria. *Elife* 6, pii: e26938.

311 24. Vassallo, C. et al. (2015) Cell rejuvenation and social behaviors promoted by LPS
312 exchange in myxobacteria. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 112 (22), E2939-46.

313 25. Vassallo, C.N. et al. (2017) Infectious polymorphic toxins delivered by outer membrane
314 exchange discriminate kin in myxobacteria. *Elife* 6.

315 26. Cascales, E. et al. (2007) Colicin biology. *Microbiol Mol Biol Rev* 71 (1), 158-229.

316 27. Rebuffat, S. (2012) Microcins in action: amazing defence strategies of Enterobacteria.

317 *Biochem Soc Trans* 40 (6), 1456-62.

318 28. van Kraaij, C. et al. (1999) Lantibiotics: biosynthesis, mode of action and applications.

319 *Nat Prod Rep* 16 (5), 575-87.

320 29. Scholl, D. (2017) Phage tail-like bacteriocins. *Annu Rev Virol* 4 (1), 453-467.

321 30. Kim, Y.C. et al. (2014) Colicin import into E. coli cells: a model system for insights into

322 the import mechanisms of bacteriocins. *Biochim Biophys Acta* 1843 (8), 1717-31.

323 31. Hayes, C.S. et al. (2014) Mechanisms and biological roles of contact-dependent growth

324 inhibition systems. *Cold Spring Harb Perspect Med* 4 (2).

325 32. Danka, E.S. et al. (2017) Are CDI systems multicolored, facultative, helping greenbeards?

326 *Trends Microbiol* 25 (5), 391-401.

327 33. Guerin, J. et al. (2017) Two-partner secretion: combining efficiency and simplicity in the

328 secretion of large proteins for bacteria-host and bacteria-bacteria interactions. *Front Cell*

329 *Infect Microbiol* 7, 148.

330 34. Ruhe, Z.C. et al. (2013) Receptor polymorphism restricts contact-dependent growth

331 inhibition to members of the same species. *MBio* 4 (4).

332 35. Willett, J.L. et al. (2015) Contact-dependent growth inhibition toxins exploit multiple

333 independent cell-entry pathways. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 112 (36), 11341-6.

334 36. Kudryashev, M. et al. (2015) Structure of the type VI secretion system contractile sheath.

335 *Cell* 160 (5), 952-62.

336 37. Basler, M. (2015) Type VI secretion system: secretion by a contractile nanomachine.

337 *Philos Trans R Soc Lond B Biol Sci* 370 (1679).

338 38. Kapitein, N. and Mogk, A. (2013) Deadly syringes: type VI secretion system activities in

339 pathogenicity and interbacterial competition. *Curr Opin Microbiol* 16 (1), 52-8.

340 39. Cianfanelli, F.R. et al. (2016) Aim, load, fire: the type VI secretion system, a bacterial

341 nanoweapon. *Trends Microbiol* 24 (1), 51-62.

342 40. Basler, M. et al. (2012) Type VI secretion requires a dynamic contractile phage tail-like

343 structure. *Nature* 483 (7388), 182-6.

344 41. Ho, B.T. et al. (2014) A view to a kill: the bacterial type VI secretion system. *Cell Host*

345 *Microbe* 15 (1), 9-21.

346 42. Brackmann, M. et al. (2017) Using force to punch holes: mechanics of contractile

347 nanomachines. *Trends Cell Biol* 27 (9), 623-632.

348 43. Basler, M. and Mekalanos, J.J. (2012) Type 6 secretion dynamics within and between

349 bacterial cells. *Science* 337 (6096), 815.

350 44. Basler, M. et al. (2013) Tit-for-tat: type VI secretion system counterattack during bacterial

351 cell-cell interactions. *Cell* 152 (4), 884-94.

352 45. Brunet, Y.R. et al. (2013) Imaging type VI secretion-mediated bacterial killing. *Cell Rep*

353 3 (1), 36-41.

354 46. LeRoux, M. et al. (2012) Quantitative single-cell characterization of bacterial interactions

355 reveals type VI secretion is a double-edged sword. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 109 (48),

356 19804-9.

47. Mougous, J.D. et al. (2007) Threonine phosphorylation post-translationally regulates protein secretion in *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*. *Nat Cell Biol* 9 (7), 797-803.

48. Silverman, J.M. et al. (2012) Structure and regulation of the type VI secretion system. *Annu Rev Microbiol* 66, 453-72.

49. Silverman, J.M. et al. (2011) Separate inputs modulate phosphorylation-dependent and -independent type VI secretion activation. *Mol Microbiol* 82 (5), 1277-90.

50. Lazzaro, M. et al. (2017) A transcriptional regulatory mechanism finely tunes the firing of Type VI secretion system in response to bacterial enemies. *MBio* 8 (4).

51. LeRoux, M. et al. (2015) Kin cell lysis is a danger signal that activates antibacterial pathways of *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*. *Elife* 4.

52. LeRoux, M. et al. (2015) Bacterial danger sensing. *J Mol Biol* 427 (23), 3744-53.

53. Russell, A.B. et al. (2011) Type VI secretion delivers bacteriolytic effectors to target cells. *Nature* 475 (7356), 343-7.

54. Durand, E. et al. (2014) VgrG, Tae, Tle, and beyond: the versatile arsenal of type VI secretion effectors. *Trends Microbiol* 22 (9), 498-507.

55. Alcoforado Diniz, J. et al. (2015) Molecular weaponry: diverse effectors delivered by the Type VI secretion system. *Cell Microbiol* 17 (12), 1742-51.

56. Russell, A.B. et al. (2014) A type VI secretion-related pathway in *Bacteroidetes* mediates interbacterial antagonism. *Cell Host Microbe* 16 (2), 227-36.

57. Russell, A.B. et al. (2012) A widespread bacterial type VI secretion effector superfamily identified using a heuristic approach. *Cell Host Microbe* 11 (5), 538-49.

58. Russell, A.B. et al. (2013) Diverse type VI secretion phospholipases are functionally plastic antibacterial effectors. *Nature* 496 (7446), 508-12.

59. Miyata, S.T. et al. (2011) *Vibrio cholerae* requires the type VI secretion system virulence factor VasX to kill *Dictyostelium discoideum*. *Infect Immun* 79 (7), 2941-9.

60. Pukatzki, S. et al. (2007) Type VI secretion system translocates a phage tail spike-like protein into target cells where it cross-links actin. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 104 (39), 15508-13.

61. Durand, E. et al. (2012) Crystal structure of the VgrG1 actin cross-linking domain of the *Vibrio cholerae* type VI secretion system. *J Biol Chem* 287 (45), 38190-9.

62. Suarez, G. et al. (2010) A type VI secretion system effector protein, VgrG1, from *Aeromonas hydrophila* that induces host cell toxicity by ADP ribosylation of actin. *J Bacteriol* 192 (1), 155-68.

63. Jiang, F. et al. (2014) A *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* type VI secretion phospholipase D effector targets both prokaryotic and eukaryotic cells. *Cell Host Microbe* 15 (5), 600-10.

64. Jiang, F. et al. (2016) The *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* type VI secretion PGAP1-like effector induces host autophagy by activating endoplasmic reticulum stress. *Cell Rep* 16 (6), 1502-9.

65. Sana, T.G. et al. (2015) Internalization of *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* strain PAO1 into epithelial cells is promoted by interaction of a T6SS effector with the microtubule network. *MBio* 6 (3), e00712.

398 66. Aubert, D.F. et al. (2016) A Burkholderia type VI effector deamidates Rho GTPases to
399 activate the pyrin inflammasome and trigger inflammation. *Cell Host Microbe* 19 (5), 664-74.

400 67. Bleves, S. (2016) Game of trans-kingdom effectors. *Trends Microbiol* 24 (10), 773-4.

401 68. Alcoforado Diniz, J. and Coulthurst, S.J. (2015) Intraspecies competition in *Serratia*
402 *marcescens* is mediated by type VI-secreted Rhs effectors and a conserved effector-associated
403 accessory protein. *J Bacteriol* 197 (14), 2350-60.

404 69. Russell, A.B. et al. (2014) Type VI secretion system effectors: poisons with a purpose.
405 *Nat Rev Microbiol* 12 (2), 137-48.

406 70. Marahiel, M.A. (2009) Working outside the protein-synthesis rules: insights into non-
407 ribosomal peptide synthesis. *J Pept Sci* 15 (12), 799-807.

408 71. Marahiel, M.A. and Essen, L.O. (2009) Nonribosomal peptide synthetases mechanistic
409 and structural aspects of essential domains. *Methods Enzymol* 458, 337-51.

410 72. Mathur, H. et al. (2015) The sactibiotic subclass of bacteriocins: an update. *Curr Protein*
411 *Pept Sci* 16 (6), 549-58.

412 73. Michel-Briand, Y. and Baysse, C. (2002) The pyocins of *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*.
413 *Biochimie* 84 (5-6), 499-510.

414 74. Sarris, P.F. et al. (2014) A phage tail-derived element with wide distribution among both
415 prokaryotic domains: a comparative genomic and phylogenetic study. *Genome Biol Evol* 6
416 (7), 1739-47.

417 75. Bock, D. et al. (2017) In situ architecture, function, and evolution of a contractile injection
418 system. *Science* 357 (6352), 713-717.

419 76. Wiles, T.J. et al. (2016) Host gut motility promotes competitive exclusion within a model
420 intestinal microbiota. *PLoS Biol* 14 (7), e1002517.

421 77. de Muinck, E.J. et al. (2013) Context-dependent competition in a model gut bacterial
422 community. *PLoS One* 8 (6), e67210.

423 78. Weiss, G.A. and Hennet, T. (2017) Mechanisms and consequences of intestinal dysbiosis.
424 *Cell Mol Life Sci* 74 (16), 2959-2977.

425 79. Sana, T.G. et al. (2017) T6SS: The bacterial "fight club" in the host gut. *PLoS Pathog* 13
426 (6), e1006325.

427 80. Wexler, A.G. et al. (2016) Human symbionts inject and neutralize antibacterial toxins to
428 persist in the gut. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 113 (13), 3639-44.

429 81. Coyne, M.J. et al. (2016) Type VI secretion systems of human gut Bacteroidales segregate
430 into three genetic architectures, two of which are contained on mobile genetic elements. *BMC*
431 *Genomics* 17, 58.

432 82. Coyne, M.J. et al. (2014) Evidence of extensive DNA transfer between bacteroidales
433 species within the human gut. *MBio* 5 (3), e01305-14.

434 83. MacIntyre, D.L. et al. (2010) The *Vibrio cholerae* type VI secretion system displays
435 antimicrobial properties. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 107 (45), 19520-4.

436 84. Gueguen, E. and Cascales, E. (2013) Promoter swapping unveils the role of the
437 *Citrobacter rodentium* CTS1 type VI secretion system in interbacterial competition. *Appl*
438 *Environ Microbiol* 79 (1), 32-8.

85. Bernard, C.S. et al. (2010) Nooks and crannies in type VI secretion regulation. *J Bacteriol* 192 (15), 3850-60.
86. Bachmann, V. et al. (2015) Bile salts modulate the mucin-activated type VI secretion system of pandemic *Vibrio cholerae*. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis* 9 (8), e0004031.
87. Sana, T.G. et al. (2016) *Salmonella Typhimurium* utilizes a T6SS-mediated antibacterial weapon to establish in the host gut. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 113 (34), E5044-51.
88. Brunet, Y.R. et al. (2011) An epigenetic switch involving overlapping *fur* and DNA methylation optimizes expression of a type VI secretion gene cluster. *PLoS Genet* 7 (7), e1002205.
89. Cheng, A.T. et al. (2015) *Vibrio cholerae* response regulator VxrB controls colonization and regulates the type VI secretion system. *PLoS Pathog* 11 (5), e1004933.
90. Anderson, M.C. et al. (2017) *Shigella sonnei* encodes a functional T6SS used for interbacterial competition and niche occupancy. *Cell Host Microbe* 21 (6), 769-776 e3.
91. Fast, D. et al. (2018) Commensal-pathogen competition impacts host viability. *Biorxiv* doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/245324>
92. Logan, S.L. et al. (2017) The *Vibrio cholerae* type VI secretions system can modulate host intestinal mechanics to displace commensal gut bacteria. *Biorxiv* doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/226472>
93. Fu, Y. et al. (2013) Tn-Seq analysis of *Vibrio cholerae* intestinal colonization reveals a role for T6SS-mediated antibacterial activity in the host. *Cell Host Microbe* 14 (6), 652-63.
94. Fu, Y. et al. (2018) Tracking *Vibrio cholerae* cell-cell interactions during infection reveals bacterial population dynamics within intestinal microenvironments. *Cell Host Microbe* 23, 1-8.
95. Zhao, W. et al. (2018) Antagonism toward the intestinal microbiota and its effect on *Vibrio cholerae* virulence. *Science* 359 (6372), 210-213.
96. Si, M. et al. (2017) Manganese scavenging and oxidative stress response mediated by type VI secretion system in *Burkholderia thailandensis*. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 114 (11), E2233-E2242.
97. Si, M. et al. (2017) The type VI secretion system engages a redox-regulated dual-functional heme transporter for zinc acquisition. *Cell Rep* 20 (4), 949-959.
98. Wan, B. et al. (2017) Type VI secretion system contributes to Enterohemorrhagic *Escherichia coli* virulence by secreting catalase against host reactive oxygen species (ROS). *PLoS Pathog* 13 (3), e1006246.
99. Gillor, O. et al. (2009) Persistence of colicinogenic *Escherichia coli* in the mouse gastrointestinal tract. *BMC Microbiol* 9, 165.
100. Majeed, H. et al. (2011) Competitive interactions in *Escherichia coli* populations: the role of bacteriocins. *ISME J* 5 (1), 71-81.
101. Joerger, R.D. (2003) Alternatives to antibiotics: bacteriocins, antimicrobial peptides and bacteriophages. *Poult Sci* 82 (4), 640-7.
102. Kirkup, B.C., Jr. (2006) Bacteriocins as oral and gastrointestinal antibiotics: theoretical considerations, applied research, and practical applications. *Curr Med Chem* 13 (27), 3335-50.

481 103. Cotter, P.D. et al. (2013) Bacteriocins - a viable alternative to antibiotics? *Nat Rev*
482 *Microbiol* 11 (2), 95-105.

483 104. Ahmad, V. et al. (2017) Antimicrobial potential of bacteriocins: in therapy, agriculture
484 and food preservation. *Int J Antimicrob Agents* 49 (1), 1-11.

485 105. Scholl, D. and Martin, D.W. Jr. (2008) Antibacterial efficacy of R-type pyocins towards
486 *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* in a murine peritonitis model. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother* 52 (5),
487 1647-52.

488 106. Hibbing, M.E. et al. (2010) Bacterial competition: surviving and thriving in the
489 microbial jungle. *Nat Rev Microbiol* 8 (1), 15-25.

490 107. Kamada, N. et al. (2013) Role of the gut microbiota in immunity and inflammatory
491 disease. *Nat Rev Immunol* 13 (5), 321-35.

492 108. Sassone-Corsi, M. et al. (2016) Microcins mediate competition among
493 Enterobacteriaceae in the inflamed gut. *Nature* 540 (7632), 280-283.

494 109. Rea, M.C. et al. (2010) Thuricin CD, a posttranslationally modified bacteriocin with a
495 narrow spectrum of activity against *Clostridium difficile*. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 107 (20),
496 9352-7.

497 110. Chatzidaki-Livanis, M. et al. (2016) *Bacteroides fragilis* type VI secretion systems use
498 novel effector and immunity proteins to antagonize human gut Bacteroidales species. *Proc*
499 *Natl Acad Sci U S A* 113 (13), 3627-32.

500 111. Roelofs, K.G. et al. (2016) Bacteroidales secreted antimicrobial proteins target surface
501 molecules necessary for gut colonization and mediate competition in vivo. *MBio* 7 (4), pii:
502 e01055-16.

503 112. Chatzidaki-Livanis, M. et al. (2017) Gut symbiont *Bacteroides fragilis* secretes a
504 eukaryotic-like ubiquitin protein that mediates intraspecies antagonism. *MBio* 8 (6), pii:
505 e01902-17.

506 113. Verster, A.J. et al. (2017) The landscape of Type VI secretion across human gut
507 microbiomes reveals its role in community composition. *Cell Host Microbe* 22 (3), 411-419.

508 114. Hecht, A.L. et al. (2016) Strain competition restricts colonization of an enteric pathogen
509 and prevents colitis. *EMBO Rep* 17 (9), 1281-91.

510 115. Borenstein, D.B. et al. (2015) Established microbial colonies can survive type VI
511 secretion assault. *PLoS Comput Biol* 11 (10), e1004520.

512 116. Kirkup, B.C. and Riley, M.A. (2004) Antibiotic-mediated antagonism leads to a bacterial
513 game of rock-paper-scissors in vivo. *Nature* 428 (6981), 412-4.

514 117. Inglis, R.F. et al. (2016) Presence of a loner strain maintains cooperation and diversity in
515 well-mixed bacterial communities. *Proc Biol Sci* 283 (1822).

516 118. Chassaing, B. et al. (2014) AIEC pathobiont instigates chronic colitis in susceptible hosts
517 by altering microbiota composition. *Gut* 63 (7), 1069-80.

518 119. Shin, J.M. et al. (2016) Biomedical applications of nisin. *J Appl Microbiol* 120 (6),
519 1449-65.

520 120. Lukacik, P. et al. (2012) Using a bacteriocin structure to engineer a phage lysin that
521 targets *Yersinia pestis*. *Biochem Soc Trans* 40 (6), 1503-6.

522 121. Lukacik, P. et al. (2012) Structural engineering of a phage lysin that targets gram-
523 negative pathogens. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 109 (25), 9857-62.

- 524 122. Scholl, D. et al. (2009) An engineered R-type pyocin is a highly specific and sensitive
525 bactericidal agent for the food-borne pathogen *Escherichia coli* O157:H7. *Antimicrob Agents*
526 *Chemother* 53 (7), 3074-80.
- 527 123. Ritchie, J.M. et al. (2011) An *Escherichia coli* O157-specific engineered pyocin prevents
528 and ameliorates infection by *E. coli* O157:H7 in an animal model of diarrheal disease.
529 *Antimicrob Agents Chemother* 55 (12), 5469-74.
- 530 124. Gebhart, D. et al. (2015) A modified R-type bacteriocin specifically targeting
531 *Clostridium difficile* prevents colonization of mice without affecting gut microbiota diversity.
532 *MBio* 6 (2), pii: e02368-14.

533

534 **Glossary**

535 **Dysbiosis:** microbial population with an imbalanced composition, often associated with
536 deleterious impact for the host. Dysbiosis has been identified as an important player of
537 inflammation in inflammatory bowel diseases.

538 **Intestinal immune system:** The complex population of cells and interactions inhabiting our
539 intestine with the dual role of tolerance toward our commensal microbiota and protection
540 against intestinal pathogen. Importantly, the intestine represents the largest compartment of
541 the immune system, with the estimation that 70% of the mammalian immune system is hosted
542 within the intestine.

543 **Microbial community:** mixed population of bacteria and single-cell microorganisms.
544 Microbial communities include microbiota, but also biofilms (bacteria that adhere to a
545 support) and consortiums (bacteria that exchange metabolic contents).

546

Legend to Figures

Figure 1. Commensal microbiota-mediated colonization resistance in the intestine. The intestinal microbiota plays a central role in both intestinal barrier maintenance and immune system maturation. Examples of microbiota-mediated inhibition of intestinal colonization by enteric pathogens are represented: exploitation competition (utilization of nutrient resources), and interference competition (production of virulence gene repressor molecules or antibacterial weapons). EHEC, enterohaemorrhagic *Escherichia coli*.

Figure 2. The arsenal of antibacterial weapons. The major antibacterial weapons used by enteric bacteria and their mechanism of action are schematically represented. Bacteriocins (green) are diffusible multi-domain proteins that are produced and released by the attacker cell. The reception (R) domain binds to the specific receptor and the translocation (T) domain helps the translocation of the activity (A) domain into the target. Contact-dependent growth inhibition (CDI, orange) comprises the CdiB translocator and CdiA toxin. The CdiA C-terminal domain (Ct) binds to a specific receptor and translocates to the target cell. Type VI secretion system (T6SS, blue) is an injection system that uses a contractile mechanism to propel an effector-loaded needle into the target.

565 **Table 1. Summary of known *in vivo* bacterial competition.**

Bacterium	Weapon	Target cell	Toxin / Activity	Reference
<i>Salmonella enterica</i> Typhimurium	T6SS	<i>Klebsiella oxytoca</i>	Tae4 (amidase)	[87]
<i>Bacillus thuringiensis</i>	Bacteriocin thuricin CD	Spore-forming Bacilli and Clostridia, including <i>C. difficile</i>	pore-forming	[109]
<i>Burkholderia thailandensis</i>	T6SS	unknown	unknown	[96, 97]
EHEC	T6SS	-	Catalases	[98]
<i>Shigella sonnei</i>	T6SS	<i>S. flexneri</i>	Unknown	[90]
<i>Shigella sonnei</i>	ColE1 colicin	<i>E. coli</i>	Pore-forming	[90]
<i>E. coli</i> Nissle	Microcins M and H47	Enterobacteriaceae, including pathogens such as AIEC and <i>S. Typhimurium</i>	unknown	[108]
<i>Bacteroides fragilis</i>	T6SS	<i>B. fragilis</i> , gut microbiota and pathogenic bacteria	Bte2	[56, 110, 114]
<i>V. cholerae</i>	T6SS	commensal <i>E. coli</i>	unknown	[95]

566

567

Outstanding Questions Box

- How do antibiotics and antibacterial molecules alter the intestinal microbiota composition and affect colonization resistance?
- What are the direct impacts of antibacterial weapons in the gut?
- What is the contribution of the antibacterial weapons of commensals in the protection of the host against pathogens?
- What is the target range of T6SS and what is the cost to produce antibacterial weapons?
- Is it a real benefit for the bacterium to be equipped with antibacterial weapons?
- How can antibacterial weapons be genetically modified for therapeutic purposes in order to manipulate the intestinal microbiota in beneficial ways?
- What are the long term impacts of such antibacterial systems on the microbiota community and host physiology?

Trends Box

- The intestinal microbiota is a complex but stable ecosystem that plays a central role in human health, and disturbance of its composition and function is associated with many diseases.
- Within the intestinal microbiota, bacteria exchange material and information.
- The microbiota can be peaceful, but many bacteria fight with others to have a better access to their niche or nutrients.
- Different antibacterial weapons have been identified and characterized, and many bacterial pathogens use these weapons to establish themselves in the intestinal environment, whereas some commensals use these weapons to specifically target pathogens, leading to protection of the host.

Exploitation

Interference