



The ecological roles of bacterial chemotaxis

Johannes M. Keegstra^{1,2}✉, Francesco Carrara^{1,2} and Roman Stocker¹✉

Abstract | How bacterial chemotaxis is performed is much better understood than why. Traditionally, chemotaxis has been understood as a foraging strategy by which bacteria enhance their uptake of nutrients and energy, yet it has remained puzzling why certain less nutritious compounds are strong chemoattractants and vice versa. Recently, we have gained increased understanding of alternative ecological roles of chemotaxis, such as navigational guidance in colony expansion, localization of hosts or symbiotic partners and contribution to microbial diversity by the generation of spatial segregation in bacterial communities. Although bacterial chemotaxis has been observed in a wide range of environmental settings, insights into the phenomenon are mostly based on laboratory studies of model organisms. In this Review, we highlight how observing individual and collective migratory behaviour of bacteria in different settings informs the quantification of trade-offs, including between chemotaxis and growth. We argue that systematically mapping when and where bacteria are motile, in particular by transgenerational bacterial tracking in dynamic environments and in situ approaches from guts to oceans, will open the door to understanding the rich interplay between metabolism and growth and the contribution of chemotaxis to microbial life.

Flagella

Elongated, thin and stiff filaments that generate forward thrust by rotating. Multiple filaments together may form a flagellar bundle.

Random walk

Movement in which steps are taken in random directions. It can be biased if the step length or orientation favours a certain direction.

Chemoattractants

Chemicals that attract an organism, inducing movement towards higher concentrations of the chemical.

We dedicate this work to the memory of Howard C. Berg (1934–2021), a true giant in illuminating the microscale world of microorganisms, who unravelled the mechanisms of bacterial sensing and locomotion to an unprecedented level. His creative insights have represented the foundation for countless chemotaxis studies over the past decades and will remain an inspiration for future discoveries in the motile lives of bacteria.

Chemotaxis is the widespread ability of motile microorganisms to direct their movement along chemical gradients. Although different strategies for motility exist¹, including twitching^{2,3} and gliding⁴ on surfaces, we concentrate here on bacterial swimming using flagella, which is the hallmark strategy of chemotactic motility. Swimming cells typically explore the environment via a random walk that alternates straight paths (runs) and reorientations (such as tumbles or flicks). The chemotaxis signalling pathway enables cells to bias their movement in response to chemical stimuli by modulating the duration of the runs. The molecular and cellular mechanisms of responses to chemoattractants are well characterized, especially the response of *Escherichia coli* but also of other species^{1,2,5–10}. Surprisingly, the ecological role of bacterial chemotaxis is much less clear^{11–13}, along with our understanding of when and where bacteria adopt

a motile lifestyle. We argue that it is now time to take the body of quantitative and mechanistic insights into how chemotaxis works and place it within the broader context of the contribution of chemotaxis to the lives of bacteria, to provide insights into why many bacteria have evolved this motility strategy.

Chemotaxis has mainly been interpreted as a foraging strategy in which the chemoattractants directly serve metabolism as sources of nutrients^{6,9} or energy^{14,15} (FIG. 1a). However, some of the earliest chemotaxis experiments have already shown that *E. coli* is also attracted to compounds that it does not take up, and that certain amino acids with low nutritional value are stronger chemoattractants than any sugar. It is still puzzling from an ecological perspective why bacteria would be attracted to compounds that do not or only poorly support growth and why, conversely, they are not attracted to certain compounds that support fast growth (BOX 1). Furthermore, it has remained unclear how the cost–benefit relation of chemotactic foraging plays out in different environments. In parallel, an alternative explanation for chemotaxis has become more prominent, according to which a chemoattractant is not itself the objective but, rather, the means to an end (FIG. 1b), such as the colonization of uncharted territory¹⁶ or the location of partners by symbionts¹⁷ or hosts by pathogens¹⁸. Chemotaxis enables pathogens to find hosts and locate

¹Institute for Environmental Engineering, ETH Zurich, Zurich, Switzerland.

²These authors contributed equally: Johannes M. Keegstra, Francesco Carrara.

✉e-mail: keegstra@ifu.baug.ethz.ch; romanstocker@ethz.ch
<https://doi.org/10.1038/s41579-022-00709-w>




Fig. 1 | Chemotactic bacterial motility across different environments. **a** | Chemotaxis can act as a mode of informed foraging in which a nutrient is an attractant, enabling cells to climb the nutrient gradient to increase growth rate. **b** | Alternatively, the chemoattractant gradient acts as a cue for a favourable target other than the attractant itself. **c–e** | Environments in which chemotactic bacteria are commonly found: gastrointestinal tract of warm-blooded animals (part **c**); soil and plants, including areas with high microbial activity around plant roots ('rhizosphere') and on leaves ('phyllosphere') (part **d**); and aquatic environments including nutrient hotspots around particulate organic matter and around eukaryotic cells ('phycosphere') (part **e**). **f–h** | Characteristics of environments that influence the ecological role of chemotaxis: bacterial cell concentration (in cells per gram of substrate)^{28,42,44} (part **f**); and physical characteristics of the environment such as complex topography, patchiness and viscosity (part **g**) and temporal structure of the chemical environment (part **h**).

specific entry points for infection¹⁸. Under this view, the chemoattractants can be, but do not need to be, metabolizable to provide an ecological advantage. For example, *Helicobacter pylori* chemotaxes towards bleach (HOCl), an antimicrobial produced by neutrophils, possibly as a signal for tissue inflammation¹⁹. *Bacillus subtilis* chemotaxes towards ethanol at concentrations that are detrimental for growth, and this behaviour might be beneficial for localizing ethanol-producing microorganisms that *B. subtilis* lyses as prey²⁰. Accordingly, some chemoattractants can have properties that would be usually associated with chemorepellents.

Chemotactic bacteria are found in a wide range of environments, contributing to the health and disease of hosts^{18,21} and playing a major role in biogeochemical cycles^{22,23}. A key example is the gastrointestinal tract of warm-blooded animals, which is the main habitat

of *E. coli*²⁴, among many other motile strains including pathogens¹⁸. Plants and soil are also favourable habitats for chemotactic bacteria, especially the microenvironments of leaves (the phyllosphere)²⁵ and around plant roots (the rhizosphere)²⁶. In aquatic environments²⁷, chemotactic bacteria are routinely found on marine particles²⁸ or associated with phytoplankton species (the phycosphere)¹⁷, protists²⁹ or corals³⁰ (FIG. 1 **c–e**). The diversity of these environments suggests that chemotaxis is an ecologically advantageous strategy for bacteria in a wide range of settings.

Determining precisely which strains perform chemotaxis and under which circumstances is not a simple task. Genetic analyses have revealed that genes for motility and chemotaxis are widespread, with core components conserved across distantly related bacteria and archaea^{31,32}. But a motile lifestyle is not a universal

Metabolism

The chemical reactions required to sustain living systems: breakdown of chemicals to release energy (catabolism), synthesis of biomass (anabolism) and elimination of waste chemicals.

Chemorepellents

Chemicals that repel an organism, inducing movement towards lower concentrations of the chemical.

Flagellar motor

A transmembrane protein complex connecting to the flagellar filaments, which converts a protonic or ionic gradient into rotary motion.

Sensory adaptation

The (partial) restoration of pre-stimulus behaviour during prolonged stimulation.

trait and many habitats harbour both strains with and without motility genes³³. Furthermore, genomic studies reveal only the potential for motility and not which strains really are motile. Many bacteria are known to switch between sessile and motile lifestyles³⁴, and bacteria can control motility at the post-translational level to cease swimming temporarily^{35,36}. The complexity arising from interspecies diversity and phenotypic plasticity illustrates the challenge in establishing a framework to understand when bacteria adopt a motile lifestyle.

To understand the ecological roles of bacterial chemotaxis, we focus on numerous key characteristics that shape the environment on the microscale³⁷ (FIG. 1f–h). First, we consider spatial structure. Chemotaxis is advantageous for bacteria in situations in which chemical gradients guide bacteria within heterogeneous resource landscapes^{37,38}. In addition, bacteria may also need to navigate landscapes with large areas lacking detectable gradients or with high viscosity that hinders swimming (for example, in the gastrointestinal tract)^{39,40}, or complex microstructures such as intricate webs of channels, grooves or pores (for example, on leaves and in soil)⁴¹. Second, we consider temporal structure. Different magnitudes and timescales of environmental changes impose very different constraints on the use of chemotaxis. Chemotaxis provides an advantage when responding to short-lived nutrient patches (such as sinking particles in the ocean) on timescales of seconds to minutes³⁸, but prolonged nutrient limitation between patches will impair motility and chemotaxis. Third, bacterial densities can be very different, ranging from extremely high densities

(10^{10} – 10^{11} cells g⁻¹) in the colon⁴², to intermediate densities (10^7 – 10^9 cells g⁻¹) in soil⁴³ and on leaves⁴⁴, to lower densities (10^5 – 10^7 cells g⁻¹) in aquatic environments⁴² (with the exception of nutrient hotspots such as particles)²⁸. Bacterial density ultimately determines whether bacterial cells use chemotaxis independently from each other (at low densities) or collectively (for example, by responding to environmental changes generated by the collective, at high densities). These microscale characteristics of bacterial habitats frame the ecological challenges to bacterial navigation and constrain the set of motility and metabolic strategies⁴⁵.

In this Review, we highlight how these aspects of bacterial density and spatial and temporal structure influence why and under which circumstances bacteria adopt a motile lifestyle. As any biological trait is the result of a cost–benefit relation embedded in its environment, we first review the quantitative understanding of the costs of motile behaviour, and then we discuss how the environment influences the benefit of chemotactic behaviour by modulating the chemotactic performance of bacteria. We then contrast settings in which cells migrate individually versus collectively. Finally, we highlight the ecological roles of chemotaxis beyond nutrient finding, such as boosting range expansion in colonization of new microenvironments and maintaining bacterial diversity.


Cost of chemotaxis

To understand under which conditions chemotaxis is advantageous and why some bacterial strains have adopted this strategy, the costs and benefits of chemotaxis need to be considered. For this, quantitative estimations of the energetic and proteomic costs of chemotaxis have become available, and recently it has become possible to directly compare these costs with the benefits of chemotaxis in simple environments.

Energetic costs of motility and chemotaxis. Energy is an essential resource of a bacterial cell. Viscous forces dominate motion through liquid at small length scales⁴⁶ and the energy spent on propulsion increases linearly with the viscosity of the medium and quadratically with the swimming speed⁴⁷. Motility by rotating flagella in water requires an estimated energy equivalent to $\sim 10^4$ ATP s⁻¹ (assuming 8×10^{-20} W per ATP)⁴⁸ for *E. coli* swimming at $\sim 25 \mu\text{m s}^{-1}$, based on flagellar motor output measurements^{49–51} (FIG. 2a). Marine bacteria, which have swimming speeds of 40–200 $\mu\text{m s}^{-1}$ (and reduced motor efficiency at high motor frequencies)⁵² will expend one to two orders of magnitude more energy than *E. coli*⁵³. For chemotaxis, in *E. coli* the energy expenditure is estimated⁵⁴ to be 10^3 – 10^4 ATP s⁻¹ based on in vivo measurements of baseline pathway activity⁵⁵ and an additional 10^3 ATP s⁻¹ for sensory adaptation⁵⁶. As the costs for sensing are not expected to scale with swimming speed, this means that for high speeds chemotaxis only requires a small increase in expenditure relative to the energy required for propulsion, but that at moderate speeds (such as $25 \mu\text{m s}^{-1}$) the costs of chemotaxis and propulsion can be comparable (FIG. 2a). There is theoretical evidence that cells could devote even more energy to chemotaxis for a marginal improvement of

Box 1 | Relation between chemotaxis and metabolism in *E. coli*

Historically, the question of why bacteria perform chemotaxis became overshadowed by research to understand how they perform it¹⁴⁹. Right from the pioneering work of Julius Adler on chemotaxis in *Escherichia coli* in the late 1960s, it was clear that cells also use chemotaxis to swim towards chemical compounds that are not used as a nutrient or energy source. A correlation between nutrient quality and influx rate has been demonstrated for the sugar influx sensing phosphotransferase system¹⁵, but this only partly determines the chemotaxis response because many sugars are also sensed through chemoreceptors. In general, for sugars there is no clear relation between the growth rate afforded by a given sugar and its strength as an attractant¹⁵⁰. In the figure, we replot data from capillary assay studies performed in the 1970s^{150,151} where the chemotactic sensitivities, defined as the negative of the logarithm of the threshold concentration inducing chemotaxis, to many sugars was measured, as well as the growth rate on those sugars when used as a carbon source (red dots). This reveals no clear correlation between measured growth rates and chemotactic sensitivities. Furthermore, the best studied chemotaxis response is that of *E. coli* to the amino acids aspartate and serine^{6,151}. Although *E. coli* consumes these amino acids first¹²⁹ and is attracted more strongly to these than to any sugar¹⁵¹ (blue lines), these amino acids only sustain low growth yields when provided as the sole carbon source¹²⁹. The chemotaxis preferences of *E. coli* point to much wider ecological functions of chemotaxis beyond simply tracking the sources of a compound to fuel metabolism.






Fig. 2 | Relative cost of bacterial chemotaxis depends on the metabolic state of a cell. **a** | At the scale of a bacterium, the drag scales linearly with swimming speed, therefore power required to rotate the flagellum scales quadratically with swimming speed. For high bacterial swimming speeds ($>40 \mu\text{m s}^{-1}$), rotation of the flagellar motor consumes the majority of the energy compared with expenditures for sensing⁵⁴, adaptation⁵⁶ and maintenance. Maintenance cost is a lower estimate based on metabolic scaling laws⁵⁹. **b** | Resource allocation of the proteome is the limiting factor during fast growth. Bacterial chemotaxis requires flagella for propulsion and chemosensory network components for directed navigation. **c** | Energetic allocation for motility and chemotaxis (ϵ_M) is relatively low compared with energy required for synthesis and growth (ϵ_S) when growth is fast (doubling time of few hours)^{58,70}, but high compared with synthesis (ϵ_S) and maintenance cost (ϵ_Q) for very slow growth (doubling time of days) or growth arrest. **d** | An increased proteome fraction is allocated to motility and chemotaxis (ϕ_M) proteins during slow growth at the expense of the fractions for ribosomes (ϕ_R), nutrient uptake (ϕ_P) and maintenance (ϕ_Q)⁷¹ (BOX 2).

Chemoreceptors

Elongated transmembrane proteins in which binding to a ligand molecule induces a conformational change that affects downstream pathway activity.

Trade-off

A situation in which a certain trait cannot increase without a decrease in another trait because of certain physical or biological constraints. When the constraint is lifted, the trade-off disappears.

sensing accuracy, but that they have settled for relatively higher noise levels to reduce energy expenditure on sensing (BOX 2).

In the energy budget of a cell, the fraction of the total energy expenditure for motility and chemotaxis depends on the growth rate ($\ln(2)/\text{doubling time}$) of the cell. *E. coli* requires approximately 4×10^{10} ATP to double its biomass⁵⁷, which corresponds to 10^7 ATP s^{-1} for a doubling time of 1 h. This means that at this (or higher) growth rate, propulsion at moderate speed requires less than 1% of the cell's total energy budget^{46,58} (FIG. 2c). This fraction increases for lower growth rates. In the absence of growth, the energy expenditure of the cell reduces to its maintenance level, estimated^{59,60} to be $\sim 10^4 \text{ ATP s}^{-1}$ for *E. coli* and species with similar size. This means that during starvation, motility would become the

dominant energy-consuming process (FIG. 2c). In some environments, such as deep-sea sediments⁶¹, energy limitation makes motility impossible, but if bacteria have sufficient energy for fast growth, they will certainly have enough energy for swimming.

Although chemotaxis is energetically costly at low growth rates, its potential benefits under such conditions can be high, making it a high risk–high reward investment. Bacteria have developed strategies to adjust their motile behaviour to the challenges imposed by energy limitation. Under prolonged nutrient starvation, it has been observed in several strains that the number of motile cells decreases over timescales of hours to days⁶¹. Although this behaviour could be a simple consequence of energy loss, it could also point to an energy-saving mechanism. Many taxa, including *E. coli* and *Salmonella enterica*, are able to stall flagella, using proteins that bind to the motor and act as a molecular brake^{36,62,63}. This points to the ability of bacteria to control energy expenditure by actively turning motility on and off⁶⁴. Another possible strategy is the use of endogenous energy storage compounds^{65,66}, which could fuel swimming for hours using only a small fraction of the cellular biomass^{67,68}. Finally, bacteria might use the widely distributed light-absorbing proteorhodopsin proteins to fuel motility, which would decouple the energy supply from the chemical landscape⁶⁹.

Proteomic cost of motility and chemotaxis. Bacteria need to allocate resources for the production of the proteins that enable motile behaviour, which is dominated by the expression of flagella. In *E. coli*, with an average of 3–4 flagella per cell, each cell expresses in the order of 60,000 subunits of the flagellin FliC protein in building flagella^{70,71} (FIG. 2b) and an additional 10,000–40,000 proteins, mostly chemoreceptors^{72,73}, for the chemotaxis pathway. The synthesis cost of these proteins (assuming an average length of 300 amino acids per protein) can be estimated as $8 \times 10^8 \text{ ATP per cell cycle}$ ^{60,74}, which means that even for growth rates as low as 0.07 h^{-1} , the energetic costs for synthesis dominate over the cost of swimming and sensing⁷⁰. As these resources could have been invested in the production of other proteins, it is important to consider the proteomic costs.

To understand proteomic expenditure by bacteria, a coarse-grained model of proteome allocation has proven successful (BOX 2). The model assumes that the total number of proteins per cell volume is constant, and therefore cellular processes are fundamentally limited by the fraction of proteins devoted to each task. For *E. coli*, the expression of motility and chemotaxis proteins amounts to 2–4% of the total cellular expressed proteins^{72,73,75}. As these proteins could have been invested in other processes that directly contribute to the growth rate, a trade-off between motility and growth can be postulated. However, because the benefit of chemotaxis to growth is environment-dependent, it cannot be understood as a strict universal trade-off between motility and instantaneous growth rate.

Experimental evidence for a trade-off between motility remained indirect until recently. Experimental evolution had shown that selecting for faster migrating

phenotypes was associated with reduced growth rates in a well-mixed environment^{76,77}. More direct evidence for a trade-off came from a recent study of gene expression⁷¹. The promoter activity of two of the main motility proteins (the flagellin FliC and the chemoreceptor Tar) of *E. coli* decreased linearly with increasing growth rate, in agreement with predictions from the proteome allocation model. Cells had different growth rates growing on different carbon sources. This relation indicates that *E. coli* invests more in motility proteins

when the growth rate, and thus the nutrient quality, is low (FIG. 2d). Alternatively, this negative correlation between the growth rate and the investment in motility may be a result of changes in cell size associated with different growth rates. Faster-growing cells are larger, and if, as has been proposed, *E. coli* maintains a fixed number of flagella per cell, this would yield a decreasing investment in motility proteins with increasing growth rate⁷⁸. Regardless of what mediates the observed expression differences of motility proteins with growth rate, the balance of the cost and benefit of expressing these proteins may shift with growth rate. To compare the cost and benefit of expressing motility and chemotaxis proteins at different growth rates⁷¹, co-culture experiments used wild type *E. coli* with a mutant deficient for motility and chemotaxis growing on different carbon sources that support different growth rates. In a well-mixed environment, the mutant outcompeted the wild type for all nutrient qualities, demonstrating a trade-off between motility and growth. This setting was contrasted with a spatially structured environment, where in addition to the primary carbon source, a bead was added that slowly released a mixture of amino acids (each estimated⁷⁹ at 10–100 μ M on the surface of the bead), thereby establishing nutrient gradients. In the structured environment, the wild type dominated for carbon sources with low growth rates ($<0.6 \text{ h}^{-1}$), revealing that the trade-off between growth and motility diminishes when the additional nutritional benefit of chemotaxis to higher concentrations of the amino acids is large. For carbon sources that support high growth rates, the mutant outcompeted the wild type. These experiments suggest that *E. coli* invests more resources into chemotaxis if the anticipated benefit is high, but an actual benefit of chemotaxis towards amino acids was only observed in environments that support low growth rates ($<0.6 \text{ h}^{-1}$).

It is noteworthy that the actual benefit of chemotaxis for *E. coli*, in terms of increased uptake of amino acids, does not outweigh the cost at higher growth rates ($>0.6 \text{ h}^{-1}$). However, at these growth rates, *E. coli* still expresses genes for chemotaxis and motility. Assuming the expression levels of the motility and chemotaxis genes are close to optimal, this suggests that *E. coli* in natural environments anticipates an additional benefit that makes chemotaxis beneficial even for high growth rates. What could this benefit be? One possibility is the anticipation of a future decrease in growth rate and loss of protein synthesis capacity, so that cells pre-emptively start the gene regulation programme to build flagella, which they do on a timescale of approximately 1 h (REFS^{80,81}) (for a review on motor and flagella assembly, see REF.⁸²). This may partly explain why *E. coli* shows high expression of motility genes during exponential growth, and a decrease in the expression of motility genes upon entering the stationary phase^{16,83}, when the resource demand for motility is arguably too high. Another possibility is that the main benefit does not originate from the nutritional value of these chemoattractants but they are, instead, used as navigational cues to favour the colonization of more favourable environments, similar to the hypothesized role of the response of *E. coli* to hormones and secondary metabolites^{84,85}

Box 2 | Optimality and energetics of bacterial chemotaxis

Proteome allocation during growth

The proteome allocation framework^{54,75,152} describes how cells adjust their proteome to optimize the growth rate, using a coarse-grained description of nutrient fluxes in the cell that contribute to growth, most importantly nutrient uptake and the conversion of nutrients into biomass. The fundamental assumptions are that the amount of protein per cell volume is constant and that the specific growth-related metabolic fluxes are limited by the amount of protein, specifically the proteome fraction of ribosomes (ϕ_R) responsible for producing proteins and of transporter and catabolic proteins generating nutrient flux (ϕ_P). Other proteomic fractions include those devoted to motility and chemotaxis (ϕ_M) and to other processes that do not directly contribute to growth (ϕ_Q). Cells can only adjust the proteome fraction devoted to each task, so that:

$$\phi_R + \phi_P + \phi_M + \phi_Q = 1$$

This means that an increase in one proteomic fraction occurs at the expense of other fractions. It has been shown empirically that the growth rate depends linearly on the proteome fraction devoted to ribosome synthesis ($\lambda \propto \phi_R$) and to nutrient uptake ($\lambda \propto \phi_P$). Optimal allocation requires that proteomic fractions are such that all fluxes are equal and equally limiting. When external conditions (such as nutrients) change, this can result in a new growth rate, and with it a new array of optimal proteomic fractions. For example, a reduction in nutrients requires a larger fraction of the proteome to be devoted to influx (such as transporters) at the expense of ribosomes. This framework has been successfully used to explain growth dynamics at the transition between two carbon sources¹⁵³ as well as overflow metabolism⁷⁵, and provides a valuable framework to understand the trade-offs between chemotaxis and growth.

Proteome and energy allocation in signal transduction

The task of any signal transduction system is to transfer information about the environment into the cell. In the case of the chemotaxis pathway, this information concerns the concentration of attractants or repellents. A body of theoretical literature^{54,154,155} on the limits of accuracy in cellular sensing has established that bacteria are fundamentally limited by concentration fluctuations of molecules diffusing within the small volume of a bacterial cell, which gives rise to sensory error. Experiments in which *Escherichia coli* and the marine bacterium *Vibrio ordalii* responded to short-lived, low-concentration pulses of attractants have shown that these bacteria can sense gradients close to the theoretical optimum of sensing accuracy set by diffusion^{154,156}. A systematic analysis of single bacterial trajectories in shallow gradients have revealed that the pathway of *E. coli* has evolved to near-optimally use the limited information coming from the environment¹⁵⁷.

Cells can approach the fundamental sensing limit by increasing the number of measurements (for example, by increasing the sampling frequency or the receptors and signalling molecules), but the sensing error decreases at best with the square root whereas the cost increases linearly with the number of signalling molecules or molecule turnover events. Suppressing molecular noise with active feedback is an even more costly enterprise: the resource expenditure scales inversely with the fourth root of the relative error, meaning that a 20% reduction in noise would require a twofold increase in resource expenditure⁸⁹. Bacteria may thus tolerate certain noise levels from a resource-saving perspective^{54,156}.

One can assume that the chemotaxis pathway is optimized to maximize its information transmission. This assumption has been used to infer the types of gradient that *E. coli* typically encounters given measured input–output relationships¹⁵⁸. However, molecular noise is not always detrimental. Bacteria may exploit molecular noise to enhance their search behaviour in shallow gradients¹⁵⁹ or in situations in which sensory cues are missing¹⁰ (see main text), or facilitate behavioural bet-hedging by generating phenotypic diversity^{98,113}.




Fig. 3 | Importance of chemotaxis in individual and collective motility. **a** | At low bacterial densities, bacteria behave as independent searchers. Even in the simplest scenario of a static chemical gradient, cells exhibit a large variation in climbing performance due to variation in the phenotypes of the chemotaxis pathway, including adaptation time or tumble bias⁹². This diversity can increase the average chemotactic performance of the population compared with the performance of the average phenotype. **b** | Bacteria in nature often navigate within structures that provide obstacles or branching geometries, as mimicked by recent microfluidic T-maze experiments¹⁰³. These experiments revealed that phenotypic variability in parameters such as the pathway gain directly impacts population performance. **c** | In patchy landscapes, cells can exploit molecular noise in the chemotaxis pathway to explore space more effectively by using a Lévy flight with extended runs instead of a Brownian random walk¹⁰⁹. This is achieved at the expense of sensing accuracy, leading to less tight accumulation around nutrient sources. **d** | Bacteria can release aggregation compounds such as quorum-sensing molecules⁹⁵ to actively enhance compactness of a population while moving. **e** | At high bacterial concentrations, cellular activity such as nutrient consumption or chemical signalling can induce collective movement. A classic example is the phenomenon of bacterial travelling waves (or bands) induced by self-generation of a chemoattractant gradient due to consumption at the leading edge of the wave (BOX 3). Within such a wave, subpopulations (P_1 and P_2) sort spatially according to their motility characteristics⁹³.

Adaptation time

The time required for the pathway activity and tumble bias to restore to pre-stimulus levels after prolonged stimulation.

Phenotypic diversity

The variation in the biological traits among members of an isogenic population due to biochemical noise.

within the gastrointestinal tract. Importantly, natural environments could also include explicit disadvantages of a motile lifestyle, such as potential mortality costs arising from increased encounters with predators⁸⁶ or specific flagella-targeting immune cells⁸⁷. Quantitative comparisons of the anticipated benefit of chemotaxis (as the fractional investment in motility and chemotaxis proteins) and the actual benefit (increased biomass or yield) in controlled microenvironments are important for establishing under which conditions bacteria should invest in a motile lifestyle, and shine light on the different ecological roles of chemotaxis.

Chemotactic performance of individuals and collectives

In certain scenarios, the advantage of chemotaxis (the why) emerges at the population level, due to the phenotypic diversity in motility⁸⁸ and signalling^{54,89–91} behaviour within a population^{92,93}. Understanding why the maintenance of a broad spectrum of chemotactic behaviours is advantageous for a population may provide clues to the ecological relevance and evolutionary advantage of chemotaxis under different conditions¹¹. This includes the enhancement of chemotactic migration towards food sources through cell–cell communication⁹⁴, bacterial stress resistance⁹⁵, systemic infection within a host¹⁸ and efficient population navigation of complex topologies such as mazes⁹⁶ or fractal landscapes⁹⁷. In this section, we discuss the ecological role of chemotaxis in two scenarios: populations in a low-density regime in which bacteria only sense and respond to the environment, and in a high-density regime in which they may shape the environment and behave as a collective.

Bacteria as independent searchers. To evaluate the chemotactic performance of a population and the fitness benefits in its environment, the perspective of a single cell remains crucial, because of the large phenotypic diversity within bacterial populations. Phenotypic diversity can increase the population performance even in the simple environment of a steady linear chemoattractant profile. When the population density is low ($<10^8$ cells g^{-1}), cells are far from each other (in liquids, mean spacing $>22 \mu m$) so that direct interactions through chemical signalling and indirect interactions through nutrient consumption are unlikely to occur, and each individual climbs gradients independently. Tracking bacteria in simple static gradients has revealed that cells with a low tumble bias climb gradients much faster than individuals with the average tumble bias (FIG. 3a), meaning that in a population displaying a large phenotypic diversity in motility traits, the average chemotaxis speed is higher than the chemotactic speed of the average individual^{90,92}. Therefore, it has been hypothesized that evolution has not only acted on the mean tumble bias but also on the shape of its distribution across the population^{90,98}.

Behavioural differences in motility strategies due to phenotypic diversity are particularly beneficial under dynamic and heterogeneous conditions^{99,100} that force a population to balance different challenges. Natural environments are more complex than single steady gradients, and spatial structure at the microscale, such as the network topologies in the phyllosphere²⁵, in the rhizosphere¹⁰¹, in corals¹⁰² and in the human lungs¹⁸, introduce great physical complexity in the environments that many bacteria must navigate. This affects bacterial navigation and transport, the spatial range of interactions between individuals or symbiotic partners and the ability to find and infect hosts (FIG. 1). Recent work using microfluidics to mimic spatially structured microenvironments has analysed the decision-making of thousands of cells navigating chemical gradients in complex geometries⁹⁶ (FIG. 3b) such as branching T-mazes¹⁰³ or fractal topologies⁹⁷. The likelihood that a bacterium

Tumble bias

The relative proportion of time that a bacterium spends reorienting during motility. Cells with high tumble bias reorient more frequently.

Pathway gain

How strongly a cell amplifies the signal from a given chemical gradient. The amplification is determined by the properties of the signal transduction machinery.

Effective diffusivity

The rate at which a randomly swimming cell explores space.

Brownian random walk

A type of random walk of small particles in a fluid, driven by thermal effects, which results in diffusive behaviour.

Lévy flight

A type of superdiffusive random walk in which the step-length distribution is heavy tailed, leading to increased spatial exploration compared with Brownian motion.

successfully navigates a gradient depends, ultimately, on the sensitivity of its chemotaxis pathway¹⁰⁴, and this sensitivity displays large variation within a population in both the tumble bias and the pathway gain¹⁰³. The tumble bias is most relevant for the response speed when cells need to climb gradients from unsteady sources, whereas the pathway gain is most relevant in the tight accumulation around persistent sources and for the navigation in complex geometries^{90,103}. The maintenance of a wide distribution of phenotypes therefore enables effective gradient climbing by part of the population in dynamic and heterogeneous environments^{90,98}.

Spatial exploration is a main ecological challenge for motile organisms in sparse environments. In environments characterized by patchy nutrient sources against a very dilute nutrient background, large regions contain no detectable chemical gradients¹¹. The task thus shifts from climbing to finding gradients, and bacteria can increase encounters with nutrient patches by increasing their effective diffusivity. Theoretical analysis and numerical simulations indicate that random motility alone provides a 100-fold to 1,000-fold increase in the encounter rate compared with non-motile bacteria^{105,106}. Chemotaxis can provide a further advantage to the search behaviour by increasing the region of space around the nutrient patch where a cell can encounter the chemical gradients emanating from the source¹⁰⁷; however, the exact benefit is likely environment-dependent (including fluid flow, size and velocity of the nutrient patch) and strain-dependent (including swimming speed, tumble bias and pathway gain).

In sparse environments, such as the phyllosphere or the bulk ocean, the performance of a population can depend predominantly on the performance of only a small fraction of its individuals, because a low chance of success is compensated by a high reward, such as the encounter of a bacterium with a rare but extremely rich nutrient patch or with the entry point to a host organism. This form of stochastic foraging inequality is exemplified by bacterial foraging on marine particles in the ocean^{35,45,105}, which represent rich hotspots of nutrients and of associated microbial activity²². Bacteria–particle encounters are probabilistic events: bacterial motility increases, on average, the chance of encountering a particle by increasing bacterial diffusivity¹⁰⁸; however, the waiting times between encounters within a population are exponentially distributed, where a small number of bacteria encounter a particle disproportionately earlier than the average bacterium (for example, the first 1% encounter a particle 100 times faster than the average)¹⁰⁵. As a result of this stochasticity, strategies involving chemotactic motility to forage on particles can be viable even in nutrient-poor environments in which a bacterium that experiences the average search time would be expected to starve to death before an encounter. This argument suggests that nutrient-poor marine environments, traditionally thought to be dominated by non-motile bacteria³³, might in fact offer important niches also for motile bacteria. When evaluating why chemotaxis is a viable strategy in the ocean, as in many other environments, the single-cell perspective is essential to evaluate the performance of a population.

A cell can enhance spatial exploration by exploiting molecular fluctuations in the chemotaxis pathway¹⁰⁹ (FIG. 3c), but at the cost of reducing sensing accuracy. Slow (~10 s) temporal fluctuations in the activity level of the chemotaxis pathway transform a Brownian random walk into a Lévy flight^{109–112} (FIG. 3c), in which the power-law distribution of run lengths greatly increases the chance of encountering a nutrient patch. Recently, intracellular measurements of chemotactic pathway activity using Förster resonance energy transfer in single *E. coli* cells^{113,114} revealed that the temporal fluctuations vary substantially among cells¹¹³. This suggests that bacterial populations can hedge their bets between increasing the encounter with nutrient patches and the ability to retain position after an encounter¹¹⁵. *E. coli* has been shown to suppress bet-hedging behaviour when more environmental information is available and the benefit of bet-hedging is lost. This is achieved by modulating expression levels¹¹⁶ as well as using post-translational modifications of signalling proteins¹¹⁷, revealing that bacteria can adjust their phenotypic distribution dynamically to optimize performance.

Chemotaxis and collective behaviour. To understand certain ecological roles of bacterial chemotaxis we need to move beyond the single-cell perspective of how individual bacteria respond to chemical cues, because some important forms and functions of chemotaxis (the why) only emerge at the level of a population of interacting individuals. At high bacterial densities ($>10^8$ cells g⁻¹), such as those found in the large intestine⁴², around nutrient hotspots in the soil such as roots⁴³ or on marine particles²⁸, cells are no longer decoupled agents because of the increased importance of chemical and physical interactions. Bacteria are social organisms, capable of communication via chemical signalling¹¹⁸. The most iconic example of cell–cell communication is quorum sensing, the process that allows groups of bacteria to synchronize changes in behaviour in response to changes in population density. Quorum sensing relies on the production, detection and response to extracellular signalling molecules called autoinducers¹¹⁹. The coupling between the release of signalling molecules and chemotactic motion towards these molecules may generate spatial patterning and bacterial spontaneous aggregations in otherwise homogeneous and static environments^{120,121}, and could also be used by bacteria to narrow their distribution around nutrient hotspots⁹⁵ (FIG. 3d).

Some classic forms of collective behaviour in bacterial chemotaxis, such as the formation of travelling bands^{16,93,122–124}, do not rely on the secretion of signalling molecules but, rather, are the emergent consequence of interactions between bacteria and their limiting resources⁹³. At high bacterial density, the local consumption of a chemoattractant generates a gradient that the population starts to chase, generating a travelling band. Using a microfluidic device that enabled the simultaneous tracking of individuals and observation of collective migration, a recent study⁹³ revealed the formation of cohesive travelling bands, despite the population being composed of phenotypically diverse individuals. Within the travelling bands, local bacterial consumption

of chemoattractant, initially distributed homogeneously, introduces a self-generated gradient, which is sensed by bacteria (FIG. 3e). This density-dependent mechanism contributes to levelling-off the gradient in front of the band, sorting for the better chemotaxers, and to sharpening it at the back of the band, where the weaker performers are. Density-dependent mechanisms mediated by consumption represent a subtle and inexpensive form of indirect communication among phenotypically diverse bacterial cells, which in this example enables populations to maintain diversity while travelling as a cohesive group.

Beyond foraging

Chemotaxis has ecological roles beyond finding nutrients¹²⁵ and serves additional ecological functions in which the chemoattractant is not the target but, rather, the means to another end. Recent work sheds light on the apparent paradox of chemotaxis to compounds associated with low growth rate (BOX 1) by highlighting the wider ecological and evolutionary implications of chemotaxis, such as boosting colonization of new environments¹⁶ and promoting diversity by stabilizing bacterial communities^{70,126}.

Chemotaxis boosting range expansion. An important, recently proposed, function of chemotaxis is boosting range expansion — the migration of a species into new habitats — and to enhance population growth in nutrient-replete environments. As described above, at high bacterial densities the consumption of nutrients creates a gradient that cells at the leading edge of the population chase, resulting in a travelling band of bacteria^{122,123} (FIG. 4a). Surprisingly, recent experiments with *E. coli* on soft-agar plates showed that adding small amounts of serine or aspartate homogeneously in the agar as a chemoattractant to plates with glycerol or glucose as primary carbon sources caused bacterial populations to expand twice as fast as populations in the same environment without the addition of the chemoattractant¹⁶. The increase in the expansion speed was dependent on a division of labour within the bacterial population: the colonization is led by a group of pioneering cells that pull the population front by chemotactic motion, and as these cells replicate they leave behind offspring that settle and occupy the environment by growth (BOX 3). The primary carbon source is used to sustain growth whereas the chemoattractant provides a cue for navigation, which drives migration before the onset of the nutrient limitation, which is typically encountered by cells during range expansion on a carbon source alone. Importantly, under initially replete conditions, chemotactic motility is not triggered, as in the classical Keller–Segel model of chemotactic migration (BOX 3), by nutrient depletion to find better environmental conditions^{71,127}. The addition of a chemoattractant makes a fast-growing population rapidly generate a gradient at the expansion front through uptake of that chemoattractant, which acts as a cue for individuals and accelerates population growth and expansion¹⁶. The mathematical description of the boosted range expansion could also qualitatively and

quantitatively describe the expansion in the case of rich undefined semi-solid media¹⁶, showing that colony expansion in complex media can be understood as driven by a growth on a primary carbon source and expansion using a chemoattractant distinct from the carbon source.

The phenomenon of boosted range expansion may thus help solve the puzzle of why bacteria have high chemotactic sensitivities for less beneficial growth substrates, such as serine or aspartate. In batch culture, *E. coli* can only increase the growth rate relative to a baseline minimal medium supplemented with glucose to a limited extent (10–20%) through catabolism of serine or aspartate^{79,128}. However, during range expansion, the colonization rate increases more than 100% when serine or aspartate are added to the primary carbon source, because of the effective decoupling between growth and chemotaxis, each of which relies upon different chemical compounds (BOX 3). *E. coli* does not grow very well on serine or aspartate as its sole carbon source¹²⁹. However, *E. coli* takes up serine or aspartate first when cells are fed a mixture of many degradable compounds in a well-mixed environment⁷⁹. A flux balance analysis indicated that these amino acids are taken up at a higher rate than required for protein synthesis and catabolized to generate energy⁷⁹. Together with the fact that they are small and abundant, this makes them good candidates to be used as sensory cues in situations in which another carbon source is the main driver of growth. Taken together, these observations raise the possibility that the chemotactic preference for serine and aspartate did not evolve only to directly supply metabolic demands of a cell but also to increase the colonization rate of a population in new environments.

Motility-based mechanisms for coexistence. Chemotaxis can promote bacterial diversity through trade-offs between chemotactic motility and other performance traits, such as growth or competitive abilities. The competition–colonization trade-off, in which better competitors are inferior colonizers and vice versa, was first tested in a study quantifying interactions in protist microcosms¹³⁰, and has long been considered a plausible explanation for species coexistence in environments characterized by a continual turnover of new patches^{131,132}. In the ocean, seascapes of organic particles introduce microscale heterogeneity that can drive ecological differentiation of microbial populations through the competition–colonization trade-off³³. Theoretical analysis suggests that trade-offs in motility performance may create alternative niches even within initially uniform environments⁹⁰. However, verification of the growth–motility trade-off in natural ecosystems is rare because environmental heterogeneity and direct competition are usually confounding factors. Recently, work unifying themes from microbial spatial ecology and evolutionary theory with systems biology and biophysics has highlighted the concerted contributions of growth, motility and chemotaxis to generating and stabilizing community diversity^{70,126} (FIG. 4).

In work to test the role of motility and spatial competition in driving bacterial coexistence, a growth–motility




Fig. 4 | Motility and chemotaxis can drive community diversity. **a** | Growth and motility of a bacterial population (cyan) in soft agar (yellow) generate typical expanding rings as the bacteria track a chemical gradient generated by nutrient consumption. **b** | Example of expanded colony of *Escherichia coli* migrating in soft agar. **c** | Co-existing *E. coli* isolates from the same host individual engage in a trade-off between growth and motility (measured by expansion rate). **d** | When one such species pair is inoculated together, spontaneous spatial exclusion is observed, in which the slow-moving but fast-growing strain is constrained to the centre (A, red) and the fast-moving but slow-growing strain inhabits the periphery (B, cyan). **e** | Bacterial diversity enabled by spatial exclusion dynamics, where a fast-moving strain (with high expansion rate v , cyan) confines a fast-growing strain (with high growth rate μ , red) by moving outwards and inhibiting nutrient transport (orange) to the centre. **f** | Evolution experiments show that motility is an evolvable phenotype even within spatially homogeneous environments. Sampling repeatedly at different distances from the plate centre ultimately selects for genotypes with different expansion speeds after ~300 generations. **g** | When an isolate selected for an expansion speed greater than its ancestor is co-inoculated with its ancestor, spatial separation is observed, where the fast-moving strain dominates the periphery (cyan) and the slow-moving ancestor occupies the centre¹²⁶ (purple). **h** | Trade-off between expansion and colonization generates spatial exclusion and, ultimately, coexistence. In this case, cells chase a non-nutritional gradient (blue) that enhances migration speed, while growing in nutrient-rich (orange) conditions (BOX 3). This mechanism of spatial expansion enables rapid domination in the periphery (cyan) at the expense of excessively diluting the rear-guard, leaving the central area to be colonized by the slow-moving strain (purple). Part **b** reprinted from REF.¹⁶, Springer Nature Limited. Parts **c** and **d** reprinted and part **e** adapted from REF.⁷⁰, Springer Nature Limited. Part **f** adapted and part **g** reprinted from REF.¹²⁶, Springer Nature Limited.

trade-off was consistently found in coexisting wild strains of *E. coli* that were isolated from a single host⁷⁰, implying that these traits were the evolutionary outcome of stable coexistence (FIG. 4c). The growth and motility parameters were measured for each strain when cultured alone. The trade-off emerges because swimming requires the expression and operation of flagella, and so can limit growth by inducing proteomic costs (BOX 2). When two such strains were co-inoculated

in the centre of a plate, mimicking the onset of competition for a freshly available nutrient patch, spontaneous spatial segregation happened. The fast-moving (but slow-growing) strain prevented the slow-moving (but fast-growing) strain from moving outwards and accessing nutrients available in the periphery (FIG. 4d). The indirect inhibitory interaction between species that drives spatial segregation is mediated by the coupling between nutrient consumption, which sculpts the

Box 3 | Life in motion: movement and reproduction

Biological dispersal shapes the spatial distribution of species and, ultimately, their ability to coexist. In the ecological literature, classical diffusion, advection–diffusion, reaction–diffusion and reaction–advection–diffusion models have been used to establish the link between individual, short-term movement and long-term, broad-scale population patterns, such as the dispersal and invasion of animals¹⁶⁰. The study of bacterial motility, chemotaxis and growth has proceeded in parallel through the combined work of microbiologists and biophysicists. This body of work has contributed to characterizing the behavioural and metabolic strategies of motile microorganisms and the underlying mechanisms. We present here the basic models proposed in the literature to characterize motility, chemotaxis and growth.


Unguided expansion

Fisher¹⁶¹ was the first to model the spread of an advantageous gene in a population, and Kolmogorov et al.¹⁶² obtained the basic analytical results for the reaction–diffusion model. This model couples a logistic term describing the reproduction of individuals with growth rate λ and carrying capacity K , and a diffusion term accounting for local movement, characterized by the diffusion coefficient D . These species traits define the characteristic spatiotemporal scales of dispersal, which proceeds via a travelling wave moving undeformed at a constant speed $v = 2(D\lambda)^{1/2}$ (see the figure, part a). This form of spatial expansion, where individuals move randomly in space and reproduce until saturation of resources, was first applied to describe the dispersal of animal populations. It has recently been observed in microorganisms, both for systems in which the wave is pulled by individuals diffusing at the leading edge¹⁶³ and in systems characterized by a strong Allee effect in which the wave is pushed by individuals behind the front¹⁶⁴.


Guided expansion

Chemotactic migrations are well captured by reaction–advection–diffusion models, known as Patlak–Keller–Segel systems¹⁶⁵. In this type of expansion, individuals perform chemotaxis towards a single compound that enables growth. This behaviour leads to the formation of a travelling wavefront moving faster than the Fisher wave, but the exact scaling remains unknown (see the figure, part b). The seminal model of Keller and Segel¹²³ was developed to study aggregations of slime moulds and migrations of chemotactic bacteria, where the production of new cells is negligible and an instability in the uniform distribution of the population leads to the formation of travelling bands. Recently, the classic Patlak–Keller–Segel


a Unguided expansion



b Guided expansion



c Boosted expansion



model has been extended to account for phenotypic diversity⁹³ and to characterize spatial exclusion dynamics in multispecies communities⁷⁰.

Boosted expansion

A richer set of dynamics compared with the Patlak–Keller–Segel model emerges when the chemoattractant is not the main nutrient source. This scenario can lead to the formation of complex, transient spatial patterns¹²⁰ or can boost the range expansion of bacterial populations¹⁶. A recently proposed model of bacterial expansion^{16,134} describes conditions in which a medium containing saturating amounts of a primary carbon source also contains a chemoattractant at low concentration. In this model, the concentrations of the major nutrient source and of the attractant are two distinct variables driving bacterial growth and motility, respectively, which results in an expansion–colonization process with speed $v \approx (\chi - D)(\lambda a_0/a_m)^{1/2}(\chi - D + D_a)^{-1/2}$ (REF.¹³⁴) (see the figure, part c), where D_a is the diffusion coefficient of the attractant, χ is the chemotactic sensitivity coefficient and a_0 and a_m are, respectively, the initial attractant concentration and the lower limit of attractant sensitivity. Importantly, the population growth rate λ and the chemotactic sensitivity coefficient χ are associated with different compounds, so that to sustain a high migration speed the nutrient does not have to be a strong attractant and vice versa. By responding in this way to a compound that is not the primary nutrient, in what appears to be a paradoxical chemotactic response, bacteria achieve an effective dispersal mechanism and a fitness advantage, namely faster colonization of virgin territories¹²⁶, compared with unguided expansion (see the figure, part a) or the classic travelling bands where the chemoattractant is the main nutrient source (see the figure, part b).

Adapted from REF.¹⁶, Springer Nature Limited.

nutrient landscape, and motility, which enables the population with higher motility to expand faster. Although the spatial exclusion can also be observed for motile but non-chemotactic cells⁷⁰, chemotaxis enhances the segregation by enabling cells to climb self-generated gradients and colonize the newly available environment faster⁷⁰ (FIG. 4e).

Evolution experiments have shown that chemotactic motility is an evolvable phenotype even within initially homogeneous environments¹²⁶ (FIG. 4f). In experiments with *E. coli*, a strain evolved in sequential expansion experiments in which bacteria were inoculated and allowed to grow to fill a plate, and then five selection series were formed by picking at 1 of 5 different distances from the initial seeding point over 50 selection cycles (about 600 generations). This created five lines with different behavioural characteristics, namely two with reduced expansion speed, one stable line and two with increased expansion speed. These evolved lines were then inoculated with the ancestor strain in

the centre of a plate to engage in competitive spatial expansion, as done by Gude et al.⁷⁰, leading to spatial segregation. This approach revealed that rapid expansion to colonize a new habitat in the presence of competitors is not the optimal strategy if space is limited, as is the case for the surface of resource patches¹²⁵. Rather, in colonizing a habitat of a specific size, the bacteria with the winning strategy are those that expand at a speed that scales as the product of their growth rate and the habitat size. The unique optimal expansion speed for a given habitat size warrants that each distance from an inoculation site occupies its own niche. Consequently, balancing the expansion of the bacterial wavefront into virgin territory and the colonization of the territory behind the wavefront is an evolutionarily stable strategy facilitating coexistence. Similar to the growth–motility trade-off, this expansion–colonization trade-off leads to spatial segregation of species (FIG. 4g) with different motility characteristics¹²⁶ in multispecies communities (FIG. 4h).

Allee effect

A positive density dependence of individual fitness which arises from cooperation or facilitation among individuals in the population.

Although the growth–motility trade-off and the expansion–colonization trade-off generate visually similar spatial segregation when expanding on soft agar (FIG. 4d,g), the underlying mechanisms are different (FIG. 4e,h). In contrast to the growth–motility trade-off, the expansion–colonization trade-off requires chemotaxis for the boosted expansion speed of the travelling wave¹³⁴. However, the expansion–colonization trade-off does not require that the strains that expand more slowly have a faster growth rate, and in fact the fast expanders may also grow faster without destabilizing coexistence¹²⁶. Therefore, both trade-offs may contribute to bacterial diversity in natural environments.

The recent findings presented here, in which chemotaxis promotes bacterial coexistence during repeated cycles of competitive colonization of new habitat, may be relevant for environments such as the gut, with regular arrival of nutrients with low bacterial density, or for patchy environments such as the ocean, where bacteria participate in colonization–exploitation dynamics of nutrient-rich particles^{28,35,133}. Importantly, these studies suggest that microbial populations that perform chemotaxis can act as micro-ecosystem engineers that shape and respond to chemical gradients in their immediate surroundings and thereby contribute to foster bacterial diversity, and highlight the fundamental role of motility and chemotaxis in niche formation and community dynamics.

Outlook

Recent research is revealing a much wider set of ecological roles for chemotaxis in the lives of bacteria than originally postulated, yet much work remains to be done to discover the full extent of the ecological functions of chemotactic responses of bacteria. In many natural environments, such as on plants, in soil, on marine particles or within animal hosts, surfaces containing degradable polysaccharides provide an important niche for motile bacteria, whose lifestyle often combines a motile planktonic phase with a sessile, surface-attached phase. Although motility-driven accumulation towards polysaccharides has been observed^{30,135,136}, the role of chemotaxis in this process is still poorly understood¹³⁵ and most studies have focused on chemotaxis towards low molecular weight substances. The response to oligosaccharides can be very different depending on the environment. On the one hand, chemotaxis towards highly diffusible oligosaccharides could direct bacteria to polysaccharide substrates¹³⁵. On the other, cells can depart from a surface before nutrients are completely exhausted^{34,35,137}, indicating that oligosaccharides, although often serving as chemoattractants, can also mediate departure from a substrate^{137,138}. To further understand sessile–motile transitions in bacteria, more work is needed to characterize the role of chemotaxis in substrate colonization, but also the rich interplay of chemotaxis with other pathways that control substrate adhesion such as the secondary messenger cyclic-di-GMP¹³⁹.

Interesting future directions gravitate around the relation between bacterial physiology and chemotactic motility under nutrient fluctuations. In a recent study,

growing *E. coli* cells were observed when nutrients were abruptly switched from glycolytic carbon sources to fermentation products, revealing long lag times after this switch¹⁴⁰. By expressing different metabolic enzymes, bacteria could have changed their pre-switch growth rate but at the cost of a longer post-switch lag time. These results suggest that growth rate is not a mere reflection of the nutritional value of a compound, and cells may lower the growth rate on a compound to anticipate a nutrient shift. We suggest that this ability to tune the growth rate specifically for dynamic environments¹⁴¹ could be relevant for bacterial motile behaviour because anticipation of change could, in a similar way, increase the potential benefit of chemotaxis in responding to those changes. We therefore expect that more can be learned from viewing motility, uptake and metabolic preferences as co-evolved rather than independent traits.

There have been important recent advances in the understanding of microbial processes, from cellular motility to the assembly of complex communities, thanks to the increased ability to observe dynamics and manipulate ecological settings at the microscale^{142–144}. This progress, in combination with conceptual advances in understanding cellular resource allocation, phenotypic diversity and spatial self-organization, has led to studies on the model system *E. coli* that inform our understanding of the ecological role of motility and chemotaxis in the natural settings experienced by bacteria. Ultimately, the ability to answer why bacteria perform chemotaxis also hinges on deepening our understanding of when and where bacteria are motile and chemotactic in their natural environment, for example through modern micro-engineering and molecular technology to sample in situ microbial activities at the microscale and mesoscale^{145,146}. At the same time, in dynamic heterogeneous landscapes in which encounters with nutrient hotspots impact the motile behaviour on the level of an individual bacterium³⁸, it is important to study aspects of chemotactic decision-making and behavioural strategies across multiple generations¹⁴⁷. Long-term tracking of bacterial individuals¹⁴⁸ in heterogeneous landscapes marks the next challenge in combining microscopy and microfluidics, paving the way for a more quantitative, single-cell understanding of the multiple contributions of chemotactic motility to bacterial fitness.

Breakthroughs in the understanding of chemotaxis, which build upon a backdrop of a detailed understanding of the molecular mechanisms of chemotaxis in model organisms, are beginning to connect the underlying molecular biology and biophysics with microbial ecology. This is an exciting development in view of the rapidly growing interest in microbial community assembly and function, and its consequences on a wide range of environments from the human gut to soils and oceans. Chemotaxis thus represents a blueprint for advances at this nexus of microbial physiology and ecology, catalysing the interest of a broad scientific community from molecular biologists and microbial ecologists to physicists and mathematicians.

Published online: 15 March 2022

Glycolytic
Using the glycolysis pathway to
generate energy.

1. Wadhwa, N. & Berg, H. C. Bacterial motility: machinery and mechanisms. *Nat. Rev. Microbiol.* **20**, 161–173 (2022).
This recent review provides an excellent overview of the diversity in bacterial propulsion mechanisms.
2. Burrows, L. L. *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* twitching motility: type IV pili in action. *Annu. Rev. Microbiol.* **66**, 493–520 (2012).
3. Dufrène, Y. F. & Persat, A. Mechanomicrobiology: how bacteria sense and respond to forces. *Nat. Rev. Microbiol.* **18**, 227–240 (2020).
4. Jarrell, K. F. & McBride, M. J. The surprisingly diverse ways that prokaryotes move. *Nat. Rev. Microbiol.* **6**, 466–476 (2008).
5. Berg, H. C. *E. coli in Motion* (Springer, 2004).
6. Bi, S. & Sourjik, V. Stimulus sensing and signal processing in bacterial chemotaxis. *Curr. Opin. Microbiol.* **45**, 22–29 (2018).
7. Parkinson, J. S., Hazelbauer, G. L. & Falke, J. J. Signaling and sensory adaptation in *Escherichia coli* chemoreceptors: 2015 update. *Trends Microbiol.* **23**, 257–266 (2015).
8. Porter, S. L., Wadhams, G. H. & Armitage, J. P. Signal processing in complex chemotaxis pathways. *Nat. Rev. Microbiol.* **9**, 153–165 (2011).
9. Colin, R. & Sourjik, V. Emergent properties of bacterial chemotaxis pathway. *Curr. Opin. Microbiol.* **39**, 24–33 (2017).
10. Brumley, D. R. et al. Cutting through the noise: bacterial chemotaxis in marine microenvironments. *Front. Mar. Sci.* **7**, 527 (2020).
11. Hein, A. M., Carrara, F., Brumley, D. R., Stocker, R. & Levin, S. A. Natural search algorithms as a bridge between organisms, evolution, and ecology. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **113**, 9413–9420 (2016).
12. Wong-Ng, J., Celani, A. & Vergassola, M. Exploring the function of bacterial chemotaxis. *Curr. Opin. Microbiol.* **45**, 16–21 (2018).
13. Colin, R., Ni, B., Laganenka, L. & Sourjik, V. Multiple functions of flagellar motility and chemotaxis in bacterial physiology. *FEMS Microbiol. Rev.* **45**, fuab038 (2021).
14. Schweinitzer, T. & Josenhans, C. Bacterial energy taxis: a global strategy? *Arch. Microbiol.* **192**, 507–520 (2010).
15. Somavanshi, R., Ghosh, B. & Sourjik, V. Sugar influx sensing by the phosphotransferase system of *Escherichia coli*. *PLoS Biol.* **14**, e2000074 (2016).
16. Cremer, J. et al. Chemotaxis as a navigation strategy to boost range expansion. *Nature* **575**, 658–663 (2019).
This work uses a quantitative approach to describe the classic assay of bacterial growth and migration in soft agar, and elucidates the distinct roles of attractant and nutrient in colony expansion.
17. Raina, J.-B., Fernandez, V., Lambert, B., Stocker, R. & Seymour, J. R. The role of microbial motility and chemotaxis in symbiosis. *Nat. Rev. Microbiol.* **17**, 284–294 (2019).
This study presents a comprehensive overview of the role of bacterial motility and chemotaxis in establishing and maintaining symbiotic relationships.
18. Matilla, M. A. & Krell, T. The effect of bacterial chemotaxis on host infection and pathogenicity. *FEMS Microbiol. Rev.* **42**, fux052 (2018).
This work presents an extensive review of the role of bacterial motility and chemotaxis in host pathogenicity from plants to animals.
19. Perkins, A., Tudorica, D. A., Amieva, M. R., Remington, S. J. & Guillemin, K. *Helicobacter pylori* senses bleach (HOC) as a chemoattractant using a cytosolic chemoreceptor. *PLoS Biol.* **17**, e3000395 (2019).
20. Tohidifar, P. et al. The unconventional cytoplasmic sensing mechanism for ethanol chemotaxis in *Bacillus subtilis*. *mBio* **11**, e02177-20 (2020).
21. Kundu, P., Blacher, E., Elinav, E. & Pettersson, S. Our gut microbiome: the evolving inner self. *Cell* **171**, 1481–1493 (2017).
22. Azam, F. & Malfatti, F. Microbial structuring of marine ecosystems. *Nat. Rev. Microbiol.* **5**, 782–791 (2007).
23. Buchan, A., LeClerc, G. R., Gulvik, C. A. & González, J. M. Master recyclers: features and functions of bacteria associated with phytoplankton blooms. *Nat. Rev. Microbiol.* **12**, 686–698 (2014).
24. Savageau, M. A. *Escherichia coli* habitats, cell types and molecular mechanisms of gene control. *Am. Nat.* **122**, 732–744 (1983).
25. Vorholt, J. A. Microbial life in the phyllosphere. *Nat. Rev. Microbiol.* **10**, 828–840 (2012).
26. Scharf, B. E., Hynes, M. F. & Alexandre, G. M. Chemotaxis signaling systems in model beneficial plant–bacteria associations. *Plant. Mol. Biol.* **90**, 549–559 (2016).
27. Stocker, R. & Seymour, J. R. Ecology and physics of bacterial chemotaxis in the ocean. *Microbiol. Mol. Biol. Rev.* **76**, 792–812 (2012).
28. Datta, M. S., Sliwerska, E., Gore, J., Polz, M. F. & Cordero, O. X. Microbial interactions lead to rapid micro-scale successions on model marine particles. *Nat. Commun.* **7**, 11965 (2016).
29. Barbara, G. M. & Mitchell, J. G. Bacterial tracking of motile algae. *FEMS Microbiol. Ecol.* **44**, 79–87 (2003).
30. Garren, M. et al. A bacterial pathogen uses dimethylsulfoniopropionate as a cue to target heat-stressed corals. *ISME J.* **8**, 999–1007 (2014).
31. Szurmant, H. & Ordal, G. W. Diversity in chemotaxis mechanisms among the bacteria and archaea. *Microbiol. Mol. Biol. Rev.* **68**, 301–319 (2004).
32. Wüchert, K. & Zhulin, I. B. Origins and diversification of a complex signal transduction system in prokaryotes. *Sci. Signal.* **3**, ra50 (2010).
33. Zehr, J. P., Weitz, J. S. & Joint, I. How microbes survive in the open ocean. *Science* **357**, 646–647 (2017).
34. McDougald, D., Rice, S. A., Barraud, N., Steinberg, P. D. & Kjelleberg, S. Should we stay or should we go: mechanisms and ecological consequences for biofilm dispersal. *Nat. Rev. Microbiol.* **10**, 39–50 (2012).
35. Yawata, Y., Carrara, F., Menolascina, F. & Stocker, R. Constrained optimal foraging by marine bacterioplankton on particulate organic matter. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **117**, 25571–25579 (2020).
This study reveals that a marine bacterium foraging on particulate nutrient hotspots optimizes nutrient uptake using rapid switches between chemotactic and non-motile lifestyles.
36. Paul, K., Nieto, V., Carlquist, W. C., Blair, D. F. & Harshey, R. M. The c-di-GMP binding protein YcgR controls flagellar motor direction and speed to affect chemotaxis by a “backstop brake” mechanism. *Mol. Cell* **38**, 128–139 (2010).
37. Fenchel, T. Microbial behavior in a heterogeneous world. *Science* **296**, 1068–1071 (2002).
38. Stocker, R. Marine microbes see a sea of gradients. *Science* **338**, 628–633 (2012).
39. McDonald, D. E., Pethick, D. W., Mullan, B. P. & Hampson, D. J. Increasing viscosity of the intestinal contents alters small intestinal structure and intestinal growth, and stimulates proliferation of enterotoxigenic *Escherichia coli* in newly-weaned pigs. *Br. J. Nutr.* **86**, 487–498 (2001).
40. Berg, H. C. & Turner Movement of microorganisms in viscous environments. *Nature* **278**, 349–351 (1979).
41. Borer, B., Tecon, R. & Or, D. Spatial organization of bacterial populations in response to oxygen and carbon counter-gradients in pore networks. *Nat. Commun.* **9**, 769 (2018).
42. Whitman, W. B., Coleman, D. C. & Wiebe, W. J. Prokaryotes: the unseen majority. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **95**, 6578–6583 (1998).
43. Raynaud, X. & Nunan, N. Spatial ecology of bacteria at the microscale in soil. *PLoS ONE* **9**, e87217 (2014).
44. Lindow, S. E. & Brandl, M. T. Microbiology of the phyllosphere. *Appl. Env. Microbiol.* **69**, 9 (2003).
45. Fernandez, V. I., Yawata, Y. & Stocker, R. A foraging mandala for aquatic microorganisms. *ISME J.* **13**, 563–575 (2019).
46. Purcell, E. M. Life at low Reynolds number. *Am. J. Phys.* **45**, 10 (1977).
47. Dusenbery, D. B. *Living at Micro Scale: The Unexpected Physics of Being Small* (Harvard Univ. Press, 2011).
48. Phillips, R. & Milo, R. *Cell Biology by the Numbers* (Garland Science, 2015).
49. Darnton, N. C., Turner, L., Rojevsky, S. & Berg, H. C. On torque and tumbling in swimming *Escherichia coli*. *J. Bacteriol.* **189**, 1756–1764 (2007).
50. Ryu, W. S., Berry, R. M. & Berg, H. C. Torque-generating units of the flagellar motor of *Escherichia coli* have a high duty ratio. *Nature* **403**, 444–446 (2000).
51. Chattopadhyay, S., Moldovan, R., Yeung, C. & Wu, X. L. Swimming efficiency of bacterium *Escherichia coli*. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **103**, 13712–13717 (2006).
52. Sowa, Y., Hotta, H., Homma, M. & Ishijima, A. Torque–speed relationship of the Na⁺-driven flagellar motor of *Vibrio alginolyticus*. *J. Mol. Biol.* **327**, 1043–1051 (2003).
53. Taylor, J. R. & Stocker, R. Trade-offs of chemotactic foraging in turbulent water. *Science* **338**, 675–679 (2012).
54. Govern, C. C. & ten Wolde, P. R. Optimal resource allocation in cellular sensing systems. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **111**, 17486–17491 (2014).
55. Sourjik, V. & Berg, H. C. Binding of the *Escherichia coli* response regulator CheY to its target measured in vivo by fluorescence resonance energy transfer. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **99**, 12669–12674 (2002).
56. Lan, G., Sartori, P., Neumann, S., Sourjik, V. & Tu, Y. The energy–speed–accuracy trade-off in sensory adaptation. *Nat. Phys.* **8**, 422–428 (2012).
57. Stouthamer, A. H. & Bettenhausen, C. W. A continuous culture study of an ATPase-negative mutant of *Escherichia coli*. *Arch. Microbiol.* **113**, 185–189 (1977).
58. Macnab, R. M. in *Escherichia coli and Salmonella Typhimurium: Cellular and Molecular Biology* Vol. 1 (eds Nerhardt, F. et al.) 732–759 (American Society for Microbiology, 1987).
59. Kempes, C. P. et al. Drivers of bacterial maintenance and minimal energy requirements. *Front. Microbiol.* **8**, 31 (2017).
60. Lynch, M. & Marinov, G. K. The bioenergetic costs of a gene. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **112**, 15690–15695 (2015).
61. Hoehler, T. M. & Jørgensen, B. B. Microbial life under extreme energy limitation. *Nat. Rev. Microbiol.* **11**, 83–94 (2013).
62. Boehm, A. et al. Second messenger-mediated adjustment of bacterial swimming velocity. *Cell* **141**, 107–116 (2010).
63. Fang, X. & Gomelsky, M. A post-translational, c-di-GMP-dependent mechanism regulating flagellar motility: c-di-GMP-dependent flagellum rotation bias. *Mol. Microbiol.* **76**, 1295–1305 (2010).
64. Sathyamoorthy, R. et al. To hunt or to rest: prey depletion induces a novel starvation survival strategy in bacterial predators. *ISME J.* **15**, 109–123 (2020).
65. Adler, J. & Templeton, B. The effect of environmental conditions on the motility of *Escherichia coli*. *J. Gen. Microbiol.* **46**, 175–184 (1967).
66. Berg, H. C. & Tedesco, P. M. Transient response to chemotactic stimuli in *Escherichia coli*. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **72**, 3235–3239 (1975).
67. Mitchell, J. G. The influence of cell size on marine bacterial motility and energetics. *Microb. Ecol.* **22**, 227–238 (1991).
68. Castro-Sowinski, S., Burdman, S., Matan, O. & Okon, Y. in *Plastics from Bacteria* Vol. 14 (ed. Chen, G. G.-Q.) 39–61 (Springer, 2010).
69. Walter, J. M., Greenfield, D., Bustamante, C. & Liphardt, J. Light-powering *Escherichia coli* with proteorhodopsin. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **104**, 2408–2412 (2007).
70. Gude, S. et al. Bacterial coexistence driven by motility and spatial competition. *Nature* **578**, 588–592 (2020).
This work presents evidence for a trade-off between motility and growth, which supports bacterial diversity through spatial segregation.
71. Ni, B., Colin, R., Link, H., Endres, R. G. & Sourjik, V. Growth-rate dependent resource investment in bacterial motile behavior quantitatively follows potential benefit of chemotaxis. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **117**, 595–601 (2020).
This work systematically compares the cost and benefit of chemotaxis in spatially extended and well-mixed environments.
72. Li, M. & Hazelbauer, G. L. Cellular stoichiometry of the components of the chemotaxis signaling complex. *J. Bacteriol.* **186**, 3687–3694 (2004).
73. Neumann, S., Hansen, C. H., Wingreen, N. S. & Sourjik, V. Differences in signalling by directly and indirectly binding ligands in bacterial chemotaxis. *EMBO J.* **29**, 3484–3495 (2010).
74. Akashi, H. & Gojorbori, T. Metabolic efficiency and amino acid composition in the proteomes of *Escherichia coli* and *Bacillus subtilis*. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **99**, 3695–3700 (2002).
75. Basan, M. et al. Overflow metabolism in *Escherichia coli* results from efficient proteome allocation. *Nature* **528**, 99–104 (2015).
76. Ni, B. et al. Evolutionary remodeling of bacterial motility checkpoint control. *Cell Rep.* **18**, 866–877 (2017).
77. Fraebel, D. T. et al. Environment determines evolutionary trajectory in a constrained phenotypic space. *eLife* **6**, e24669 (2017).
78. Honda, T. et al. Coordination of gene expression with cell size enables *Escherichia coli* to efficiently maintain motility across conditions. Preprint at *bioRxiv* <https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.05.12.443892> (2021).
79. Zampieri, M., Hörli, M., Hotz, F., Müller, N. F. & Sauer, U. Regulatory mechanisms underlying coordination of amino acid and glucose catabolism in *Escherichia coli*. *Nat. Commun.* **10**, 3354 (2019).
80. Zhao, Z. et al. Frequent pauses in *Escherichia coli* flagella elongation revealed by single cell real-time fluorescence imaging. *Nat. Commun.* **9**, 1885 (2018).

81. Zhuang, X. et al. Live-cell fluorescence imaging reveals dynamic production and loss of bacterial flagella. *Mol. Microbiol.* **114**, 279–291 (2020).
82. Chevanec, F. F. V. & Hughes, K. T. Coordinating assembly of a bacterial macromolecular machine. *Nat. Rev. Microbiol.* **6**, 455–465 (2008). **This work presents a classic overview of the gene regulatory pathway that controls flagella assembly in Gram-negative bacteria.**
83. Amsler, C. D., Cho, M. & Matsumura, P. Multiple factors underlying the maximum motility of *Escherichia coli* as cultures enter post-exponential growth. *J. Bacteriol.* **175**, 6238–6244 (1993).
84. Lopes, J. G. & Sourjik, V. Chemotaxis of *Escherichia coli* to major hormones and polyamines present in human gut. *ISME J.* **12**, 2736–2747 (2018).
85. Yang, J. et al. Biphasic chemotaxis of *Escherichia coli* to the microbiota metabolite indole. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **117**, 6114–6120 (2020).
86. Matz, C. & Jürgens, K. High motility reduces grazing mortality of planktonic bacteria. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* **71**, 921–929 (2005).
87. Cummings, L. A., Wilkerson, W. D., Bergsbaken, T. & Cookson, B. T. In vivo, *fliC* expression by *Salmonella enterica* serovar Typhimurium is heterogeneous, regulated by ClpX, and anatomically restricted. *Mol. Microbiol.* **61**, 795–809 (2006).
88. Yuan, J. & Berg, H. C. Ultrasensitivity of an adaptive bacterial motor. *J. Mol. Biol.* **425**, 1760–1764 (2013).
89. Lestas, I., Vinnicombe, G. & Paulsson, J. Fundamental limits on the suppression of molecular fluctuations. *Nature* **467**, 174–178 (2010).
90. Frankel, N. W. et al. Adaptability of non-genetic diversity in bacterial chemotaxis. *eLife* **3**, e03526 (2014).
91. Goldbeter, A. & Koshland, D. E. An amplified sensitivity arising from covalent modification in biological systems. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **78**, 6840–6844 (1981).
92. Waite, A. J. et al. Non-genetic diversity modulates population performance. *Mol. Syst. Biol.* **12**, 895 (2016).
93. Fu, X. et al. Spatial self-organization resolves conflicts between individuality and collective migration. *Nat. Commun.* **9**, 2177 (2018). **This sophisticated microfluidic study reveals that a chemotactic population may travel as a cohesive unit despite strong phenotypic heterogeneity within the population.**
94. Long, Z., Quaife, B., Salman, H. & Oltvai, Z. N. Cell–cell communication enhances bacterial chemotaxis toward external attractants. *Sci. Rep.* **7**, 12855 (2017).
95. Laganenka, L., Colin, R. & Sourjik, V. Chemotaxis towards autoinducer 2 mediates autoaggregation in *Escherichia coli*. *Nat. Commun.* **7**, 12984 (2016). **This study demonstrates that bacteria may chase self-generated gradients by producing quorum-sensing molecules.**
96. Park, S. et al. Influence of topology on bacterial social interaction. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **100**, 13910–13915 (2003).
97. Phan, T. V. et al. Bacterial route finding and collective escape in mazes and fractals. *Phys. Rev. X* **10**, 031017 (2020).
98. Waite, A. J., Frankel, N. W. & Emonet, T. Behavioral variability and phenotypic diversity in bacterial chemotaxis. *Annu. Rev. Biophys.* **47**, 595–616 (2018). **This work presents a review of the mechanisms underlying behavioural variation in bacterial chemotaxis and the consequences for chemotactic performance.**
99. Ackermann, M. A functional perspective on phenotypic heterogeneity in microorganisms. *Nat. Rev. Microbiol.* **13**, 497–508 (2015).
100. Bödi, Z. et al. Phenotypic heterogeneity promotes adaptive evolution. *PLoS Biol.* **15**, e2000644 (2017).
101. Seymour, J. R., Amin, S. A., Raina, J.-B. & Stocker, R. Zooming in on the phycosphere: the ecological interface for phytoplankton–bacteria relationships. *Nat. Microbiol.* **2**, 17065 (2017).
102. Weber, L., Gonzalez-Diaz, P., Armenteros, M. & Apprill, A. The coral ecosphere: a unique coral reef habitat that fosters coral–microbial interactions. *Limnol. Oceanogr.* **64**, 2373–2388 (2019).
103. Salek, M. M., Carrara, F., Fernandez, V., Guasto, J. S. & Stocker, R. Bacterial chemotaxis in a microfluidic T-maze reveals strong phenotypic heterogeneity in chemotactic sensitivity. *Nat. Commun.* **10**, 1877 (2019).
104. Ford, R. M. & Lauffenburger, D. A. Measurement of bacterial random motility and chemotaxis coefficients: II. Application of single-cell-based mathematical model. *Biotechnol. Bioeng.* **37**, 661–672 (1991).
105. Lambert, B. S., Fernandez, V. I. & Stocker, R. Motility drives bacterial encounter with particles responsible for carbon export throughout the ocean. *Limnol. Oceanogr. Lett.* **4**, 113–118 (2019).
106. Stomka, J., Alcolombri, U., Secchi, E., Stocker, R. & Fernandez, V. I. Encounter rates between bacteria and small sinking particles. *N. J. Phys.* **22**, 043016 (2020).
107. Hein, A. M. & Martin, B. T. Information limitation and the dynamics of coupled ecological systems. *Nat. Ecol. Evol.* **4**, 82–90 (2020).
108. Kiorboe, T., Grossart, H.-P., Ploug, H. & Tang, K. Mechanisms and rates of bacterial colonization of sinking aggregates. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* **68**, 3996–4006 (2002).
109. Viswanathan, G. M. et al. Optimizing the success of random searches. *Nature* **401**, 911–914 (1999).
110. Korobkova, E., Emonet, T., Vilar, J. M. G., Shimizu, T. S. & Cluzel, P. From molecular noise to behavioural variability in a single bacterium. *Nature* **428**, 574–578 (2004).
111. Tu, Y. & Grinstein, G. How white noise generates power-law switching in bacterial flagellar motors. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **4**, 208101 (2005).
112. Huo, H., He, R., Zhang, R. & Yuan, J. Swimming *Escherichia coli* explore the environment by Lévy walk. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* **87**, e02429–20 (2021).
113. Keegstra, J. M. et al. Phenotypic diversity and temporal variability in a bacterial signaling network revealed by single-cell FRET. *eLife* **6**, e27455 (2017).
114. Colin, R. & Sourjik, V. Multiple sources of slow activity fluctuations in a bacterial chemosensory network. *eLife* **6**, e26796 (2017).
115. Karin, O. & Alon, U. Temporal fluctuations in chemotaxis gain implements a simulated tempering strategy for efficient navigation in complex environments. *SSRN Electron. J.* **24**, 102796 (2021).
116. Carey, J. N. et al. Regulated stochasticity in a bacterial signaling network permits tolerance to a rapid environmental change. *Cell* **173**, 196–207.e14 (2018).
117. Kamino, K., Keegstra, J. M., Long, J., Emonet, T. & Shimizu, T. S. Adaptive tuning of cell sensory diversity without changes in gene expression. *Sci. Adv.* **6**, eabc1087 (2020). **This study shows that a bacterial population increases chemotactic bed-hedging when environmental signals are unavailable, but suppresses the sensory diversity when a traceable signal is presented.**
118. Bassler, B. L. & Losick, R. Bacterially speaking. *Cell* **125**, 237–246 (2006).
119. Mukherjee, S. & Bassler, B. L. Bacterial quorum sensing in complex and dynamically changing environments. *Nat. Rev. Microbiol.* **17**, 371–382 (2019).
120. Budrene, E. O. & Berg, H. C. Dynamics of formation of symmetrical patterns by chemotactic bacteria. *Nature* **376**, 49–53 (1995).
121. Ben-Jacob, E., Cohen, I. & Levine, H. Cooperative self-organization of microorganisms. *Adv. Phys.* **49**, 395–554 (2000).
122. Adler, J. Chemotaxis in bacteria. *Science* **153**, 708–716 (1966).
123. Keller, E. F. & Segel, L. A. Model for chemotaxis. *J. Theor. Biol.* **30**, 225–234 (1971).
124. Saragosti, J. et al. Directional persistence of chemotactic bacteria in a traveling concentration wave. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **108**, 16235–16240 (2011).
125. Mattingly & Emonet, T. The balancing act of growth and expansion. *Nature* **575**, 602–603 (2019).
126. Liu, W., Cremer, J., Li, D., Hwa, T. & Liu, C. An evolutionarily stable strategy to colonize spatially extended habitats. *Nature* **575**, 664–668 (2019). **This study reveals that chemotactic strains selected for different speeds of range expansion in semi-solid agar can stably coexist.**
127. Hui, S. et al. Quantitative proteomic analysis reveals a simple strategy of global resource allocation in bacteria. *Mol. Syst. Biol.* **11**, 784 (2015).
128. Maser, A., Peebo, K., Villu, R. & Nahku, R. Amino acids are key substrates to *Escherichia coli* BW25113 for achieving high specific growth rate. *Res. Microbiol.* **171**, 185–193 (2020).
129. Yang, Y. et al. Relation between chemotaxis and consumption of amino acids in bacteria. *Mol. Microbiol.* **96**, 1272–1282 (2015). **This study is a pioneering work on the relation between chemotaxis and metabolism, where the relationship between amino acid uptake preference and chemotactic affinity in *E. coli* and *B. subtilis* is studied.**
130. Cadotte, M. W. et al. On testing the competition–colonization trade-off in a multispecies assemblage. *Am. Nat.* **168**, 704–709 (2006).
131. Amarasekare, P. Competitive coexistence in spatially structured environments: a synthesis. *Ecol. Lett.* **6**, 1109–1122 (2003).
132. Levins, R. & Culver, D. Regional coexistence of species and competition between rare species. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **68**, 1246–1248 (1971).
133. Yawata, Y. et al. Competition–dispersal tradeoff ecologically differentiates recently speciated marine bacterioplankton populations. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **111**, 5622–5627 (2014).
134. Narla, A. V., Cremer, J. & Hwa, T. A traveling-wave solution for bacterial chemotaxis with growth. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **118**, e2105138118 (2021). **This work develops a comprehensive mathematical framework describing migrating bands of bacteria driven by growth and chemotaxis that is applicable to many environments.**
135. Bassler, B. L., Gibbons, P. J., Yu, C. & Roseman, S. Chemotaxis to chitin oligosaccharides by *Vibrio furnissi*. *J. Biol. Chem.* **266**, 24268–24275 (1991).
136. Konishi, H., Hio, M., Kobayashi, M., Takase, R. & Hashimoto, W. Bacterial chemotaxis towards polysaccharide pectin by pectin-binding protein. *Sci. Rep.* **10**, 3977 (2020).
137. Alcolombri, U. et al. Sinking enhances the degradation of organic particles by marine bacteria. *Nat. Geosci.* **14**, 775–780 (2021).
138. D’Souza, G. G., Povolo, V. R., Keegstra, J. M., Stocker, R. & Ackermann, M. Nutrient complexity triggers transitions between solitary and colonial growth in bacterial populations. *ISME J.* **1**, 1 (2021).
139. Nesper, J. et al. Cyclic di-GMP differentially tunes a bacterial flagellar motor through a novel class of CheY-like regulators. *eLife* **6**, e28842 (2017).
140. Basan, M. et al. A universal trade-off between growth and lag in fluctuating environments. *Nature* **584**, 470–474 (2020).
141. Nguyen, J. et al. A distinct growth physiology enhances bacterial growth under rapid nutrient fluctuations. *Nat. Commun.* **12**, 3662 (2021).
142. Costello, E. K., Stagaman, K., Dethlefsen, L., Bohannan, B. J. M. & Relman, D. A. The application of ecological theory toward an understanding of the human microbiome. *Science* **336**, 1255–1262 (2012).
143. Cordero, O. X. & Datta, M. S. Microbial interactions and community assembly at microscale. *Curr. Opin. Microbiol.* **31**, 227–234 (2016).
144. Rusconi, R., Garren, M. & Stocker, R. Microfluidics expands the frontiers of microbial ecology. *Annu. Rev. Biophys.* **43**, 65–91 (2014).
145. Lambert, B. S. et al. A microfluidics-based in situ chemotaxis assay to study the behaviour of aquatic microbial communities. *Nat. Microbiol.* **2**, 1344–1349 (2017).
146. Clerc, E. E., Raina, J.-B., Lambert, B. S., Seymour, J. & Stocker, R. In situ chemotaxis assay to examine microbial behavior in aquatic ecosystems. *J. Vis. Exp.* **159**, e61062 (2020).
147. Pleška, M., Jordan, D., Frenzt, Z., Xue, B. & Leibler, S. Nongenetic individuality, changeability, and inheritance in bacterial behavior. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **118**, e2023322118 (2021).
148. Figueroa-Morales, N. et al. 3D spatial exploration by *E. coli* echoes motor temporal variability. *Phys. Rev. X* **10**, 021004 (2020).
149. Hazelbauer, G. L. Bacterial chemotaxis: the early years of molecular studies. *Annu. Rev. Microbiol.* **66**, 285–303 (2012).
150. Adler, J., Hazelbauer, G. L. & Dahl, M. M. Chemotaxis toward sugars in *Escherichia coli*. *J. Bacteriol.* **115**, 824–847 (1973).
151. Mesibov, R. & Adler, J. Chemotaxis toward amino acids in *Escherichia coli*. *J. Bacteriol.* **112**, 12 (1972).
152. Dekel, E. & Alon, U. Optimality and evolutionary tuning of the expression level of a protein. *Nature* **436**, 588–592 (2005).
153. Erickson, D. W. et al. A global resource allocation strategy governs growth transition kinetics of *Escherichia coli*. *Nature* **551**, 119–123 (2017).
154. Berg, H. C. & Purcell, E. M. Physics of chemoreception. *Biophys. J.* **20**, 193–219 (1977).
155. Mora, T. & Wingreen, N. S. Limits of sensing temporal concentration changes by single cells. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **104**, 248101 (2010).
156. Brumley, D. R. et al. Bacteria push the limits of chemotactic precision to navigate dynamic chemical

- gradients. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **116**, 10792–10797 (2019).
157. Mattingly, H. H., Kamino, K., Machta, B. B. & Emonet, T. *Escherichia coli* chemotaxis is information limited. *Nat. Phys.* **17**, 1426–1431 (2021).
 158. Clausnitzer, D., Micali, G., Neumann, S., Sourjik, V. & Endres, R. G. Predicting chemical environments of bacteria from receptor signaling. *PLoS Comput. Biol.* **10**, e1003870 (2014).
 159. Flores, M., Shimizu, T. S., ten Wolde, P. R. & Tostevin, F. Signaling noise enhances chemotactic drift of *E. coli*. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **109**, 148101 (2012).
 160. Okubo, A. & Levin, S. A. *Diffusion and Ecological Problems: Modern Perspectives* Vol. 14 (Springer, 2001).
 161. Fisher, R. A. The wave of advance of advantageous genes. *Ann. Eugen.* **7**, 355–369 (1937).
 162. Kolmogorov, A., Petrovskii, I. & Piskunov, N. Study of a diffusion equation that is related to the growth of a quality of matter and its application to a biological problem. *Mosc. Univ. Math. Bull.* **1**, 1–26 (1937).

163. Giometto, A., Rinaldo, A., Carrara, F. & Altermatt, F. Emerging predictable features of replicated biological invasion fronts. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **111**, 297–301 (2014).
164. Gandhi, S. R., Yurtsev, E. A., Korolev, K. S. & Gore, J. Range expansions transition from pulled to pushed waves as growth becomes more cooperative in an experimental microbial population. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **113**, 6922–6927 (2016).
165. Painter, K. J. Mathematical models for chemotaxis and their applications in self-organisation phenomena. *J. Theor. Biol.* **481**, 162–182 (2019).

Acknowledgements

The authors thank all cited authors for the work highlighted in this Review and apologize to those not cited for length reasons. They are grateful to U. Alcolombri, Z. Landry, J. Nguyen, C. Martinez-Pérez and J. Wheeler for critical reading of the manuscript, and to V. Fernandez, N. Norris and U. Sauer for stimulating discussions. They thank R. Naisbit for scientific editing. The authors were supported by the Simons Foundation through the Principles of Microbial Ecosystems

(PriME) collaboration (grant 542395) and the Swiss National Science Foundation's National Centre of Competence in Research (NCCR) Microbiomes (no. 51NF40_180575 to R.S.).

Author contributions

J.M.K. and F.C. researched data for the article. All authors contributed to the discussion of the content, wrote the article and reviewed and edited the manuscript before submission.

Competing interests

The authors declare no competing interests.

Peer review information

Nature Reviews Microbiology and the authors acknowledge Terence Hwa and the other, anonymous, reviewers for their contribution to the peer review of this work.

Publisher's note

Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

© Springer Nature Limited 2022