

Using Game Theory for Real-Time Behavioral Dynamics in Microscopic Populations with Noisy Signaling

Adam Noel*, Yuting Fang[†], Nan Yang[†], Dimitrios Makrakis[‡], and Andrew W. Eckford[§]

*School of Engineering, University of Warwick, Coventry, UK

[†]Research School of Engineering, Australian National University, Canberra, ACT, Australia

[‡]School of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science, University of Ottawa, Ottawa, ON, Canada

[§]Department of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science, York University, Toronto, ON, Canada

Abstract—This article introduces the application of game theory to understand noisy real-time signaling and the resulting behavioral dynamics in microscopic populations such as bacteria and other cells. It presents a bridge between the fields of molecular communication and microscopic game theory. Molecular communication uses conventional communication engineering theory and techniques to study and design systems that use chemical molecules as information carriers. Microscopic game theory models interactions within and between populations of cells and microorganisms. Integrating these two fields provides unique opportunities to understand and control microscopic populations that have imperfect signal propagation. Two case studies, namely bacteria quorum sensing and tumor cell signaling, are presented with example games to demonstrate the potential of this approach.

I. INTRODUCTION

For decades, communication engineers have applied mathematics and signal processing to design and understand communication networks. Wired and wireless networks have permeated into our everyday lives by connecting humanity and making it easier for us to receive and share information. By controlling the end-to-end communication process, engineers have built and continue to design systems that are fast, efficient, and reliable. However, communication system design is not exclusive to engineers. Nature has also evolved many strategies for living things to signal each other and share information.

While it is common knowledge that many species (including ourselves) have natural methods to communicate, some of us may not appreciate the extensiveness and complexity of communication in the microscopic domain, nor the important role it plays, in both our evolution and our everyday health. Signals are being regularly transmitted within and between individual cells and microorganisms. These signals may not be sending packets of data in the conventional communication sense, but nevertheless they enable conventional communication applications such as sensing, coordination, and control. Thus, we can adapt conventional communication engineering theory and techniques to study these signaling mechanisms and understand how they work.

An emerging research field in this direction is *molecular communication*, which considers the use of chemical

molecules as information carriers and where traditional communication engineering does not directly apply; see [1]. The growth of this field has been primarily driven by two factors. The first is the ubiquitous use of molecules by cells and microorganisms. The second is the incredible potential to use molecules in new devices and networks where traditional communication designs are not suitable, such as for fighting neurological diseases or for sending messages within microfluidic chips.

An engineer typically expects that a transmitter and a receiver will function as designed. However, unlike modern wireless networks and other communication systems, engineers have less top-down control over systems that include cells and microorganisms. Reasons for this include the limited intelligence of individual cells and the presence of distinct sources of noise. The strength of noise sources, including molecular diffusion and chemical reaction kinetics, are often time-varying and signal-dependent (e.g., see Fig. 1). These characteristics lead to the following problems:

- 1) If we want to send a signal to a natural microorganism, such as an individual bacterium, then we are constrained to using (noisy) signaling mechanisms that can propagate in microorganism environments and which they would understand.
- 2) Even if signals were correctly received and detected, we may not be able to guarantee that an individual microorganism behaves as we expect. Microorganisms do not typically live in isolation but in diverse environments where there can be many species (e.g., see Fig. 2). Often, these organisms are sharing signals that influence their behavior, yet they will have imperfect knowledge about each other.

An individual microorganism is not a rational thinker, but it would have evolved to optimize its response to noisy environmental signals. Thus, understanding and controlling microscopic populations requires more than “simply” applying communication theory principles. We must also account for the *real-time behavioral dynamics* of the population, i.e., the individuals’ behavioral responses to repeated interactions, which is the subject of this article.

The need to predict and control behavioral dynamics sug-




Fig. 1. **Noisiness of a diffusion wave.** Even in a stable uniform environment without obstacles or chemical reactions, molecular diffusion is a noisy process. The distribution of molecules observed versus time at some distance from an instantaneous point release of molecules is shown. The color bar on the right is the legend for the distribution values, which add up to 1 for each sampling time. The observed diffusion signal has a variance that is proportional to the time-varying strength of the expected signal (solid white line).




Fig. 2. **Signaling in a diverse microscopic environment.** Microscopic environments can be home to many different species of cells, including animal cells (Type A) and bacterial cells (Types B and C). Even within an individual species, different phenotypes (variations) express different observable traits (e.g., different shades of cell type B). It is common for cells of the same species to communicate with each other (arrows with solid lines), but cross-species communication is also very common, whether intended or not (arrows with dashed lines). Many examples are reviewed in [2].

gests the application of *game theory* [3]. Game theory is a tool for understanding the interactions between rational *players* whose actions (i.e., *strategies*) are influenced by their perceived gains (i.e., *payoffs*). Unlike conventional optimization, game theory models how players adjust their behavior in response to the behavior (or *anticipated* behavior) of other players. For example, in the classical *Prisoner's Dilemma*, two criminals have an incentive to testify against each other,

even though the global optimum is for neither of them to testify. Game theoretic models are usually described in terms of strategies and decisions, but they are also applicable (and arguably more so) to microbial populations, even though they are not “rational” beings. This is precisely because their behaviors are driven by evolution and responses to external signals; see [4].

This article serves as an introduction for applying game theory to behavioral dynamics in microscopic environments with noisy signaling. We propose combining the ideas of game theory for microorganisms with the communication engineering approach from molecular communication. The existing applications of game theory have generally focused on evolution and not accounted for the imperfect propagation of physical signals. Studies of molecular communication have focused on stochastic signal propagation but have not considered behavioral dynamics. This article seeks to bridge this gap and demonstrate that unique insights and engineering opportunities can result.

Our long term objective is to design systems that use chemical signaling, where we can predict and control behavior between autonomous devices. If we can understand the system as a game, then we can ask how to modify the game in order to achieve a desired result. For example, we could seek how to maintain a healthy system state, how to mitigate disease, or how to efficiently allocate resources for effective signaling. Two specific scenarios that we describe in this article as case studies with sample games are quorum sensing by bacteria and signaling by cancer cells. Related work, which did not consider the *control* of behavioral dynamics, includes [5], where bacteria decide whether to form links with other bacteria and share resources, and [6], where two transmitters either compete or cooperate when sending molecules to a common receiver. Cooperation between bacteria for carrying information is also considered in work including [7].

The remainder of this article is as follows. First, we summarize existing examples of games and game-theoretic analysis in microbial systems. These games highlight the relevance of real-time behavioral dynamics to competition and cooperation. Next, we highlight the unique game properties that apply to real-time behavioral dynamics in these environments. Finally, we demonstrate the potential to study and control real-time behavioral dynamics through case studies of bacteria quorum sensing and cancer cell signaling.

II. MICROSCOPIC SYSTEM DYNAMICS

Now we briefly discuss examples of game theoretic applications and related analysis in microscopic systems. These examples demonstrate progress in understanding the complex and dynamic interactions within and between microbial populations, and enable us to draw inspiration to control the real-time dynamics of such populations when they rely on noisy signaling.

Generally, microbial environments are both diverse and dynamic; they are often home to multiple species, including bacteria and animal cells, and their populations can migrate and evolve both spatially and temporally. There are many

examples of “games” where the players are living cells that compete or cooperate with each other. A common refrain that we observe in [4] is the importance of the spatial distribution; a homogeneous model might only predict that a single behavior survives, whereas non-uniform spatial distributions can also lead to system stability by providing suitable *local* interactions, i.e., the best behavior for an individual cell depends on the actions of its immediate neighbors. We now consider some examples.

A. Metabolic Games

There are different metabolic pathways for breaking down sugars into usable energy, including respiration and fermentation. These pathways have different effective rates and different efficiencies (e.g., fermentation is faster but less efficient). We can view a cell’s pathway as its strategy, and it is possible for a cell to switch pathways or use multiple pathways simultaneously. [4] reviewed games that sought to understand why different pathways have evolved and how different pathways can be maintained within a stable population. For example, it has been shown that fermentation can be favored in a spatially homogeneous environment that is analogous to the Prisoner’s dilemma; each individual benefits by consuming sugar as fast as it can. However, by accounting for local interactions, it can be shown why and how a mixed population of fermenters and respirators can coexist.

B. Tumor Growth

Recent research has used evolutionary game theory to understand the growth and progression of malignant tumors. [4] reviewed games that modeled competition between healthy and tumor cells, and between different types of tumor cells. For example, a tumor can grow by having an equilibrium between cells that are more effective at dividing and cells that are more effective at moving.

In addition to metabolic games and tumor growth, [4] considers how different variations of the same species take turns dominating a population, how different species cooperate to break down resources, and how cells send information with pheromones. The sensitivity to spatial heterogeneity in all of these cases suggests that molecular communication analysis (which models noisy signal propagation between local individuals) is relevant for microscopic populations.

C. Quorum Sensing

On the topic of local signaling, a common mechanism for real-time coordination amongst bacteria is quorum sensing (QS). In QS, each bacterium both releases and detects signaling molecules to estimate the population density. When the density is sufficient, the bacteria initiate collaborative actions, such as biofilm formation. These actions require more effort from each bacterium but can lead to a greater payoff for the community (i.e., a higher chance of survival). Furthermore, the study of QS has applications beyond bacteria. For example, [8] drew analogies between QS and the behavior of cancer cells.

Generally, QS mechanisms can be quite complex. [2] described many non-trivial signaling and behavioral dynamics

associated with QS, including the use of multiple types of molecules, crosstalk between different species (see Fig. 2), and eavesdropping by cells that do not release signaling molecules. There are opportunities to model these scenarios as games (as we also discuss later in this article), and also to draw inspiration from communication engineering concepts such as network security and dealing with interference. Work that has analyzed signaling between bacteria as a game includes [5], [9]. [5] studied the formation of links between pairs of bacteria as a repeated game and whether a colony of connected bacteria could form. [9] presented a cooperation game that accounts for the cost to generate signaling molecules and the cost of cooperating. However, existing analysis does not tend to model physical molecular signals and their stochastic signaling dynamics.

III. PROPERTIES OF REAL-TIME MICROSCOPIC GAMES

By focusing on the *control* of *real-time* behavior under *noisy* signaling, our proposed game theoretic approach has features that are distinct from existing analysis of microscopic systems. Here, we highlight both the unique properties of the game theoretic components and the differences in how solutions could be obtained.

A. Players

Microorganisms qualify as players, even though they are not rational decision-makers. While many games in biology are modeled at the population level, microscopic games that account for local interactions require that the game be modeled at the level of individual cells. This was also needed for the spatially heterogeneous games reviewed in [4]. Furthermore, due to the limited intelligence of the individual microorganisms and the impact of information uncertainty due to noisy signaling via stochastic reaction-diffusion, we are interested in games with players that have *imperfect real-time* information about each other. For example, a microorganism will most likely not know the precise number of players nor the actual behavior of each player. This is especially true when the population changes, e.g., players enter or leave via motility, cell division, and death. We also seek to manipulate the propagation of the molecular communication signals so that we can tune the perceived information and control the players.

B. Strategies

In biological systems, individual players are typically treated in aggregate and one describes the distribution of strategies in a population, e.g., what fraction is cooperating and what fraction is cheating. For microscopic games, we should also consider the spatial distribution of strategies, as emphasized in [4]. Additionally, to be *real-time*, we seek to model the dynamics of *individual* behavior, where a player might change its behavior due to its ongoing (but noisy) assessment of the environment. Individual dynamics are common in general game theory (as *repeated games*; see [10]). However, microscopic game theory problems usually assume that a player’s behavior is fixed and variations are only achieved in future

generations via mutations. Part of the novelty of our approach is having a game where a microscopic player's strategy can change within its lifetime.

C. Payoffs

As in existing microscopic games (and in games more generally), the payoffs in our approach are the net rewards that players receive as the outcome of the game, as a function of the strategies of all of the players. Whereas a player's strategy depends on *perceived* information about the system, which can be incorrect, the payoffs depend on the *actual* current system state. Nevertheless, to be relevant to our approach, a suitable payoff model should include the following:

- 1) Accommodate the spatial distribution of players. For example, the reward for a player that is adjacent to a cheater may be less than that for a player that is surrounded by cooperators.
- 2) Vary with time, both to model the temporal behavior of the players, and also to account for a dynamic environment. For example, the players may consume a resource that depletes and replenishes over time.
- 3) Impose a cost on a player *changing* its behavior. Obviously, different behaviors should have different costs (e.g., cooperation is generally modeled to be more resource intensive than cheating). However, it is also reasonable for a player to spend resources in order to switch from one behavior to another. For microorganisms, this could be represented as the time and energy needed to alter gene expression.
- 4) Be tunable. We seek to control the environment by altering the cost or the reward for particular behaviors. For example, we might make cooperation more expensive in order to prevent the formation of a biofilm.

D. Solutions

Most biological games, including microscopic games, are studied using evolutionary game theory; see [3], [4], [10]. This means that the solution of interest is the Evolutionarily Stable Strategy (ESS), which is a distribution of strategies that remains stable over generations of players. This framework is consistent with a model where a player's behavior is fixed over its lifetime.

For us to consider real-time games between dynamic microscopic players, the similar but distinct *Nash Equilibrium* (NE) framework is more appropriate. When a NE is achieved, no player can benefit by changing its strategy (unless, of course, the game itself changes). Thus, from the context of solutions, we are interested in how we could guide a microbial population towards a particular NE or how we could convert a desired system state into a NE. For example, if the conditions leading to the formation of a tumor was a NE, then we might seek to prevent this NE by making the requisite cooperation between cancer cells a non-equilibrium state.

IV. SAMPLE APPLICATIONS OF GAME THEORY AND MOLECULAR COMMUNICATION TO MICROORGANISMS

We complete this article with two practical case studies where we seek to integrate game theory and molecular

communication to control behavioral dynamics in microscopic populations. For each case study, we describe example games with both one and multiple species. A summary of the case studies, the associated games, and some relevant open problems are listed in Table I. The first case study considers quorum sensing to achieve cooperation within a bacterial population. We completed a preliminary study of this scenario with a simple resource sharing game in [11]. The second case study considers signals from tumor cells and their interactions with healthy tissue and the immune system. The two studies demonstrate the breadth of opportunities for integrating stochastic signal propagation with game theory. Game theory enables us to model complex interdependent behavior, and molecular communication analysis enables us to describe the imperfect local information due to stochastic signal propagation.

A. Case Study 1: Bacteria Signaling

We are particularly inspired by QS as an implementation for communication between bacteria and are interested in its influence on real-time behavior. For the first case study, we consider a resource sharing game where the players are all members of the same QS population, and then an eavesdropping game with multiple species where only one population uses QS signals. Applications of the corresponding models might lead to improved strategies for combating antibiotic resistance or improving the health of essential bacterial communities.

1) *Resource Sharing Game*: Consider a resource sharing game where bacteria consume a common resource (e.g., food) and they could work together to access the resource. For example, the bacteria could cooperate to coordinate an attack on a larger organism or to optimize nutrient extraction via cross-feeding (see [4]). In QS, each bacterium estimates the size of the population. We are interested in how the uncertainty in the population (both size and state) affects the dynamics of the population. If we assume that all bacteria behave in their own interest, then any individual bacterium would only commit the additional resources necessary for cooperation if it would benefit from doing so, or if it "*believes*" that it would benefit.

We considered a simple model of this game in [11], which included only some of the distinctive game properties identified in this article. We assumed that there was a constant amount of resource available, imposed diminishing returns as the number of cooperators grew, and included mechanisms to either punish or reward selfish players (i.e., those deciding to not cooperate). An approximation for diffusion was used for each bacterium to estimate the size of the population and the number of cooperators, such that bacteria separated by a large distance were more difficult to detect and classify. Even with the simple model, the results in [11] suggested that uncertainty in the size and behavior of the rest of the population can overcome a lack of explicit coordination and lead to cooperation. Thus, we might manipulate a microbial system towards cooperation, in spite of (or even perhaps due to) unreliable signaling.

In other variations of this game, some bacteria might not fully participate in the resource sharing process, either by

TABLE I
CASE STUDY SUMMARY WITH GAME COMPONENTS AND SAMPLE OPEN PROBLEMS.

| Case Study | Game | Players | Strategy | Payoff | Sample Open Problem(s) |
|----------------------|--------------------------------|---------------|---|---|--|
| Bacteria Signaling | Resource Sharing | QS Bacteria | Whether to signal and whether to cooperate | Signaling and cooperation both increase cost but cooperation can increase reward | How many bacteria need to signal for cooperation to occur? Can we predict the fraction of cooperators? |
| | Inter-Species Eavesdropping | QS Bacteria | Strength of signaling molecules and agreeing whether to cooperate | Stronger signaling is more expensive and makes quorum easier to reach but is easier to detect by others | Can QS population be manipulated to make it easier for the silent cells to detect? How much does this depend on the proximity between the two populations? |
| | | Silent Cells | Whether to act against quorum | Action is expensive but increases reward if bacteria are present | Can silent cells' sensitivity to detect QS improve without wasting resources to act on non-cooperating populations? |
| Tumor Cell Signaling | Diffusion Control | Tumor Cells | Agree whether to stimulate healthy tissue | Stimulation is expensive and lowers diffusion, which increases protection but reduces nutrient levels | Can we discourage stimulation of healthy tissue by increasing the cost? Does the stimulation signal depend on each cell's perceived proximity to the healthy tissue? |
| | Competition with Immune System | Tumor Cells | Agree whether to stimulate healthy tissue | Stimulation is expensive and lowers diffusion, which increases protection but reduces nutrient levels | Does a tumor cell population perceive the actions of the immune system and adjust its own behavior accordingly? |
| | | Immune System | Magnitude and type of immune response | Developing a response is expensive but increases capacity to detect and fight cancer at early stage | Can we manipulate the immune system to make cancer cells easier to detect? Is this best achieved by amplifying adaptive responses, or is this too expensive? |

never releasing QS molecules or never cooperating. These actions make them “free-riders” of any benefit from the cooperating population. This has been observed experimentally in mutants with no QS mechanism in [12], and is particularly beneficial to a free-rider if the cost to transmit the QS signal or the cost to cooperate is expensive. A bacterium can still benefit from cooperation if there are still enough bacteria cooperating in the quorum. However, the population estimation will be perturbed and if there are too many free-riders then the bacteria that are still signaling are wasting energy. Open questions include (1) whether game theory can enable us to predict a stable number of free-riders, and (2) whether mechanisms exist to prevent too many bacteria from free-riding.

2) *Inter-Species Eavesdropping Game*: As we noted previously, QS can include signaling between different species and enable one population to eavesdrop on another. For example, [2] discussed how bacteria such as *E. coli* and even animals such as *C. elegans* do not generate QS signals but can intercept them from other species. Through “silent” observation, *E. coli* can mount “stealth attacks” on hosts and *C. elegans* can be both attracted to food sources and repelled by pathogens. With these examples in mind, we can consider a game where the QS bacteria have to also decide the strength of their QS signals. A stronger signal can make achieving cooperation more reliable but at the cost of making detection by other populations easier. The members of the eavesdropping population have to decide whether the noisy QS signal is sufficient to take action against the QS bacteria population. Parameters of interest include the size and proximity of these populations, as these would influence the reliability of the signals as well as the payoffs.

We can consider whether the bacteria could be manipulated to make them easier to detect and whether the eavesdropping population can adjust its sensitivity to the QS signal to avoid taking action and wasting energy when it is unnecessary.

B. Case Study 2: Tumor Cell Signaling

Our next case study considers a more diverse environment that includes cancer cells, healthy cells, and immune system cells. Cancerous tumors are groups of cells that undergo abnormal growth and can invade surrounding tissue. They can eventually metastasize and spread throughout the body, at which stage they are very difficult to treat. Thus, we are particularly interested in the formation and behavior of pre-malignant tumors. For this case study, we consider a diffusion control game that is played by the tumor cell population, and then a more complex game where we add the immune system cells as players. The proposed games use signaling and decision-making at the cellular level to gain insight into cancer development and treatment.

1) *Diffusion Control Game*: Tumors are more than just cells that grow and divide without restraint; they are complex communities that signal among themselves and with the surrounding environment. As we previously noted, [8] observed that evolutionary strategies used by bacteria can also be identified within tumors. For example, when bacteria create a biofilm, they increase their resistance to external threats such as antibiotics but this also reduces the intake of nutrients and oxygen. Tumor cells undergo a similar trade-off when they stimulate surrounding cells to both produce more




Fig. 3. **Signaling by tumor cells.** Cancer tumor cells (grey) are capable of manipulating nearby healthy tissue cells (white) to produce infrastructure that protects the tumor and shields it from detection by the immune system. The signaling by the tumor to the tissue (represented by arrows with dashed lines) results in an environment that has similarities to that achieved by bacteria communities that create biofilms; see [8].

extracellular matrix and increase their metabolic rates, which simultaneously reduces access of molecules to the tumor via diffusion (which reduces the ability of the immune system to identify the cancerous cells via antigens) while maintaining energy needs (see Fig. 3).

Along this direction, we could model tumor growth as a diffusion control game where tumor cells choose whether to stimulate the surround tissue, i.e., whether to reduce the diffusion rate (which reduces the ambient nutrient levels but decreases the chance of detection by the immune system). The player model could include a tumor cell's uncertainty about its population size and its own location in the tumor relative to the surrounding tissue. These parameters could be estimated via molecular communication, i.e., inferred from the concentrations of molecules in the vicinity of the player. The payoff model could include the cost of signaling to the tissue while showing the expected trade-off between detectability and access to nutrients. This game could help us understand and mitigate the conditions where healthy tissue supporting the tumor is an attainable NE, for example by increasing the cost needed to reliably communicate with the healthy tissue.

2) *Competition with Immune System:* We can extend the diffusion control game by adding the immune system, which provides both adaptive and innate protection against external threats; see [13]. An initial game theoretic model in this direction could consider the energy costs associated with building an adaptive immune response versus the response's capacity to detect and fight cancer before a tumor can metastasize. The dynamics of this model would include (1) determining the number of adaptive cell players to respond to the detection of a tumor, (2) the strategy of each adaptive immune cell to identify and respond to the tumor, and (3) the tumor cells' efforts to protect themselves and whether they are able to detect the immune system's behavior. Each of these components would rely on noisy observations of propagating signals, e.g., the probability of tumor detection would rely on how easily antigens can reach and identify the tumor.

There is significant potential to explore this model, as [13] reviewed epidemiological studies demonstrating that patients with compromised adaptive immunity can be at a *reduced*

risk for some types of cancers, and environmental conditions can actually prompt innate immune cells to *promote* tumor growth by suppressing an adaptive response. This suggests that individual immune cells are indeed players that could be manipulated to fight or support a tumor. Furthermore, the model could be integrated with clinical tools such as immunotherapy, where the adaptive immune system is modified to improve immunity against a particular target; see [14].

V. CONCLUSIONS

In this article we identified opportunities to integrate game theoretic modeling with noisy signaling for real-time behavioral dynamics in microscopic environments. Integrating game theory and molecular communication can help us understand and possibly manipulate the competitive dynamics at a physical scale that accounts for the actions taken by individual cells. We identified how game theoretic models based on our approach are distinct from existing microscopic games in that they account for both *real-time* and *local* behavior with *noisy* information. We presented bacteria resource sharing and tumor cell signaling as two sample scenarios whose analysis and understanding could benefit from this integrated approach and potentially lead to control. We anticipate that many other microscopic scenarios could also benefit.

REFERENCES

- [1] N. Farsad, H. B. Yilmaz, A. Eckford, C.-B. Chae, and W. Guo, "A comprehensive survey of recent advancements in molecular communication," *IEEE Commun. Surveys Tuts.*, vol. 18, no. 3, pp. 1887–1919, 2016.
- [2] S. Atkinson and P. Williams, "Quorum sensing and social networking in the microbial world," *J. Royal Soc. Interface*, vol. 6, no. 40, pp. 959–978, Nov. 2009.
- [3] M. Broom and J. Rychtar, *Game-Theoretical Models in Biology*. CRC Press, 2013.
- [4] S. Hummert, K. Bohl, D. Basanta, A. Deutsch, S. Werner, G. Theißen, A. Schroeter, and S. Schuster, "Evolutionary game theory: Cells as players," *Mol. BioSyst.*, vol. 10, no. 12, pp. 3044–3065, Aug. 2014.
- [5] L. Canzian, K. Zhao, G. C. L. Wong, and M. van der Schaar, "A dynamic network formation model for understanding bacterial self-organization into micro-colonies," *IEEE Trans. Mol. Biol. Multi-Scale Commun.*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 76–89, Mar. 2015.
- [6] C. Koca and O. B. Akan, "Anarchy vs. cooperation on internet of molecular things," *IEEE Internet Things J.*, vol. 4, no. 5, pp. 1445–1453, Oct. 2017.
- [7] B. D. Unluturk, S. Balasubramaniam, and I. Akyildiz, "The impact of social behavior on the attenuation and delay of bacterial nanonetworks," *IEEE Trans. Nanobiosci.*, vol. 15, no. 8, pp. 959–969, Dec. 2016.
- [8] G. Lambert, L. Estévez-Salmeron, S. Oh, D. Liao, B. M. Emerson, T. D. Tlsty, and R. H. Austin, "An analogy between the evolution of drug resistance in bacterial communities and malignant tissues," *Nat. Rev. Cancer*, vol. 11, no. 5, pp. 375–382, May 2011.
- [9] S. P. Brown and R. A. Johnstone, "Cooperation in the dark: Signalling and collective action in quorum-sensing bacteria," *Proc. Royal Soc. B*, vol. 268, no. 1470, pp. 961–965, May 2001.
- [10] M. Maschler, E. Solan, and S. Zamir, *Game Theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.
- [11] A. Noel, Y. Fang, N. Yang, D. Makrakis, and A. W. Eckford, "Effect of local population uncertainty on cooperation in bacteria," in *Proc. IEEE ITW*, Nov. 2017, pp. 334–338.
- [12] R. Popat, S. A. Cruz, M. Messina, P. Williams, S. A. West, and S. P. Diggle, "Quorum-sensing and cheating in bacterial biofilms," *Proc. Royal Soc. B*, vol. 279, no. 1748, pp. 4765–4771, 2012.
- [13] K. E. de Visser, A. Eichten, and L. M. Coussens, "Paradoxical roles of the immune system during cancer development," *Nat. Rev. Cancer*, vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 24–37, Jan. 2006.

- [14] A. D’Onofrio, “A general framework for modeling tumor-immune system competition and immunotherapy: Mathematical analysis and biomedical inferences,” *Physica D*, vol. 208, no. 3, pp. 220–235, Sep. 2005.