

|                             |   |
|-----------------------------|---|
| Title                       | Within-host interference competition can prevent invasion of rare parasites   |
| Authors                     | Quigley, Benjamin J. Z.;Brown, Sam P.;Leggett, Helen C.;Scanlan, Pauline D.;Buckling, Angus   |
| Publication date            | 2017-05-15  |
| Original Citation           | Quigley, B. J. Z., Brown, S. P., Leggett, H. C., Scanlan, P. D. and Buckling, A. (2017) 'Within-host interference competition can prevent invasion of rare parasites', <i>Journal of Parasitology</i> , 145(6), pp. 770-774. doi: 10.1017/S003118201700052X |
| Type of publication         | Article (peer-reviewed)   |
| Link to publisher's version | 10.1017/S003118201700052X   |
| Rights                      | © 2017, Cambridge University Press. All rights reserved.  |
| Download date               | 2025-02-11 20:45:26   |
| Item downloaded from        | <a href="https://hdl.handle.net/10468/8569">https://hdl.handle.net/10468/8569</a>   |



1 **Abstract**

2           Competition between parasite species or genotypes can play an important role  
3 in the establishment of parasites in new host populations. Here, we investigate a  
4 mechanism by which a rare parasite is unable to establish itself in a host population if  
5 a common resident parasite is already present (a “priority effect”). We develop a  
6 simple epidemiological model and show that a rare parasite genotype is unable to  
7 invade if coinfecting parasite genotypes inhibit each others transmission more than  
8 expected from simple resource partitioning. This is because a rare parasite is more  
9 likely to be in multiply-infected hosts than the common genotype, and hence more  
10 likely to pay the cost of reduced transmission. Experiments competing interfering  
11 clones of bacteriophage infecting a bacterium support the model prediction that the  
12 clones are unable to invade each other from rare. We briefly discuss the implications  
13 of these results for host-parasite ecology and (co)evolution

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

## 1 **Introduction**

2 An important factor influencing the establishment of parasites in a host population is  
3 the presence of other parasite species or genotypes (Read, 2001; Pedersen and Fenton,  
4 2007). In some cases, interactions between parasites can be positive, such that the  
5 presence of one species can facilitate the establishment of another (Cox 2001; Lello *et*  
6 *al.* 2004; Graham, 2008; Telfer, 2010; Shrestha *et al.* 2013; Ramiro *et al.* 2016).  
7 However, in many cases, particularly between-genotypes (Read 2001; Brown *et al.*  
8 2002; Buckling & Brockhurst 2008), parasites display competitive interactions, such  
9 that a resident parasite population is likely to reduce the likelihood of a focal parasite  
10 becoming established (Onderdonk *et al.* 1981; Dittmar *et al.* 1982; Hart and Cloyd,  
11 1990; Cox, 2001; Lello *et al.* 2004; Mideo, 2009; Telfer, 2010).

12

13 Assuming differences in infection order of the host, competitive interactions between  
14 parasites can result in priority effects (Sutherland, 1974; Connell and Slatyer, 1977),  
15 such that parasites that infect a host first can have a relative advantage (Eswarappa *et*  
16 *al.* 2012; Hoverman *et al.* 2013). Mechanistically, such priority effects might arise  
17 for a number of reasons, including ecological monopolization of host resources  
18 (Sutherland, 1974), rapid adaptation to the specific host environments in the case of  
19 microparasites (Gomez *et al.* 2016), and because anti-competitor toxins will increase  
20 in concentration with parasite density (Inglis *et al.* 2009). Here, we develop a simple  
21 model and carry out experiments using a bacterium-virus system to investigate the  
22 potential for another type of a priority effect: one that occurs at the level of the host  
23 population rather than the individual host. Specifically, we consider if such  
24 population level priority effects might arise even when they don't occur at the level of  
25 the individual host.

1 Why might a rare parasite be unable to invade a host population in the presence of an  
2 endemic parasite, yet is able to outcompete the resident parasite within individual  
3 hosts? A simple reason is that mixed infections often result in lower levels of  
4 transmission than would be expected from single genotype/species infection based on  
5 host resource partitioning, as a result of parasite anti-competitor mechanisms or host  
6 immunity (Sugita *et al.* 1981; Dobson 1985; Gupta *et al.* 1994; Roberts & Dobson  
7 1995; Cox, 2001; Read, 2001; Fenton 2008; Buckling and Brockhurst, 2008; Lello *et*  
8 *al.* 2004; Balmer *et al.* 2009; Telfer, 2010). Assuming a resident parasite has infected  
9 a high frequency of hosts, a rare invading parasite is more likely to find itself in a  
10 mixed infection compared to the resident, and hence is more likely to pay the cost of  
11 lower transmission to new hosts (Fenton 2008).

12

13 The basic building block of most micro-parasitic epidemiological models is the  
14 compartmental SI model (Keeling and Rohani, 2008), and we use its classic  
15 framework to assess the conditions when a parasite of a different type (genotype or  
16 species) can invade from rare when there is lower total transmission from a mixed  
17 infection. We then test the qualitative predictions with an experimental case study  
18 using the bacterium *Pseudomonas fluorescens* SBW25 and its lytic virus,  
19 bacteriophage  $\phi$ 2 (Buckling and Rainey, 2002). In a previous study (Leggett *et al.*  
20 2013), viruses that were propagated over tens of generations under a high multiplicity  
21 of infection (MOI; the ratio of virus to bacteria) evolved greater within-host  
22 competitiveness than those propagated under a low MOI. This increased  
23 competitiveness was caused by a shorter latent period: competing viruses were unable  
24 to fully assemble before host lysis occurred. This shorter lysis time however came at  
25 the cost of a reduction in the total number of virions produced from a lysed cell.

1 Lysis time was phenotypically plastic, and was not shortened when high MOI-evolved  
2 phages were propagated under low MOI; as consequence, transmission was lower  
3 from mixed clone infections than single clone infections. We therefore determined if  
4 the high and low MOI-evolved viruses could both be prevented from invading each  
5 other from rare under high but not low MOI, despite the high MOI-evolved viruses  
6 having a clear within-host advantage.

7

8

## 9 **Materials and Methods**

### 10 **Theory Methods**

11 We begin with a classic SI model at an endemic equilibrium (Keeling and Rohani,  
12 2008). We then augment the system by introducing a rare mutant, and explore the  
13 conditions under which it can invade.

14

#### 15 Classic SI Model

16 Consider a population subdivided into individuals susceptible to a particular disease  
17 ( $S$ ) and individuals infected with that same disease ( $I$ ). Assuming a freely mixing  
18 population, susceptible individuals ( $S$ ) that encounter an infected individual ( $I$ ), them-  
19 selves become infected. The rate at which this happens is described by the force of  
20 infection of the wild-type parasite  $\lambda_w (= \beta I_w$ , where  $\beta$  represents parasite transmission  
21 rate).  $S$  refers to numbers of susceptible hosts, and  $I_w$  refers to number of hosts  
22 infected with a wild-type pathogen.

23

24 The dynamics can be described by the following set of differential equations:

25

$$\frac{dS}{dt} = b(S + I_w) - S(\lambda_w + \mu) + cI_w$$
$$\frac{dI_w}{dt} = S\lambda_w - (\mu + v + c)I_w$$

1 [1]

2

3 Where  $b$ = host birth rate,  $\mu$ = host death rate,  $v$ = extra mortality of host caused by  
4 parasite infection, and  $c$ = rate of parasite clearance from the host. A stable  
5 coexistence equilibrium containing both susceptible ( $S$ ) and infected ( $I_w$ ) hosts will be  
6 established when:

7 
$$S^* = \frac{\mu + v + c}{\beta} \quad [2]$$

8 
$$I_w^* = \frac{(b - \mu)(\mu + v + c)}{\beta(\mu + v - b)}$$

9

10 These conditions are locally asymptotically stable when condition A is satisfied (see  
11 SI for working):

12 
$$\mu < b < \mu + v \quad (\text{Condition A})$$

13

14 To these stable conditions, we now add a rare mutant parasite and assess whether or  
15 not it can invade.

16

### 17 Introducing Rare Mutant

18 If a mutant is introduced to the population, then a multiply-infected host can occur,  
19 i.e. a host can be simultaneously infected with both a wild-type and mutant parasite.

20 This creates two new classes of individuals - hosts infected with the mutant,  $I_m$ , and  
21 hosts infected with both the mutant and the wild-type,  $I_{wm}$ . Note that infection is a  
22 symmetrical process, i.e. a host that is infected with a wild-type parasite can then be  
23 infected with a mutant parasite (and vice versa), creating a multiply-infected host.

24 Multiply-infected hosts are likely to represent a reduced transmission opportunity for  
25 co-infecting parasites. The reduction in transmission is because of some sort of

1 competitive interaction that reduces transmission of each individual strain from a  
2 single host to less than 50%, i.e. transmission is lower than expected from simply  
3 passively partitioning host resources.

4

5 This effect can be captured by having a separate transmission term for multiply-  
6 infected hosts ( $\beta_{wm}$ ). The force of infection of the wild type ( $\lambda_w$ ) and mutant ( $\lambda_m$ ) now  
7 becomes:

8

$$9 \quad \lambda_w = \beta I_w + \beta_{wm} I_{wm} \quad [3]$$

$$10 \quad \lambda_m = \beta I_m + \beta_{wm} I_{wm}$$

11 With the full system represented by the following set of differential equations:

12

$$13 \quad \frac{dS}{dt} = bS - S(\lambda_w + \lambda_m + \mu) + c(I_w + I_m)$$

$$14 \quad \frac{dI_w}{dt} = S\lambda_w - I_w(\mu + v + c + \lambda_m) + cI_{wm}$$

$$15 \quad \frac{dI_m}{dt} = S\lambda_m - I_w(\mu + v + c + \lambda_w) + cI_{wm} \quad [4]$$

16

$$17 \quad \frac{dI_{wm}}{dt} = I_w\lambda_m + I_m\lambda_w - I_{wm}(2c + \mu + v)$$

18

19 Further variations and justifications on the model are explored in the supplementary  
20 information.

21

22 Given the classic SI endemic equilibrium conditions (see condition A), we are able to  
23 assess the stability of the augmented system on the introduction of a rare mutant  
24 which transmits as well as the resident; i.e. we ask the question: under what



1 conditions can the rare mutant invade? See SI for working, and the Results section for  
2 the mutant invasion condition.

3

#### 4 **Experimental Materials and Methods**

5 We tested our predictions using two different bacteriophage clones derived from the  
6 lytic dsDNA phage SBW25Φ2 and the susceptible bacterium *Pseudomonas*  
7 *fluorescens* SBW25 (Buckling and Rainey, 2002). The phage clones were isolated  
8 from populations of SBW25Φ2 that had previously been evolved under conditions of  
9 High multiplicity of infection (MOI; the ratio of phage to bacteria) and Low MOI  
10 (subsequently termed H and L clones, respectively) (Leggett et al. 2013). Both clones  
11 grew equally well under conditions of low MOI, however when H and L are found  
12 together in a mixed infection, the output of both strains is reduced, and the H clone  
13 has a competitive advantage (Leggett *et al.* 2013). In order to distinguish between the  
14 two phage clones, the H clone was selected to grow on a mutant of *Pseudomonas*  
15 *fluorescens* SBW25 that was resistant to ancestral SBW25Φ2 (Scanlan *et al.* 2011)  
16 and the L clone. The final densities of the H clone was determined by the plaque  
17 forming units (PFU's) on lawns of resistant host, whilst the final densities of the L  
18 clone was determined by the PFU's on wild-type host lawns minus the number of  
19 PFU's on resistant host lawns.

20

21 To determine whether a rare bacteriophage was prevented from invading, we mixed H  
22 and L strains at different starting ratios (H:L) 1000:1, 1:1 and 1:1000 under high ( $5 \times$   
23  $10^7$  colony forming units (CFU's)/ml) and low ( $1 \times 10^4$  CFU's/ml) bacterial densities,  
24 whilst fixing the total density of phage at  $1 \times 10^5$  PFU's/ml. This enabled conditions  
25 where the multiplicity of infection (MOI) was low (high bacterial densities) and high

1 (low bacterial densities). High MOI treatments were used to test whether within-host  
2 competition was the mechanism preventing the invasion of rare parasites, with the  
3 low MOI treatment acting as a control where we would not expect to see frequency  
4 dependence.

5

6 After inoculating the bacteria with the starting ratios of phage, they were grown in  
7 wells containing 2ml of King's media B (KB), incubated at 28°C, static, for 8 hours.

8 Phage were then extracted from each replicate population by taking samples and

9 adding 10% v:v chloroform, vortexing and centrifuging at 13 000 g for 3 min. The

10 final densities of H and L clones were determined by serial plating onto bacterial

11 lawns of both susceptible and resistant hosts. Ten microlitres of supernatant

12 containing phage was spot plated onto growing lawns of each bacterial host (that had

13 been reconditioned from stock by growing for 24 hours in liquid KB at 28 °C) using

14 KB soft agar overlay plates. Plates were placed in a 28 °C incubator and checked for

15 phage plaques (zones of lysis that indicate parasite infectivity) after 8, 12, 24, 48 and

16 72 hours of incubation. Fitness of the phage was calculated using the estimated

17 Malthusian parameters ( $m$ ), where  $m = \ln(N_f/N_0)$  where  $N_0$  is the starting density and

18  $N_f$  is the final density (Lenski *et al.* 1991). We then determined the selection of

19 coefficient of L strains in competition with H strains,  $(m_L - m_H)/m_H$ , where  $m_L$  and  $m_H$

20 are the Malthusian parameters of L and H strains respectively (Lenski *et al.* 1991).

21

## 22 **Results**

### 23 **Theoretical Results**

1 We were able to derive a simple analytical condition for the invasion of a rare mutant  
2 parasite (see Theoretical Methods section), primarily as a function of the cost of  
3 transmission associated with being in a mixed infection:

4

$$\frac{\beta_{wm}}{\beta} > \frac{(v + \mu)^2}{(c + \mu + v)(b + 2v + \mu)} \quad (\text{Condition B})$$

6

7

8 When condition B is satisfied, the mutant can invade. When condition B is not  
9 satisfied, the population remains at the classic SI equilibrium conditions described in  
10 the Theory Methods, above. The  $\beta_{wm}/\beta$  term in condition B represents the relative  
11 transmission rate from multiply-infected hosts. Under pure resource competition,  
12 there is no reduction in total transmission of parasites from mixed versus single  
13 infections, i.e.  $\beta_{wm} = \beta/2$ , and the rare mutant can invade. As the relative transmission  
14 rate of multiply-infected hosts is reduced, the likelihood of a rare mutant invading the  
15 population decreases. We show the invasion conditions for different ratios of  $\beta_{wm}/\beta$  as  
16 a function of parasite-imposed host mortality (virulence;  $v$ ) and rate of parasite  
17 clearance from the host ( $c$ ) in Figure 1. Note that this qualitative result is robust to a  
18 range of model variations, including assuming that: all individuals give birth to  
19 susceptible hosts (not just susceptible parents); it is harder for host to clear mixed  
20 infections; and there is density dependent growth of hosts (see SI).

21

## 22 **Experimental Results**

23 We then tested our theoretical prediction that parasites are unable to invade from rare  
24 when there are mixed infections by competing different starting ratios (1:1000, 1:1  
25 and 1000:1) of two bacteriophage strains (H and L) under low and high MOI, on

1 bacterial hosts of *Pseudomonas fluorescens* SBW25. We have previously shown that  
2 the presence of H clones under conditions of high MOI reduces phage population  
3 growth rate, indicating that H clones reduce absolute between host transmission  
4 (Leggett *et al.* 2013; 2017), as assumed in our model.

5  
6 Crucially, we found a significant interaction between MOI and starting frequency  
7 (Figure 2;  $F_{2,30} = 4.030$ ,  $P = 0.028$ ): while the relative growth rates of the two clones  
8 was largely independent of starting frequency under conditions of low MOI, under  
9 higher MOI the rare clone always had a fitness disadvantage. Note that at 1:1 ratios,  
10 the L clones was fitter under low MOI, presumably as a result of the host range  
11 phenotype that is costly in this system (Poullain *et al.* 2008; Scanlan *et al.* 2011)  
12 while the H clone was fitter under high MOI, as reported in previous studies (Leggett  
13 *et al.* 2013) (1 sample t-tests:  $P < 0.01$  in both cases). Note that we found that there  
14 was no main effect of starting frequency (Figure 2;  $F_{2,30} = 0.417$ ,  $P = 0.663$ ) on the  
15 relative growth rate of the H and L strains, nor a main effect of whether phages were  
16 cultured at high or low MOI (Figure 2;  $F_{1,30} = 1.586$ ,  $P = 0.218$ ).

17

## 18 **Discussion**

19 Here we investigated whether parasites that display strong anti-competitor  
20 behaviours in coinfecting hosts suffer a fitness cost when rare, thus limiting the  
21 conditions under which parasites can become established in new host populations.  
22 Our simple epidemiological model confirmed findings implicit in previous models  
23 (e.g. Fenton 2008) that interference between coinfecting strains reduces total parasite  
24 transmission from hosts, the likelihood of a rare parasite invading an endemic parasite  
25 population is reduced. We subsequently find evidence for this reciprocal invasion

1 inhibition in competing bacteriophage genotypes (infecting bacteria) that experience  
2 growth inhibition with coinfection. Crucially, this reciprocal invasion inhibition was  
3 not observed when there was little coinfection, but instead one phage genotype  
4 consistently outcompeted the other, demonstrating that coinfection was the driver of  
5 the observed growth cost of being rare.

6         How important might this effect be? While we are not aware of any data from  
7 natural populations that could provide direct evidence for its operation, the  
8 assumptions required for this type of priority effect will frequently be met.  
9 Specifically, mixed genotypes and species infections are common in nature (Read,  
10 2001; Pedersen and Fenton, 2007), and many interactions between parasites are  
11 directly or indirectly, via the host immune system, inhibitory (Sugita *et al.* 1981; Cox,  
12 2001; Read, 2001; Buckling and Brockhurst, 2008; Lello *et al.* 2004; Balmer *et al.*  
13 2009; Mideo, 2009; Telfer, 2010).

14         In addition to the clear epidemiological implications of the work, the  
15 population level priority effects reported here might have important evolutionary and  
16 coevolutionary implications. First, it is likely to limit the evolution of generalist  
17 parasites. On the one hand, if parasites are limited in their interaction with novel host  
18 populations this will limit selection for generalism (Kawecki 1998). On the other,  
19 generalist parasites may find themselves in mixed infections more frequently than  
20 specialist parasites, hence exposing them to this transmission cost (Leggett *et al.*  
21 2013); although not in circumstances where generalists have unique access to certain  
22 hosts (Gandon *et al.* 2002). This may represent a novel cost of generalism over and  
23 above genetic tradeoffs and costs of using less productive hosts (Futuyma & Moreno  
24 1988; Heineman *et al.* 2008; Benmayor *et al.* 2009), helping to explain host  
25 specialization of parasite species and genotypes. Second, limiting the invasion of new

1 parasite genotypes can have important implications for coevolutionary dynamics.  
2 Specifically, high parasite diversity and density can increase parasite adaptation to  
3 their local hosts and lead to more rapid and arms-race-like coevolution (Morgan *et al.*  
4 2005; Gomez *et al.* 2015).

5 More generally, our results highlight the importance of considering priority  
6 effects (i.e. an advantage of early colonisation) at different scales. Priority effects are  
7 typically investigated within ecological patches (or hosts), but here we show a meta-  
8 population (or community) - level priority effect, which may also be an important  
9 consideration in a range of ecological systems. Precisely how priority effects at  
10 different scales interact requires further exploration.

11

## 12 **Acknowledgements**

13 This work was funded by NERC, BBSRC and AXA Research Fund. AB  
14 acknowledges support from the Royal Society. HCL is funded by The Royal  
15 Commission for the Exhibition of 1851. PDS is funded by a Royal Society-Science  
16 Foundation Ireland University Research Fellowship.

17

## 18 **References**

- 19 **Balmer, O., Stearns, S.C., Schötzau, A. and Brun, R.** (2009). Intraspecific  
20 competition between co-infecting parasite strains enhances host survival in  
21 African trypanosomes. *Ecology* **90**, 3367–3378.
- 22 **Benmayor, R., Hodgson, D. J., Perron, G. G., and Buckling, A.** (2009). Host  
23 Mixing and Disease Emergence. *Current Biology* **19**, 764–767.
- 24 **Buckling, A. and Brockhurst, M.A.** (2008). Kin selection and the evolution of  
25 virulence. *Heredity* **100**, 484–488.

- 1 **Buckling, A., and Rainey, P. B.** (2002). Antagonistic coevolution between a  
2 bacterium and a bacteriophage. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B* **269**, 931–936.
- 3 **Brown, S., Hochberg, M. and Grenfell, B.** (2002). Does multiple infection select for  
4 raised virulence? *Trends in Microbiology* **10**, 401–405.
- 5 **Connell, J. H. and Slatyer, R. O.** (1977). Mechanisms of succession in natural  
6 communities and their role in community stability and organization. *The*  
7 *American Naturalist* **111**, 1119 – 1144.
- 8 **Cox, F.** (2001). Concomitant infections, parasites and immune responses.  
9 *Parasitology* **122**, S23–S38.
- 10 **Dittmar, D., Castro, A. and Haines, H.** (1982). Demonstration of interference  
11 between dengue virus types in cultured mosquito cells using monoclonal antibody  
12 probes. *Journal of General Virology* **59**, 273–282.
- 13 **Dobson, A. P.** (1985). The population dynamics of competition between parasites.  
14 *Parasitology* **91**, 317-47.
- 15 **Eswarappa, S. M., Estrela, S. and Brown, S. P.** (2012). Within-Host Dynamics of  
16 Multi-Species Infections: Facilitation, Competition and Virulence. *PloS One* **7**,  
17 e38730.
- 18 **Fenton, A.** (2007). Worms and germs: the population dynamic consequences of  
19 microparasite-macroparasite co-infection. *Parasitology* **135**, 1545-1560.
- 20 **Futuyma, D. and Moreno, G.** (1988). The evolution of ecological specialization.  
21 *Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics* **19**, 207–233.
- 22 **Gandon, S., van Baalen, M. and Jansen, V. A. A.** (2002). The evolution of parasite  
23 virulence, superinfection, and host resistance. *The American Naturalist* **159**, 658–  
24 669.
- 25 **Gómez, P., Paterson, S., De Meester, L., Liu, X., Lenzi, L., Sharma, M. D.,**

- 1        **McElroy, K. and Buckling, A.** (2016) Local adaptation of a bacterium is as  
2        important as its presence in structuring a natural microbial community. *Nature*  
3        *Communications* **7**, 12453
- 4        **Gomez, P., Ashby, B. and Buckling, A.** (2015). Population mixing promotes arms  
5        race host-parasite coevolution. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B* **282**, 2297
- 6        **Graham, A.L.** (2008) Ecological rules governing helminth-microparasite coinfection.  
7        *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences USA* **105**, 566–570.
- 8        **Gupta, S., Swinton, J., & Anderson, R. M.** (1994). Theoretical studies of the effects  
9        of heterogeneity in the parasite population on the transmission dynamics of  
10        malaria. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B* **256**, 231–238.
- 11       **Hart, A.R. and Cloyd, M.W.** (1990). Interference patterns of human  
12       immunodeficiency viruses HIV-1 and HIV-2. *Virology* **177**, 1–10
- 13       **Heineman, R.H., Springman, R., and Bull, J.J.** (2008). Optimal foraging by  
14       bacteriophages through host avoidance. *The American Naturalist* **171**, E149–  
15       E157. [1]  
[SEP]
- 16       **Hoverman, J. T., Hoye, B. J. and Johnson, P. T. J.** (2013). Does timing matter?  
17       How priority effects influence the outcome of parasite interactions within hosts.  
18       *Oecologia* **173**, 1471–1480.
- 19       **Inglis, R. F., Gardner, A., Cornelis, P., and Buckling, A.** (2009). Spite and  
20       virulence in the bacterium *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* *Proceedings of the National*  
21       *Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* **106**, 5703–5707.
- 22       **Kawecki, T. J.** (1998). Red Queen meets Santa Rosalia: Arms Races and the  
23       evolution of host specialization in organisms with parasitic lifestyles. *The*  
24       *American Naturalist* **152**, 635–651.
- 25       **Keeling, M.J. and Rohani, P.** (2008). *Modeling Infectious Diseases in Humans and*



1        *Animals*. Princeton University Press.

2        **Leggett, H. C., Benmayor, R., Hodgson, D. J., and Buckling, A.** (2013).

3        Experimental evolution of adaptive phenotypic plasticity in a parasite. *Current*

4        *Biology* **23**, 139–142.

5        **Leggett, H. C., Buckling, A., Long, G. H. and Boots, M.** (2013). Generalism and

6        the evolution of parasite virulence. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution* **28**, 592–596.

7        **Leggett, H.C., Wild, G., West, S. and Buckling, A.** (2017). Fast-killing parasites are

8        “prudent” in space. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B*, in press.

9        **Lello, J., Boag, B., Fenton, A., Stevenson, I.R. and Hudson, P.J.** (2004)

10        Competition and mutualism among the gut helminths of a mammalian host.

11        *Nature* **428**, 840–844.

12        **Lenski, R., Rose, M., Simpson, S. and Tadler, S.** (1991). Long-Term Experimental

13        Evolution in *Escherichia Coli* .1. Adaptation and Divergence During 2,000

14        Generations. *The American Naturalist* **138**, 1315–1341.

15        **Mideo, N.** (2009). Parasite adaptations to within-host competition. *Trends in*

16        *Parasitology* **25**, 261–268.

17        **Morgan, A. D., Gandon, S. and Buckling, A.** (2005). The effect of migration on

18        local adaptation in a coevolving host-parasite system *Nature* **437**253–256.

19        **Onderdonk, A., Marshall, B., Cisneros, R. and Levy, S.B.** (1981). Competition

20        between congenic *Escherichia coli* K-12 strains *in vivo*. *Infection and Immunity*

21        **32**, 74–79.

22        **Pedersen, A.B. and Fenton, A.** (2007) Emphasizing the ecology in parasite

23        community ecology. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution* **22**, 133–139.

24        **Ramiro, R. S., Pollitt, L. C., Mideo, N. and Reece, S. E.** (2016). Facilitation

25        through altered resource availability in a mixed-species rodent malaria infection.

- 1        *Ecology letters* **19**, 1041–1050.
- 2        **Read, A.F.** (2001). The Ecology of Genetically Diverse Infections. *Science* **292**,
- 3        1099–1102.
- 4        **Roberts, M. & Dobson, A.P.** (1995). The population dynamics of communities of
- 5        parasitic helminths. *Mathematical Bioscience* **126**, 191-215.
- 6        **Scanlan, P., Hall, A., Lopez Pascua, L.D.C. and Buckling, A.** (2011). Genetic basis
- 7        of infectivity evolution in a bacteriophage. *Molecular ecology* **20**, 981–989.
- 8        **Shrestha, S., Foxman, B., Weinberger, D.M., Steiner, C., Viboud, C. and Rohani,**
- 9        **P.** (2013). Identifying the interaction between influenza and pneumococcal
- 10       pneumonia using incidence data. *Science Translational Medicine* **5**, 191ra84
- 11       **Sugita, K.** (1981). Interference between virulent and avirulent strains of Sendai virus.
- 12       **55**, 95–107.
- 13       **Sutherland, J. P.** (1974). Multiple stable points in natural com- munities. *The*
- 14       *American Naturalist* **108**, 859–873.
- 15       **Telfer, S., Lambin, X., Birtles, R., Beldomenico, P., Burthe, S., Paterson, S. and**
- 16       **Begon, M.** (2010). Species interactions in a parasite community drive infection
- 17       risk in a wildlife population *Science* **330**, 243–246.

18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

1 **Figure Legends**

2

3 **Figure 1: Plotting Condition B – Rare parasite less likely to invade as relative**

4 **transmission rate of multiply-infected host ( $\beta_{wm}/\beta$ ) is reduced.** Phase plane

5 diagram showing the value of  $\beta_{wm}/\beta$  required for the rare parasite to invade, as a

6 function of virulence ( $v$ ) and host recovery rate ( $c$ ). For sensible values of  $\beta$  ( $<1$ ), the

7 mechanism preventing invasion of the rare parasite is a form of interference

8 competition i.e.  $\beta_{wm}/\beta < \beta/2$ . Parameters;  $b=0.3$ ,  $\mu=0.2$ .

9

10 **Figure 2: Positive frequency dependence prevents rare phage from invading.**

11 The relative growth rate (selection coefficient) of L phage strains, compared with H

12 strains, is plotted for different starting ratios of H:L, under high and low MOI. Error

13 bars are  $\pm 1$  standard error of the mean.

14

15

16

17