

On multiple infections by parasites with complex life cycles

Phuong L. Nguyen [†] and Chaitanya S. Gokhale ^{‡,*}

[†] Department of Biology, University of Fribourg,

Chemin du musée 15, Switzerland

[‡]Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Biology, Department of Theoretical Biology

August-Thienemann-Straße 2, 24306 Plön, Germany

*Center for Computational and Theoretical Biology, University of Würzburg,

Klara-Oppenheimer Weg, 32, 97074, Würzburg, Germany

[†]linh.phuong.nguyen@evobio.eu

[‡]chaitanya.gokhale@uni-wuerzburg.de

1 **Abstract:** Host manipulation is a common strategy of parasites with complex
2 life cycle. It directly affects predator-prey dynamics in trophically transmitted
3 parasites. Theoretical studies suggest that predation-enhancing manipulation of-
4 ten decimates the prey population, making parasites prone to extinction. Host
5 manipulation, however, can also reduce predation due to conflicting interests
6 when multiple parasites infect a host, which is often neglected in theoretical stud-
7 ies. Misaligned interests of coinfecting parasites can occur due to limited carrying
8 capacity or parasitoid developmental stage. Including this realistic complexity in
9 a mathematical model, the results depart from previous studies substantially.
10 We show that coinfecting multi-trophic parasites can preserve the predator-prey
11 system and themselves through manipulation and reproduction parameters. Our
12 study highlights the necessity of and provides the means of incorporating the
13 reality of multiple parasites and their multi-trophic life cycles into the theory of
14 parasite ecology.

Introduction

Parasites infect life on earth ubiquitously, and many of these parasites have complex life cycles (Zimmer, 2001). While a complex life cycle can be defined as abrupt ontogenic changes in morphology and ecology (Benesh, 2016), a complex parasitic life cycle typically involves numerous hosts that a parasite needs to traverse to complete its life cycle. This complex life cycle results in the evolution of various strategies that enable the success of parasite transmission from one host to another. One famous strategy that inspires many science fiction movies and novels is host manipulation, where a parasite can alter the morphology and/or behaviour of its host to enhance its transmission to the next host (Hughes et al., 2012). Host manipulation has been shown in many host-parasite systems, from parasites with simple life cycles to those with a complex life cycle that involves more than one host species (Hughes et al., 2012; Molyneux and Jefferies, 1986). For instance, sand flies infected by *Leishmania* parasites bite more and take more time for a blood meal from mammals (the definitive host of *Leishmania*) compared to their uninfected counterparts (Rogers and Bates, 2007). Copepods infected by cestode parasites are more active and accessible to sticklebacks (the cestodes' definitive hosts) than uninfected copepods (Wedekind and Milinski, 1996).

Theoretical studies have long attempted to understand the ecological and evolutionary consequences of host manipulation. Roosien et al. (2013) and Hosack et al. (2008) showed that manipulative parasites could increase the disease prevalence in an epidemic. Gandon (2018) studied the evolution of the manipulative ability of infectious disease parasites, showing different evolutionary outcomes depending on whether the pathogen can control its vector or host. Haderler and Freedman (1989); Fenton and Rands (2006) and Rogawa et al. (2018) showed that host manipulation could stabilise or destabilise the predator-prey dynamics depending on how manipulation affects the predation response function and the reproduction of the definitive infected host. Seppälä and Jokela (2008) showed that host manipulation could evolve even when it increases the risk of the intermediate host being eaten by a non-host predator, given that the initial predation risk is sufficiently low.

Most studies mentioned above have not explicitly considered a crucial aspect of parasite dynamics – multiple infections (Kalbe et al., 2002) i.e. the presence of multiple individual parasites within a single host. Multiple infections are a norm rather than an exception in parasitism. They result in the coinfection of more than one parasite inside a host, which may alter the manipulative outcomes (figure 1). An alignment of interest between coinfecting parasites may enhance manipulation, while a conflict of interest may reduce the manipulative effect. Indeed, Hafer and Milinski (2015) showed that copepods infected by two cestode parasites reduce the activity of copepods when both parasites are at the same noninfectious stage, i.e. both parasites are not ready to transmit. Thus, the reduction in mobility is suggested to reduce the predation rate by the definitive hosts. When two infectious parasites infect the copepods, the copepods' activity increases, and so does the predation risk for the copepod. However, when the copepods are infected by one infectious and one noninfectious parasite, their interests clash, and one parasite wins.

Theoretical work that considers multiple infections often focuses on the evolution of virulence (van Baalen and Sabelis, 1995; Alizon et al., 2013; Alizon and van Baalen, 2008; Choisy and de Roode, 2010; Alizon, 2012), while host manipulation in trophically transmitted parasites receives less attention. Even though host manipulation and virulence correlate with parasite transmission, there are subtle differences, such that virulence implies an addition to the natural mortality rate of the infected host, whereas manipulation links to the immediate death of the intermediate host due to predation. Host manipulation in trophically transmitted parasites, therefore, not only affects the intermediate host population but also the entire predator-prey dynamics. Theoretical studies regarding host manipulation rarely consider multiple infections. Studies incorporating this feature neglect the predator-prey dynamics, which will likely have important feedback on the evolution of host manipulation (Parker et al., 2003; Vickery and Poulin, 2009). Moreover, these models assume that transmission from definitive hosts to intermediate hosts is due to direct contact between the two types of hosts (Rogawa et al., 2018; Iritani and Sato, 2018; Haderler and Freedman, 1989;



101.pdf

Figure 1: Who is in control?. Schistocephalus eggs, which overwinter at the bottom of bodies of water, hatch into microscopically tiny swimming larvae. These larvae are eaten by copepods (also known as Cyclops due to its single eye), where they develop to the second larval stage. However, the copepod is only the first intermediate host. The larvae are then eaten by sticklebacks, reaching the third larval stage and growing prominently in size and weight. For the parasite to successfully reach its final host, a warm-blooded animal like a bird, it manipulates its intermediate hosts. The timing is crucial as the chances of success are greatest if the larvae develop in the copepod for 13 to 15 days before entering the stickleback. The presence of multiple parasites in the same host can lead to competition and strategic decisions pertaining to investment in manipulation and growth. And indeed, a stickleback can be infected by numerous tapeworms, as shown above by Martin Kalbe.

69 [Fenton and Rands, 2006](#)). This is often not the case in nature, as parasites are released from
 70 the definitive hosts into the environment. Transmission thus happens only when intermediate
 71 hosts have contact with this free-living parasite pool. The inclusion of this free-living stage
 72 could have a profound effect on the dynamics of the whole predator-prey-parasite system.

73 Our study addresses the gap in the theoretical work on host manipulation in trophically
 74 transmitted parasites. We include multiple infections and consider the dynamics of the free-
 75 living parasite pool. Our compartment model helps illustrate a parasite's complex life cycle
 76 with two host species: an intermediate host preyed upon by a definitive host. Transmission

from the intermediate host to the definitive host occurs when predation on infected intermediate hosts happens. Reproduction only happens in the definitive hosts. New parasites then enter the environment, where the cycle continues. We focus on the intermediate host manipulation, such that the parasite increases the uptake of the intermediate host by the definitive host to increase its transmission rate. We then analyse the effect of host manipulation on the ecological dynamics in the predator-prey-parasite system. We found that sabotage in host manipulation almost always pushes the dynamical system toward bistability, provided the reproduction in a single infection is sufficiently small. The bistable nature suggests that the predator-prey parasite system is finely balanced and susceptible to extinction via ecological disturbances. Initially surprising, we showed that cooperation in host manipulation and enhanced reproduction in co-infecting parasites is not always beneficial and might expose the parasite population to the risk of extinction.

Model

Our model concerns the complex lifecycle of a trophically transmitted parasite that requires two hosts: an intermediate host and a definitive host. Reproduction only happens inside the definitive hosts, releasing new parasitic progeny in the environment. An intermediate host can be infected if it encounters this free-living parasite pool. Finally, when a definitive host consumes an infected intermediate host, the definitive host gets infected, and the parasite completes its life cycle.

For simplicity, we assume that hosts can be infected by one (single infection) or, at most, two parasites (double infections). Thus, while I_s and D_s are the susceptible intermediate and definitive hosts, their singly and doubly infected counterparts are denoted by I_w and D_w and I_{ww} and D_{ww} respectively. Our model is, therefore, more relevant to the macroparasitic system. Given that infection occurs, the probability that two parasites from the parasite pool co-transmit to an intermediate host is denoted by p . Thus, $1 - p$ is the probability that a single parasite enters an intermediate host. When a definitive host consumes an

intermediate host infected by two parasites, there is a probability q that the parasites co-transmit to the definitive host. With probability $1-q$, only one parasite successfully transmits. This formulation assumes that infection always happens when hosts encounter parasites. The dynamics of a complex life cycle parasite that requires two hosts is described by the following system of equations, firstly for the intermediate host as,

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{dI_s}{dt} &= R(I_s, I_w, I_{ww}) - dI_s - P_s(D_s, D_w, D_{ww})I_s - \eta I_s \\ \frac{dI_w}{dt} &= (1-p)\eta I_s - (d + \alpha_w)I_w - P_w(D_s, D_w, D_{ww}, \beta_w)I_w \\ \frac{dI_{ww}}{dt} &= p\eta I_s - (d + \alpha_{ww})I_{ww} - P_{ww}(D_s, D_w, D_{ww}, \beta_{ww})I_{ww}\end{aligned}\tag{1}$$

where $R(I_s, I_w, I_{ww})$ represents the birth rate of the intermediate hosts, a function of both infected and uninfected individuals. P_s , P_w , P_{ww} are the predation functions of definitive hosts on susceptible, singly infected and doubly infected intermediate hosts. The predation function depends on the density of the definitive hosts and the manipulative strategies of parasites in the intermediate hosts. In particular, if a single parasite infects an intermediate host, the manipulation strategy is β_w . However, if the intermediate host is co-infected, the manipulation strategy is β_{ww} . In the scope of this model, we assume no specific relationship between β_w and β_{ww} to explore all possible ecological outcomes of the system. The force of infection by parasites in the environment is denoted by $\eta = \gamma W$. The force of infection is a term often used in epidemiology, which represents the rate at which a host gets infected by the parasites. Since parasites can manipulate intermediate and definitive hosts, whenever we mention host manipulation, it specifically refers to the manipulation in intermediate hosts, which correlates to the predation rate.

121 For the definitive hosts, we have,

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{dD_s}{dt} &= B(D_s, D_w, D_{ww}, I_s, I_w, I_{ww}) - \mu D_s - (\lambda_{ww} + \lambda_w) D_s \\
\frac{dD_w}{dt} &= (\lambda_w + (1 - q)\lambda_{ww}) D_s - (\mu + \sigma_w) D_w - ((1 - q)\lambda_{ww} + \lambda_w) D_w \\
\frac{dD_{ww}}{dt} &= q\lambda_{ww} D_s + ((1 - q)\lambda_{ww} + \lambda_w) D_w - (\mu + \sigma_{ww}) D_{ww}
\end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

122 where $B(D_s, D_w, D_{ww}, I_s, I_w, I_{ww})$ represents the birth rate of definitive hosts. The birth
123 rates depend on the density of both intermediate and definitive hosts, infected or uninfected.
124 The force of infection that corresponds respectively to singly infected intermediate host (I_w)
125 and doubly infected intermediate hosts (I_{ww}) is denoted respectively by $\lambda_w = h(\rho + \beta_w)I_w$
126 and $\lambda_{ww} = h(\rho + \beta_{ww})I_{ww}$, where ρ is the baseline predation rate, i.e. the basic constitutive
127 level of predation, and h is the probability that the parasite successfully establishes inside
128 the host. Without manipulation, that is, $\beta_w = \beta_{ww} = 0$, the parasite is still transmitted via
129 the baseline predation. The dynamics of the free-living parasites in the environment are then
130 given by

$$\frac{dW}{dt} = f_w D_w + f_{ww} D_{ww} - \delta W - \eta I_s. \tag{3}$$

131 Definitions of different parameters can be found in Table SI.1.

132 Here, we focus on manipulation that enhances transmission from intermediate hosts to
133 definitive hosts; we thus simplify the transmission from the parasite pool to intermediate
134 hosts so that no sequential infection occurs. This assumption is motivated given that the
135 prey lifecycle is often shorter than the predator's. A prey likely encounters the free-living
136 parasite pool once and then dies due to predation, making sequential transmission less likely
137 at this state. Sequential infection can happen when parasites transmit from intermediate
138 hosts to definitive hosts. Therefore, a singly infected definitive host can be further infected
139 by another parasite if it consumes infected intermediate hosts. Figure (2) illustrates the

system's dynamics, and Table. 1 contains the different parameters and variables used.




Figure 2: Schematic of the model. Blue ovals represent the intermediate hosts, while the green diamonds represent the definitive hosts. The hexagon represents the parasite pool compartment, with the red circles illustrating the free-living individual parasites. The parasites infect the intermediate hosts singly (I_w , top) or doubly (I_{ww} , bottom). These intermediate hosts are then predated upon by the definitive hosts, thus moving the parasites to the final host (either as D_w or D_{ww}) where they can reproduce and reenter the free-living stage in the environmental pool \mathbf{W} .

140

141 Results

142 Basic reproduction ratio R_0 of the parasites

143 The basic reproduction ratio R_0 (or basic reproduction number as often used in epidemiology)
 144 indicates parasite fitness. It can be understood as the expected number of offspring a parasite
 145 produces during its lifetime when introduced to a susceptible host population. We calculate
 146 the basic reproduction ratio R_0 using the next-generation method (Diekmann et al., 1990,

Table 1: Description of variables and parameters

Parameters and Variables	Description
I_i	Density of intermediate hosts that are susceptible $i = s$, singly infected $i = w$, or doubly infected $i = ww$
D_i	Density of definitive hosts that are susceptible $i = s$, singly infected $i = w$, or doubly infected $i = ww$
W	Density of parasites released from definitive hosts into the environment
d	Natural death rate of intermediate hosts
α_i	Additional death rate of intermediate hosts due to infection by a single parasite ($i = w$) or two parasites ($i = ww$)
p	Probability that two parasites cotransmit from the environment to an intermediate host
γ	Transmission rate of parasites in the environment to intermediate hosts
μ	Natural death rate of definitive hosts
σ_i	Additional death rate of definitive hosts due to infection by a single parasite ($i = w$) or two parasites ($i = ww$)
σ_i	Additional death rate of the hosts due to being infected by a singly parasite ($i = w$) or two parasites ($i = ww$)
q	Probability that two parasites cotransmit from intermediate hosts to definitive hosts
β_i	Transmission rate of parasites from intermediate hosts to definitive hosts
f_i	Reproduction rate of parasites in singly infected definitive hosts ($i = w$) or doubly infected hosts ($i = ww$)
δ	Natural death rate of parasites in the environment
h	Probability that the parasites successfully established inside the definitive host

147 2009; Hurford et al., 2010) (See SI1 for details).

$$\begin{aligned}
R_0 = & \overbrace{\gamma I_s^* \frac{pqh(\rho + \beta_{ww})}{\alpha_{ww} + d + P_{ww}} \frac{D_s^*}{\mu + \sigma_{ww}} \frac{f_{ww}}{\delta + \gamma I_s^*}}^{\text{Double infections}} + \\
& \underbrace{\gamma I_s^* \left(\frac{(1-p)h(\rho + \beta_w)}{\alpha_w + d + P_w} + \frac{p(1-q)h(\rho + \beta_{ww})}{\alpha_{ww} + d + P_{ww}} \right) \frac{D_s^*}{\mu + \sigma_w} \frac{f_w}{\delta + \gamma I_s^*}}_{\text{Single infection}} \quad (4)
\end{aligned}$$

148 where I_s^* and D_s^* are the densities of susceptible intermediate and definitive hosts at the
 149 disease-free equilibrium. Here, the expression of R_0 contains the possible reproduction routes
 150 of a parasite, which can be via double or single infections. The first component corresponds
 151 to the double infections route, in which the focal parasite co-transmits with another parasite
 152 into a susceptible intermediate host, then co-transmits into a susceptible definitive host and
 153 reproduces. Here, parasites are so rare that only co-transmission matters and the compart-
 154 ments with sequential infections are neglected. The second component corresponds to the
 155 single infection route, wherein the focal parasite infects a susceptible intermediate host via
 156 single or double infections. The parasite then transmits alone into the susceptible definitive
 157 host and eventually reproduces.

158 If $R_0 > 1$, a parasite spreads when introduced into the disease-free equilibrium of prey and
 159 predator. Intuitively, the higher the density of susceptible intermediate and definitive hosts,
 160 the larger the value of R_0 as the infection reservoir is more extensive. In contrast, regardless
 161 of the explicit form of the predation function, the higher the predation rate P_w and P_{ww} , the
 162 lower the value of R_0 given the smaller reservoir of intermediate hosts. The effect of host
 163 manipulation on the value of R_0 is more complex; as host manipulation becomes efficient,
 164 the transmission rate from the intermediate host to the definitive host increases, but so does
 165 the predation rate. A higher predation rate results in a smaller intermediate host reservoir
 166 for the parasites to infect. To understand the effect of manipulation on parasites' fitness
 167 and the system's ecological dynamics, we next specify the predation functions. We consider
 168 linear functions for predation to begin with,

$$\begin{aligned} P_s(D_s, D_w, D_{ww}) &= \rho D_{total} \\ P_w(D_s, D_w, D_{ww}, \beta_w) &= (\rho + \beta_w) D_{total} \\ P_{ww}(D_s, D_w, D_{ww}, \beta_{ww}) &= (\rho + \beta_{ww}) D_{total} \end{aligned}$$

169 where $D_{total} = D_s + D_w + D_{ww}$ is the total density of the definitive hosts, and ρ is the

baseline capture rate of the predator on the prey. If an intermediate host is infected, it is captured by the definitive hosts with rate $\rho + \beta_w$ if it is singly infected and with rate $\rho + \beta_{ww}$ if it is doubly infected. Zero values for β_w and β_{ww} suggest no manipulation, and predation is at the baseline value ρ .

For simplicity, we also consider a linear function of the birth of definitive hosts

$$B(D_s, D_w, D_{ww}, I_s, I_w, I_{ww}) = \rho c D_{total} I_{total}$$

where c is the efficiency of converting prey into predator's offspring, and $I_{total} = I_s + I_w + I_{ww}$ is the total density of the intermediate hosts. It is important to note that host manipulation affects population dynamics via its influence on the predation rate, not the physiological aspect of the definitive host, i.e., the predator. The birth rate of the predators thus depends on the capture rate, but it is not affected by host manipulation; to our best knowledge, there is no supporting evidence to consider otherwise.

The explicit form of I_s^* and D_s^* , capturing the predator-prey dynamics, depends on the precise form of all birth and predation functions B, R, P_s, P_w and P_{ww} . However, it does not depend on the ability to manipulate or any other parameter of the parasite. Given that the birth rate of the predator and the predation rate are linear functions in prey and predator density, the form of the birth rate R of the prey has a significant effect on the susceptible intermediate and definitive host dynamics.

Birth function of intermediate hosts

The simplest form of the prey's birth rate is a linear function, in which case the disease-free equilibrium is always unstable. In particular, it has a cyclic behaviour because, at this equilibrium, the jacobian matrix of the system (1, 2, 3) always has two pure imaginary eigenvalues (see SI2). This follows from the Lotka-Volterra system using linear functions for prey birth and predation (Lotka, 1920). Since the disease-free dynamics is cyclic, it is difficult

to analyse the spread of a parasite using the basic reproduction ratio, which is evaluated when the disease-free state is stable. Here, $R_0 > 1$ happens when γ , the transmission rate from the environment to intermediate hosts, and the reproduction rates f_w, f_{ww} are quite large (as compared to the theoretical threshold shown by the mathematical conditions in SI3). However, even when this condition is satisfied, the parasite may not be able to spread and persist in cyclic susceptible host dynamics (Figure SI1). This result agrees with the conclusion in (Ripa and Dieckmann, 2013), which suggests that it is difficult for a mutant to invade a cyclic resident population. In our case, it is not the invasion of a mutant in a resident population but the invasion of a parasite in a cyclic disease-free host population; the argument, however, remains valid in both cases. This issue deserves a more thorough investigation, which is out of the scope of this article. Here, we choose a non-linear birth function of the intermediate hosts to obtain a stable disease circulation state and focus on the effect of host manipulation on the ecological dynamics (Figure 3).

The logistic growth for the non-linear birth function follows by

$$R(I_w, I_s, I_{ww}) = rI_{total}(1 - kI_{total})$$

where k is the intraspecific competition coefficient. The disease-free equilibrium is as follows

$$I_s^* = \frac{\mu}{c\rho} ; D_s^* = \frac{c\rho(r - d) - k\mu r}{c\rho^2}$$

This equilibrium is positive and stable if components of the parasite, such as reproduction and transmission, are sufficiently small; details of the condition can be found in section SI 4. Here, because reproduction and transmission value of the parasite are not sufficient, it goes extinct (Figure 3A), leaving the predator-prey dynamics attaining equilibrium (Figure 3B)

When a parasite appears in the disease-free equilibrium, it spreads if its reproduction ratio $R_0 > 1$ (Figure 3C, D). Since the expression is complicated, we could only obtain analytical solutions for this inequality with assumptions. We assume the same parasite virulence,




Figure 3: Ecological dynamics of the predator-prey-parasite system. A) Ecological trajectories of infected hosts and free-living parasite when parasites cannot persist, B) Phase plane of susceptible intermediate and definitive hosts under disease free scenario. C) Ecological trajectories of infected hosts and free-living parasite when parasites persist. D) Phase plane of susceptible and definitive host under disease circulating scenario. Parameters for disease free equilibrium $\rho = 1.2$, $d = 0.9$, $r = 2.5$, $\gamma = 2.9$, $\alpha_w = \alpha_{ww} = 0$, $\beta_w = \beta_{ww} = 1.5$, $p = 0.05$, $c = 1.4$, $\mu = 3.9$, $\sigma_w = \sigma_{ww} = 0$, $q = 0.05$, $f_w = f_{ww} = 7.5$, $\delta = 0.9$, $k = 0.26$, $h = 0.6$. Disease stable equilibrium have the same parameter values except for higher host manipulation $\beta_w = \beta_{ww} = 4.5$ and parasite reproduction $f_w = f_{ww} = 45$

215 $\alpha_w = \alpha_{ww}$, $\sigma_w = \sigma_{ww}$, and reproduction in double infection as a linear function concerning
 216 reproduction in single infections, $f_{ww} = \epsilon f_w$. When $\epsilon > 1$, reproduction in double infections
 217 is enhanced compared to in single infections, whereas $\epsilon \leq 1$, reproduction in double infections
 218 is suppressed or equal to reproduction in single infections. We found that the parasite can
 219 establish if its reproduction value in a single infection f_w is more significant than a threshold
 220 (Figure 4, see section SI 5 and Eq. (SI.19)).

221 Our numerical results show that the parasite reproduction is substantial compared to other
 222 parameters (Figure 4A). For instance, in the parameter set used to generate Figure (4B, to
 223 spread in the prey-predator system, the value of parasite reproduction (f_w) has to be at
 224 least 20 times the value of intermediate host reproduction $r = 2.5$, given that both these
 225 parameters represent the per capita growth rate of the parasite and the intermediate host
 226 population. This observation suggests that trophically transmitted parasites must release a
 227 large amount of offspring into the environment to persist. Interestingly, bistability occurs
 228 if the reproduction rate of the parasite in double infections is enhanced (Figure 4A). The
 229 parasite population can reach a stable equilibrium in the bistable region if the initial density
 230 is large enough. In contrast, with sufficient disturbance, the parasite population could go
 231 extinct.

232 The effect of host manipulation on ecological dynamics

233 Host manipulation can be cooperative; two parasites increase the predation rate on interme-
 234 diate hosts, or $\beta_{ww} > \beta_w$. However, it can also be uncooperative; the predation rate on
 235 doubly-infected intermediate hosts is lower than that on singly-infected ones or $\beta_{ww} < \beta_w$.
 236 Cooperation in parasite manipulation increases the parasite's basic reproduction ratio R_0 ,
 237 but the manipulation in a single infection substantially affects the value of R_0 (Figure 5).
 238 Intuitively, if the manipulation in a single infection is minor, there is not enough transmission,
 239 and the parasite goes extinct. However, suppose the ability to manipulate the host in a single
 240 infection is merely enough for the parasite population to escape extinction. In that case, the




Figure 4: Effect of parasite reproduction on the ecological dynamics. A) Enhanced reproduction in double infection leads to bistability, B, C) Density of singly infected host at equilibrium when reproduction of parasites are the same in singly and doubly infected hosts $f_{ww} = f_w$, and when reproduction of parasites in doubly infected hosts is enhanced four times than those in singly infected hosts $f_{ww} = 4f_w$. Filled circles indicate stable equilibrium and open circles indicate unstable equilibrium. Parameter $\rho = 1.2$, $d = 0.9$, $r = 2.5$, $\gamma = 2.9$, $\alpha_w = 0$, $\alpha_{ww} = 0$, $\beta_w = 1.5$, $\beta_{ww} = 1.5$, $p = 0.05$, $c = 1.4$, $\mu = 3.9$, $\sigma_w = 0$, $\sigma_{ww} = 0$, $q = 0.05$, $\delta = 0.9$, $k = 0.26$, $h = 0.6$.

241 system is in a bistable state where intermediate cooperation in host manipulation cannot
 242 guarantee a single equilibrium (Hatched area Figure 5 Left). In the bistable region, the
 243 basic reproduction ratio can be less than one, implying that the parasite with manipulative
 244 values within this range, i.e. weak manipulation ability, cannot spread. When the system

245 encounters bistability, the parasite population risks extinction if there is a disturbance in the
246 community. In the following parts, we will explore scenarios where bistability may occur.

247 Besides manipulation, co-infecting parasites can influence each other in different life history
248 traits. Parasites can have an enhanced reproduction rate in coinfections, i.e. $f_{ww} > f_w$
249 (upper part of the horizontal line in Figure 5 Right). Likewise, they can compete for resources,
250 so reproduction in double infection is suppressed compared to single infection (lower part of
251 the horizontal line in Figure 5 Right). Without any assumption on the relationship between
252 manipulative ability and reproduction, we explore all possible combinations of cooperation-
253 sabotage range in manipulation and suppressed-enhanced range in reproduction. This results
254 in four scenarios of parameter combinations: i, parasites sabotage manipulation but have
255 enhanced reproduction – manipulative incoordination (top left quadrant in Figure 5 Right),
256 ii, parasites cooperate to increase manipulation and enhance reproduction – coordination
257 (top right quadrant in Figure 5 Right), iii, parasites cooperate in manipulation but suppress
258 reproduction – reproductive incoordination (bottom right quadrant in Figure 5 Right), and
259 iv, parasites sabotage manipulation and suppress reproduction – discordance (bottom left
260 quadrant in Figure 5 Right).

261 If coinfecting parasites are discordant, i.e. uncooperative in manipulations and show sup-
262 pressed reproduction, they cannot persist (Figure 5). On the other extreme, where they are
263 highly cooperative in manipulation and show enhanced reproduction, i.e., an extreme level
264 of coordination, there is a guaranteed single equilibrium for parasite existence. Note that
265 this happens at the combination of $\beta_{ww}/\beta_w \rightarrow \infty$ and $f_{ww}/f_w \rightarrow \infty$, a scenario that is
266 rather impossible in reality. Very often, we expect intermediate levels of coordination where
267 a bistable area could occur (top left quadrant in Figure 5 at $f_w = (37, 37.5)$). However, the
268 size of this area is sensitive to the value of reproduction and manipulation in a single infection.
269 In particular, higher values of these two parameters reduce the bistability area to the point
270 that sufficiently large reproduction in single infection can guarantee single equilibrium when
271 parasites coordinate (top left quadrant in Figure 5 Left at $f_w = (38)$, Figure SI.1 include

272 Figure in supplementary, this is not correct). In contrast, smaller values of reproduction and
273 manipulation in single infection increase the bistability area (Figure include also supplemen-
274 tary figure). If the parasites sabotage each other, the system is highly prone to bistability
275 and only has a single equilibrium when reproduction is especially enhanced (left side of ver-
276 tical line in Figure 5 Left). Interestingly, sufficiently high reproduction enhancement leads to
277 bistability (i.e. f_{ww} is at least four times f_w), and reproductive incoordination, i.e. depressed
278 reproduction and manipulative cooperation, always leads to a single equilibrium of the system
279 (Figure 4A, bottom right quadrant in Figure 5Left). While a single equilibrium guarantees
280 the existence of a parasite population, bistability indicates that a disturbance of the system
281 may likely lead to the extinction of the parasite population. This suggests that the benefits
282 of coordination in reproduction and manipulation are context-dependent. Coordinating is
283 advantageous if no significant tradeoffs and reproduction or manipulation in single infections
284 are large enough.

285 Co-transmission probability from the parasite pool to intermediate hosts p has the opposite
286 effect on the bistable area compared to co-transmission probability q from intermediate hosts
287 to intermediate hosts (Figure 6). In particular, when the parasite sabotages the manipulation,
288 increasing p enlarges the bistable area, whereas increasing q reduces it. In contrast, when
289 parasites cooperate in manipulation, reducing p decreases the bistable area while reducing
290 q widens it. If cooperation in manipulation is exceptionally high, the population will always
291 exist with one stable equilibrium regardless of the co-transmission value. However, there are
292 always limitations and trade-offs, so high values may only be possible sometimes. Bistability
293 indicates vulnerability to disturbance, suggesting that cooperation in manipulation may be
294 beneficial when the co-transmission from the pool to the intermediate host increases. How-
295 ever, cooperation in manipulation may harm the population when the co-transmission from
296 the intermediate host to the definitive host increases.




Figure 5: Effect of manipulation and reproduction on bistability. Left: R_0 values increase with more efficient manipulation in single and double infection. The hatched area indicates the bistable region. As manipulation in single infection increases, the system only has one stable equilibrium. On the black line, the manipulation level is equal between single and double infection ($\beta_w = \beta_{ww}$). In the upper triangular area, parasites cooperate, and in the lower triangular area, parasites sabotage. Right: Changes in the bistability area (shaded areas) concerning different reproduction rates in single infection (different boundary styles). Manipulation and reproduction levels are equal between single and double infection on the vertical and horizontal lines. Common parameter: $\rho = 1.2$, $d = 0.9$, $r = 2.5$, $\gamma = 2.9$, $\alpha_w = 0$, $\alpha_{ww} = 0$, $p = 0.05$, $c = 1.4$, $\mu = 3.9$, $\sigma_w = 0$, $\sigma_{ww} = 0$, $q = 0.05$, $\delta = 0.9$, $k = 0.26$, $\beta_w = 1.65$, $h = 0.6$.




Figure 6: Left: Effect of cotransmission from parasite pool to intermediate host. Right: Effect of cotransmission from intermediate to definitive host. Common parameters: $\rho = 1.2$, $d = 0.9$, $r = 2.5$, $\gamma = 2.9$, $\alpha_w = 0$, $\alpha_{ww} = 0$, $p = 0.05$, $c = 1.4$, $\mu = 3.9$, $\sigma_w = 0$, $\sigma_{ww} = 0$, $q = 0.05$, $\delta = 0.9$, $k = 0.26$, $\epsilon = 4.5$, $\beta_w = 1.45$, $f_w = 38$, $h = 0.6$.

Discussion & Conclusion

Host manipulation is a ubiquitous phenomenon suggested to affect the predator-prey dynamics in trophically transmitted parasites. In particular, manipulation of infected intermediate hosts to increase the predation rate of definitive hosts may result in a heavy burden of predators on the intermediate host population. This pressure can make parasites more vulnerable to extinction (Haderler and Freedman, 1989; Fenton and Rands, 2006).

Our model shows that parasites cannot spread quickly in a cyclic predator-prey system. This delay is an expected result since even though the parasite's basic reproduction ratio R_0 is larger than one, it is estimated at the predator and prey's unstable equilibrium (or cyclic equilibrium). Thus, when the density of the prey and predator is at the minimum value of the cycle, the "effective" R_0 of the parasite can be smaller than one. Another interesting result is that the reproduction value is much larger than other parameter values, such as the *per capita* reproduction rate of the intermediate host. This result is likely due to the introduction of a free-living parasitic pool. Our model shows that in making the system more realistic, we also obtain a more realistic quantitative value for parasitic reproduction.

In the study by Rogawa et al. (2018), a non-manipulative parasite can invade a susceptible prey-predator population and cause the system to cycle. The system stops cycling and approaches a fixed point when the parasite becomes manipulative, and this stability increases with increased manipulation. In our model, non-manipulative parasites cannot persist in the system, and the parasite never leads to cyclic dynamics. These results may contradict with Rogawa et al. (2018), where non-manipulative parasites can still exist via cyclic behaviour. We suggest that the different results may be due to our introduction of a parasite pool and multiple infections, unlike the model of Rogawa et al. (2018). In their system, transmission from the definitive host to the intermediate host was assumed to result from direct contact between the two host species. Such immediate transmission could directly accelerate the feedback loop between prey and predator. Hence, faster predator-prey dynamics occur, which may lead to cyclic dynamics when parasites are introduced.

Another study on host manipulation, [Iritani and Sato \(2018\)](#), showed that manipulative parasites persist if they switch from suppressing to boosting predation rate. This theoretical work modelled the ability to change the manipulative strategy of a single parasite inside a host, which can be equal to introducing the developmental state of a parasite, where a suppressed predation rate protects the parasites that are not ready to transmit. That is why decreasing manipulative ability is beneficial and prevents parasite extinction. In our model, sabotaging manipulation also reduces manipulative ability, which only reduces the basic reproduction ratio R_0 and makes the system bistable, exposing the parasite to the risk of extinction. This result contrasts with [Iritani and Sato \(2018\)](#) because in our model, the parasite cannot switch its manipulative strategy, and sabotage decreases the transmission rate from intermediate to definitive host and does not benefit the parasite in any way.

In our study, population dynamics exhibit bistability under certain circumstances. This is very likely due to the introduction of co-transmission, which has been shown to result in bistable population dynamics in plant virus [Allen et al. \(2019\)](#) and infectious diseases [Gao et al. \(2016\)](#). In this bistability region, if the system is disturbed (e.g. migration of the intermediate or definitive hosts or predation of intermediate hosts by other predators), then the density of the infected hosts may crash, leading to parasite extinction. The bistability region widens as parasites show enhanced reproduction but sabotage manipulation. This extension is because the density of the doubly infected hosts is always much smaller than the singly infected hosts, limited by sequential transmission and a small probability of co-transmission. If manipulation in a single infection is insufficient, then the transmission of the parasites depends mainly on the doubly infected hosts, which is rare. So, extinction is possible if manipulation in double infections is low.

Finally, our study focuses on the ecological dynamics of a trophically transmitted parasite between two host species. In nature, parasites with complex life cycles can have more than two hosts. However, our model of a single intermediate host species can already provide enough complexity to discuss the relationship between transmission and manipulation.

351 Here, we introduce more realistic features compared to previous models, such as a free-living
352 parasite pool and multiple infections, regardless of some simplifications, such as multiple in-
353 fections being limited to at most two parasites. In this way, we can obtain analytical results
354 of the reproduction ratio and mathematical expressions for the existing condition of the para-
355 site. Our model serves as a groundwork for future exploration into more complex and realistic
356 systems, where numerical simulation may be the only possible approach. Moreover, the re-
357 sults of our ecological model are a baseline for further investigation of the evolution of host
358 manipulation, where introducing the parasite pool may create interesting eco-evolutionary
359 feedbacks to the system.

360 References

- 361 Alizon, S., 2012. Parasite co-transmission and the evolutionary epidemiology of virulence.
362 *Evolution* 67:921–933. URL <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1558-5646.2012.01827.x>.
- 363 Alizon, S. and M. van Baalen, 2008. Multiple infections, immune dynamics, and the evolution
364 of virulence. *The American Naturalist* 172:E150–E168. URL [https://doi.org/10.](https://doi.org/10.1086/590958)
365 [1086/590958](https://doi.org/10.1086/590958).
- 366 Alizon, S., J. C. de Roode, and Y. Michalakis, 2013. Multiple infections and the evolution of
367 virulence. *Ecology Letters* 16:556–567. URL <https://doi.org/10.1111/ele.12076>.
- 368 Allen, L. J. S., V. A. Bokil, N. J. Cuniffe, F. M. Hamelin, F. M. Hilker, and M. J. Jeger, 2019.
369 Modelling Vector Transmission and Epidemiology of Co-Infecting Plant Viruses. *Viruses*
370 11:1153. URL <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC6950130/>.
- 371 van Baalen, M. and M. W. Sabelis, 1995. The dynamics of multiple infection and the
372 evolution of virulence. *The American Naturalist* 146:881–910. URL [https://doi.org/](https://doi.org/10.1086/285830)
373 [10.1086/285830](https://doi.org/10.1086/285830).

374 Benesh, D. P., 2016. Autonomy and integration in complex parasite life cycles. *Parasitology*
375 143:1824 – 1846.

376 Choisy, M. and J. C. de Roode, 2010. Mixed infections and the evolution of virulence: Effects
377 of resource competition, parasite plasticity, and impaired host immunity. *The American*
378 *Naturalist* 175:E105–E118. URL <https://doi.org/10.1086/651587>.

379 Diekmann, O., J. Heesterbeek, and J. Metz, 1990. On the definition and the computation
380 of the basic reproduction ratio r_0 in models for infectious diseases in heterogeneous
381 populations. *Journal of Mathematical Biology* 28. URL [https://doi.org/10.1007/](https://doi.org/10.1007/bf00178324)
382 [bf00178324](https://doi.org/10.1007/bf00178324).

383 Diekmann, O., J. A. P. Heesterbeek, and M. G. Roberts, 2009. The construction of next-
384 generation matrices for compartmental epidemic models. *Journal of The Royal Society*
385 *Interface* 7:873–885. URL <https://doi.org/10.1098/rsif.2009.0386>.

386 Fenton, A. and S. A. Rands, 2006. The impact of parasite manipulation and predator
387 foraging behavior on predator - prey communities. *Ecology* 87:2832–2841. URL [https://doi.org/10.1890/0012-9658\(2006\)87\[2832:tiopma\]2.0.co;2](https://doi.org/10.1890/0012-9658(2006)87[2832:tiopma]2.0.co;2).

389 Gandon, S., 2018. Evolution and manipulation of vector host choice. *The American Naturalist*
390 192:23–34. URL <https://doi.org/10.1086/697575>.

391 Gao, D., T. C. Porco, and S. Ruan, 2016. Coinfection dynamics of two diseases in a single
392 host population. *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications* 442:171–188. URL
393 <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0022247X16300841>.

394 Haderler, K. P. and H. I. Freedman, 1989. Predator-prey populations with parasitic infec-
395 tion. *Journal of Mathematical Biology* 27:609–631. URL [https://doi.org/10.1007/](https://doi.org/10.1007/bf00276947)
396 [bf00276947](https://doi.org/10.1007/bf00276947).

397 Hafer, N. and M. Milinski, 2015. When parasites disagree: evidence for parasite-induced
398 sabotage of host manipulation. *Evolution* 69:611 – 620.

- 399 Hosack, G. R., P. A. Rossignol, and P. van den Driessche, 2008. The control of vector-borne
400 disease epidemics. *Journal of Theoretical Biology* 255:16–25. URL [https://doi.org/](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jtbi.2008.07.033)
401 10.1016/j.jtbi.2008.07.033.
- 402 Hughes, D. P., J. Brodeur, and F. Thomas, 2012. *Host Manipulation by Parasites*. Oxford
403 University Press, London, England.
- 404 Hurford, A., D. Cownden, and T. Day, 2010. Next-generation tools for evolutionary invasion
405 analyses. *Journal of The Royal Society Interface* 7:561–571.
- 406 Iritani, R. and T. Sato, 2018. Host-manipulation by trophically transmitted parasites: The
407 switcher-paradigm. *Trends in Parasitology* 34:934–944. URL [https://doi.org/10.](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pt.2018.08.005)
408 1016/j.pt.2018.08.005.
- 409 Kalbe, M., K. M. Wegner, and T. B. H. Reusch, 2002. Dispersion patterns of parasites in
410 0+ year threespined sticklebacks: a cross population comparison. *Journal of Fish Biology*
411 60:1529–1542.
- 412 Lotka, A. J., 1920. Analytical note on certain rhythmic relations in organic systems. *Pro-*
413 *ceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 6:410–415. URL [https://doi.org/10.](https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.6.7.410)
414 1073/pnas.6.7.410.
- 415 Molyneux, D. H. and D. Jefferies, 1986. Feeding behaviour of pathogen-infected vectors.
416 *Parasitology* 92:721–736.
- 417 Parker, G. A., J. C. Chubb, G. N. Roberts, M. Michaud, and M. Milinski, 2003. Optimal
418 growth strategies of larval helminths in their intermediate hosts. *Journal of Evolutionary*
419 *Biology* 16:47–54. URL <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1420-9101.2003.00504.x>.
- 420 Ripa, J. and U. Dieckmann, 2013. Mutant invasions and adaptive dynamics in variable
421 environments. *Evolution* 67:1279–1290. URL [https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/](https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/evo.12046)
422 doi/abs/10.1111/evo.12046.

- 423 Rogawa, A., S. Ogata, and A. Mougi, 2018. Parasite transmission between trophic levels
424 stabilizes predator–prey interaction. *Scientific Reports* 8. URL [https://doi.org/10.](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-018-30818-7)
425 1038/s41598-018-30818-7.
- 426 Rogers, M. E. and P. A. Bates, 2007. *Leishmania* manipulation of sand fly feeding behavior
427 results in enhanced transmission. *PLoS Pathogens* 3:e91. URL [https://doi.org/10.](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.ppat.0030091)
428 1371/journal.ppat.0030091.
- 429 Roosien, B. K., R. Gomulkiewicz, L. L. Ingwell, N. A. Bosque-Pérez, D. Rajabaskar, and
430 S. D. Eigenbrode, 2013. Conditional vector preference aids the spread of plant pathogens:
431 Results from a model. *Environmental Entomology* 42:1299–1308. URL [https://doi.](https://doi.org/10.1603/en13062)
432 org/10.1603/en13062.
- 433 Seppälä, O. and J. Jokela, 2008. Host manipulation as a parasite transmission strategy
434 when manipulation is exploited by non-host predators. *Biology Letters* 4:663–666. URL
435 <https://doi.org/10.1098/rsbl.2008.0335>.
- 436 Vickery, W. L. and R. Poulin, 2009. The evolution of host manipulation by parasites: a
437 game theory analysis. *Evolutionary Ecology* 24:773–788. URL [https://doi.org/10.](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10682-009-9334-0)
438 1007/s10682-009-9334-0.
- 439 Wedekind, C. and M. Milinski, 1996. Do three-spined sticklebacks avoid consuming cope-
440 pods, the first intermediate host of *Schistocephalus solidus*? - an experimental analysis
441 of behavioural resistance. *Parasitology* 112:371–383. URL [https://doi.org/10.1017/](https://doi.org/10.1017/s0031182000066609)
442 s0031182000066609.
- 443 Zimmer, C., 2001. *Parasite Rex: Inside the Bizarre World of Nature's Most Dangerous*
444 *Creatures*. Atria Books.