

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 lifecycles. It directly affects predator-prey dynamics in trophically transmitted
3 parasites. Theoretical studies suggest that predation-enhancing manipulation
4 often decimates the prey population, making parasites prone to extinction. Host
5 manipulation, however, can also suppress predation due to conflicting interests
6 when multiple parasites infect a host, often neglected in theoretical studies.
7 Misaligned interests of coinfecting parasites can occur due to limited carrying
8 capacity or parasitoid developmental stage. Including this realistic complexity
9 in 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 a combination of manipulation and reproduction
12 parameters. Our study highlights the necessity and provides the means of incor-
13 porating the reality of multiple parasites and their multi-trophic life cycles in the
14 theory of parasite ecology.

15 Introduction

16 Parasites infect life on earth ubiquitously, and many of these parasites have complex life
17 cycles (Zimmer, 2001). While a complex lifecycle can be defined as abrupt ontogenic changes
18 in morphology and ecology (Benesh, 2016), a complex parasitic lifecycle typically involves
19 numerous hosts that a parasite needs to traverse to complete its life cycle. This complex
20 lifecycle results in the evolution of various strategies that enable the success of parasite
21 transmission from one host to another. One famous strategy that inspires many science
22 fiction movies and novels is host manipulation, where a parasite can alter the morphology
23 and/or behaviour of its host to enhance its transmission to the next host (Hughes et al.,
24 2012). Host manipulation has been shown in many host-parasite systems, from parasites with
25 simple life-cycle to those with complex life-cycle that involves more than one host (Hughes
26 et al., 2012; Molyneux and Jefferies, 1986). For instance, sand flies infected by *Leishmania*
27 parasites bite more and take more time for a blood meal from mammals (the definitive host of
28 *Leishmania*) compared to their uninfected counterparts (Rogers and Bates, 2007). Copepods
29 infected by cestode parasites are more active and accessible to sticklebacks (the definitive
30 hosts of the cestodes) compared to uninfected copepods (Wedekind and Milinski, 1996).

31 Theoretical studies have long attempted to understand the ecological and evolutionary
32 consequences of host manipulation. Roosien et al. (2013) and Hosack et al. (2008) showed
33 that manipulative parasites could increase the disease prevalence in an epidemic. Gandon
34 (2018) studied the evolution of the manipulative ability of infectious disease parasites, show-
35 ing different evolutionary outcomes depending on whether the pathogen can control its vector
36 or host. Haderler and Freedman (1989); Fenton and Rands (2006) and Rogawa et al. (2018)
37 showed that host manipulation could stabilise or destabilise the predator-prey dynamics de-
38 pending on how manipulation affects the predation response function and the assumption
39 on the fertility of the definitive infected host. Seppälä and Jokela (2008) showed that host
40 manipulation could evolve even when it increases the risk of the intermediate host being
41 eaten by a non-host predator, given that the initial predation risk is sufficiently low. These

models, however, lack a crucial aspect of parasite dynamics, multiple infections (Kalbe et al., 2002)

Typical studies do not consider multiple infections, a phenomenon that is the norm rather than an exception in parasitism. Multiple infections 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 over the other.

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). ~~They show multiple infections can increase virulence (van Baalen and Sabelis, 1995; Choisy and de Roode, 2010). Evolutionary branching of a less virulent and a hypervirulent parasite can occur when considering within-host dynamics (Alizon and van Baalen, 2008), and a reduction in virulence is possible if parasites are co-transmitted (Alizon, 2012). These studies also involve host manipulation to a certain extent, as it can affect transmission rates, even though they do not explicitly consider the trait. Host manipulation, while host manipulation~~ in trophically transmitted parasites receives less attention. ~~Although manipulation correlates with the transmission rate in trophically transmitted parasites and infectious diseases~~ Even though host manipulation and virulence both correlates with parasite transmission, there are differences subtle differences, such that virulence implies an addition to the natural mortality rate of the infected host, while manipulation links to immediate death of the intermediate host due to predation. ~~Host manipulation influences the~~



101.pdf

Figure 1: Who is in control?. Schistocephalus eggs, which overwinter at the bottom of bodies of water, hatch into microscopically small 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, where they reach the third larval stage and grow significantly 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 decision pertaining to investment in manipulation and growth. And indeed a stickleback can be infected by numerous tapeworms as shown above by Martin Kalbe.

69 ~~predation rate in trophically transmitted parasites, predominantly affecting~~ therefore not only

70 ~~affects the intermediate host population but the entire~~ predator-prey dynamics. Theoretical

71 studies on host manipulation in trophically transmitted parasites ~~with multiple infections are~~

72 ~~rare (Parker et al., 2003; Vickery and Poulin, 2009). Moreover, they do not consider~~ rarely

73 ~~consider multiple infections and those that did incorporate this feature neglect the~~ prey-

74 predator dynamics, which will likely have important feedback on the evolution of host ma-

75 nipulation. ~~A few studies considering the prey-predator dynamics do not incorporate multiple~~

76 ~~infections (Rogawa et al., 2018; Iritani and Sato, 2018; Haderler and Freedman, 1989; Fenton and Rands, 2006)~~

77 ~~. More importantly, they~~ (Parker et al., 2003; Vickery and Poulin, 2009). Moreover, these
78 models assume that transmission from definitive hosts to intermediate hosts is due to direct
79 contact between the two types of hosts (Rogawa et al., 2018; Iritani and Sato, 2018; Haderler and Freedman, 198
80 . This is often not the case in nature, as parasites are released from the definitive hosts into
81 the environment. Transmission thus happens only when intermediate hosts have contact
82 with this free-living parasite pool. The inclusion of this free-living stage could have profound
83 effect on the dynamics of the whole predator-prey-parasite system.

84 Our study addresses the gap in the theoretical work on host manipulation in trophically
85 transmitted parasites. We include multiple infections and consider the dynamics of the free-
86 living parasite pool. Our compartment model helps illustrate a parasite's complex lifecycle
87 with two hosts: an intermediate host preyed upon by a definitive host. Transmission from the
88 intermediate host to the definitive host occurs when predation on infected intermediate hosts
89 happens. Reproduction only happens in the definitive hosts. New parasites then enter the
90 environment, where the cycle continues. We focus on the intermediate host manipulation,
91 such that the parasite increases the uptake of the intermediate host by the definitive host
92 to increase its transmission rate. We then analyse the effect of host manipulation on the
93 ecological dynamics in the prey-predator-parasite system. In contrast to the abovementioned
94 examples, our model consists of a single intermediate host as it already provides enough
95 complexity to discuss between transmission and manipulation. We found that sabotage in
96 host manipulation almost always pushes the dynamical system toward bistability, provided the
97 reproduction in a single infection is sufficiently small. The bistable nature suggests that the
98 predator-prey parasite system is finely balanced and susceptible to extinction via ecological
99 disturbances. Initially surprising, we showed that cooperation in host manipulation and
100 enhanced reproduction in co-infecting parasites is not always beneficial and might expose
101 the parasite population to the risk of extinction.

Model and Results

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 lifecycle.

For simplicity, we assume that hosts can be infected by one (single infection) or, at most, two parasites (double infections). 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 lifecycle 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

124 host, the manipulation strategy is β_w . However, if the intermediate host is co-infected, the
 125 manipulation strategy is β_{ww} . In the scope of this model, we assume no specific relationship
 126 between β_w and β_{ww} to explore all possible ecological outcomes of the system. The force
 127 of infection by parasites in the environment is denoted by $\eta = \gamma W$. Since parasites can ma-
 128 nipulate intermediate and definitive hosts, here, whenever we mention host manipulation, it
 129 specifically refers to the manipulation in intermediate hosts, which correlates to the predation
 130 rate.

131 For the definitive hosts we have,

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

132 where $B(D_s, D_w, D_{ww}, I_s, I_w, I_{ww})$ represents the birth rate of definitive hosts. The birth
 133 rates depend on the density of both intermediate and definitive hosts, infected or uninfected.
 134 The force of infection that corresponds respectively to singly infected intermediate host (I_w)
 135 and doubly infected intermediate hosts (I_{ww}) is denoted respectively by $\lambda_w = h(\rho + \beta_w)I_w$
 136 and $\lambda_{ww} = h(\rho + \beta_{ww})I_{ww}$, where ρ is the baseline predation rate and h is the probability
 137 that the parasite successfully establishes inside the host. If there is no manipulation, that is,
 138 $\beta_w = \beta_{ww} = 0$, the parasite is still transmitted via the based line predation. The dynamics
 139 of the free-living parasites in the environment are then given by,

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

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

141 Here, we focus on manipulation that enhances transmission from intermediate hosts to
 142 definitive hosts; we thus simplify the transmission from the parasite pool to intermediate

143 hosts such that no sequential infection. This assumption is motivated given that the prey'
 144 lifecycle is often shorter than that of the predator. A prey likely encounters the free-living
 145 parasite pool once and then dies due to predation, making sequential transmission less likely
 146 at this state. Sequential infection can happen when parasites transmit from intermediate
 147 hosts to definitive hosts. Therefore, a singly infected definitive host can be further infected
 148 by another parasite if it consumes infected intermediate hosts. Figure (2) illustrates the
 system's dynamics.




Figure 2: ~~Schematic of the model.~~ Schematic of the model. Blue ovals represent the intermediate host compartment, while the green diamonds represent definitive host compartment, and the transparent 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 **W**.

149

Results

Basic reproduction ratio R_0 of the parasites

The basic reproduction ratio R_0 (or basic reproduction number as often used in epidemiology) indicates parasite fitness. It can be understood as the expected number of offspring a parasite produces during its lifetime when introduced to a susceptible host population. We calculate the basic reproduction ratio R_0 using the next-generation method (Diekmann et al., 1990, 2009; Hurford et al., 2010) (See SI1 for details).

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

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

If $R_0 > 1$, a parasite spreads when introduced into the disease-free equilibrium of prey and predator. Intuitively, the higher the density of susceptible intermediate and definitive hosts, the larger the value of R_0 as the infection reservoir is more extensive. In contrast, regardless of the explicit form of the predation function, the higher the predation rate P_w and P_{ww} , the

171 lower the value of R_0 given the smaller reservoir of intermediate hosts. The effect of host
 172 manipulation on the value of R_0 is not so straightforward; as host manipulation becomes
 173 efficient, the transmission rate from the intermediate host to the definitive host increases,
 174 but so does the predation rate. A higher predation rate results in a smaller intermediate
 175 host reservoir available for the parasites to infect. To understand the effect of manipulation
 176 on parasites' fitness and the system's ecological dynamics, we next specify the predation
 177 functions. We consider linear functions for predation to begin with,

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

178 where $D_{total} = D_s + D_w + D_{ww}$ is the total density of the definitive hosts, and ρ is the
 179 baseline capture rate of the predator on the prey. If an intermediate host is infected, it is
 180 captured by the definitive hosts with rate $\rho + \beta_w$ if it is singly infected and with rate $\rho + \beta_{ww}$
 181 if it is doubly infected. Zero values for β_w and β_{ww} suggest no manipulation, and predation
 182 is at the baseline value ρ .

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

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

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

190 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} . But, it does not depend on the manipulation ability 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 significantly large (the specific mathematical conditions can be found 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.

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

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

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

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

217 This equilibrium is positive and stable if components of the parasite, such as reproduction
218 and transmission are sufficiently small, details of the condition can be found in section SI 4.
219 (Figure 3B).

220 When a parasite appears in the disease-free equilibrium, it spreads if its reproduction ratio
221 $R_0 > 1$. Since the expression is complicated, we could not obtain analytical solutions for
222 this inequality without assumptions. We assume the same parasite virulence, $\alpha_w = \alpha_{ww}$,
223 $\sigma_w = \sigma_{ww}$, and reproduction in double infection as a linear function concerning reproduction
224 in single infections, $f_{ww} = \epsilon f_w$. When $\epsilon > 1$, reproduction in double infections is enhanced
225 as compared to in single infections, whereas $\epsilon \leq 1$, reproduction in double infections is
226 depressed or equal to reproduction in single infections. We found that the parasite can
227 establish if its reproduction value in a single infection f_w is more significant than a threshold
228 (Figure 4, see section SI 5 and Eq. (SI.19)).

229 Our numerical results show that the parasite reproduction is substantial compared to other
230 parameters (its value is nearly 40 times greater than other parameters). This observation
231 suggests that trophically transmitted parasites must release many offspring into the environ-
232 ment to persist. Interestingly, bistability occurs if the reproduction rate of the parasite in
233 double infections is enhanced (Figure 4A). In the bistable region, the parasite population can
234 reach a stable equilibrium if the initial density is large enough. In contrast, with sufficient
235 disturbance, the parasite population could go extinct.




Figure 3: A, B) ~~Disease-free~~ mention A and B separately and same for C and D Disease-free equilibrium where the parasite cannot persist. C, D) Disease stable equilibrium. Solid gray line indicate the density of free-living parasites, blue lines indicate infected intermediate hosts while red lines indicate infected definitive hosts. Dashed lines indicate singly infected hosts while dot-dashed lines indicate doubly infected hosts. 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 $f_w = f_{ww} = 45$




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 $\rho = 1.2$, $d = 0.9$, $r = 2.5$, $\gamma = 2.9$, $\alpha_w = 0$, $\alpha_{ww} = 0$, $\beta_w = 1.5$, $\beta_{ww} = 1.5$, $p = 0.05$, $c = 1.4$, $\mu = 3.9$, $\sigma_w = 0$, $\sigma_{ww} = 0$, $q = 0.05$, $\delta = 0.9$, $k = 0.26$, $h = 0.6$.

The effect of host manipulation on ecological dynamics

Host manipulation can be cooperative; two parasites increase the predation rate on intermediate hosts, or $\beta_{ww} > \beta_w$. However, it can also be uncooperative; the predation rate on doubly-infected intermediate hosts is lower than that on singly-infected ones or $\beta_{ww} < \beta_w$.

240 Cooperation in parasite manipulation increases the parasite's basic reproduction ratio R_0 ,
 241 but the manipulation in a single infection substantially affects the value of R_0 (Figure 5
 242 Left). Intuitively, if the manipulation in a single infection is minor, there is not enough
 243 transmission, and the parasite goes extinct. However, suppose the ability to manipulate the
 244 host in a single infection is merely enough for the parasite population to escape extinction.
 245 In that case, cooperation in host manipulation leads to a bistable system state. Within the
 246 bistable region, the basic reproduction ratio can be less than one, suggesting that the parasite
 247 cannot spread when its manipulative values are within this area of weak manipulation when
 248 coinfecting.

249 Co-infecting parasites can influence each other in different life history traits besides ma-
 250 nipulation. Parasites can have an enhanced reproduction rate in coinfections, i.e. $f_{ww} > f_w$.
 251 Likewise, they can compete for resources, so reproduction in double infection is depressed
 252 as compared to in single infection. Without any assumption on the relationship between
 253 manipulative ability and reproduction, we explore all possible combinations of cooperation-
 254 sabotage range in manipulation and depressed-enhanced range in reproduction. If parasites
 255 are uncooperative in manipulations and shows depressed reproduction, they cannot persist
 256 (Figure 5). In contrast, if they are highly cooperative in manipulation and show enhanced re-
 257 production (i.e. $\beta_{ww}/\beta_w \rightarrow \infty$ and $f_{ww}/f_w \rightarrow \infty$), there is a guaranteed single equilibrium
 258 for parasite existence.

259 For intermediate levels of coordination in reproduction and manipulation, a bistable area
 260 could occur. However, the size of this area is sensitive to the value of reproduction and
 261 manipulation in a single infection. In particular, higher values of these two parameters
 262 reduce the bistability area, whereas larger values increase the bistability area (Figure 5,
 263 Figure SI.1). If the parasites sabotage each other, the system is highly prone to bistability
 264 and only has a single equilibrium when reproduction is especially enhanced. Interestingly,
 265 sufficiently high reproduction enhancement leads to bistability (i.e. f_{ww} is at least four times
 266 f_w), and depressed reproduction always leads to a single equilibrium of the system (Figure

5). While a single equilibrium guarantees the existence of a parasite population, bistability indicates that a disturbance of the system may likely lead to the extinction of the parasite population. This suggests that the benefits of coordination in reproduction and manipulation are context-dependent. Coordinating holds an advantage if there are no significant tradeoffs and if reproduction or manipulation in single infections are large enough.




Figure 5: Left: R_0 values increase with more efficient manipulation in both 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 indifference equal between single infection and double infection ($\beta_w = \beta_{ww}$). Right: Changes of the bistability area (shaded areas) with respect to concerning different reproduction rates in single infection (different boundary styles). Manipulation and reproduction is indifference levels are equal between single infection and double infection on the vertical and horizontal lines respectively. Common parameter: $\rho = 1.2$, $d = 0.9$, $r = 2.5$, $\gamma = 2.9$, $\alpha_w = 0$, $\alpha_{ww} = 0$, $p = 0.05$, $c = 1.4$, $\mu = 3.9$, $\sigma_w = 0$, $\sigma_{ww} = 0$, $q = 0.05$, $\delta = 0.9$, $k = 0.26$, $\beta_w = 1.65$, $h = 0.6$.

Co-transmission probability from the parasite pool to intermediate hosts p has the opposite effect on the bistable area compared to co-transmission probability q from intermediate hosts to intermediate hosts (Figure 6). In particular, when the parasite sabotages the manipulation, increasing p enlarges the bistable area, whereas increasing q reduces it. In contrast, when parasites cooperate in manipulation, reducing p decreases the bistable area while reducing q widens it. If cooperation in manipulation is exceptionally high, the population will

278 always exist with one stable equilibrium regardless of the co-transmission value. However,
 279 as there are always limitations and trade-offs, high values may not be possible. Bistability
 280 indicates vulnerability to disturbance, suggesting that cooperation in manipulation may be
 281 beneficial when the co-transmission from the pool to the intermediate host increases. How-
 282 ever, cooperation in manipulation may harm the population when the co-transmission from
 283 the intermediate host to the definitive host increases.




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

284 Discussion & Conclusion

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

290 Our model shows that parasites cannot spread quickly in a cyclic predator-prey system.
 291 This delay is an expected result since even though the parasite's basic reproduction ratio R_0
 292 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. 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 hosts. 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.

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 not sufficient 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.

Iritani and Sato (2018) show that manipulative parasites persist if they can alternate manipulation between boosting and suppressing predation rate. In our model, the parasite cannot switch its manipulative strategy. Sabotaging manipulation 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, sabotage decreases transmission rate from intermediate to definitive host, and does not benefit the parasite.

Finally, our study focuses on the ecological dynamics of the trophically transmitted parasite. However, investigating the evolution of host manipulation is a natural extension beyond the scope of a single manuscript, given the complexities that arise in the ecological dynamics itself. Studying the evolution of host manipulation, considering the free-living parasite pool, calls for thorough analyses, which could be a standalone study. For example, we would need to include differences between the traits of the multiple parasites and hence the ecological model becomes more complex than presented in this study. The combinatorics and orderings of sequential infections will then become important. In addition, the occurrence of bistability in our model suggests that the evolution of host manipulation may drive the parasite to extinction simply because of the rarity of the mutant and the Allee effect as per Adaptive dynamics approaches. The coinfecting parasites can increase manipulation and enhance reproduction freely if there exist no tradeoffs. Nevertheless, our model shows that the benefits of this strategy are context-dependent, making it suboptimal in certain cases. Evolutionary dynamics would therefore depend on the tradeoff between host manipulation and other traits of the parasites, such as reproduction, virulence, and survivorship in the parasite pool, to list a few. This extension deserves thorough analysis, and we will treat it as a separate matter.

References

- Alizon, S., 2012. Parasite co-transmission and the evolutionary epidemiology of virulence. *Evolution* 67:921–933. URL <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1558-5646.2012.01827.x>.
- Alizon, S. and M. van Baalen, 2008. Multiple infections, immune dynamics, and the evolution of virulence. *The American Naturalist* 172:E150–E168. URL <https://doi.org/10.1086/590958>.
- Alizon, S., J. C. de Roode, and Y. Michalakis, 2013. Multiple infections and the evolution of virulence. *Ecology Letters* 16:556–567. URL <https://doi.org/10.1111/ele.12076>.
- Allen, L. J. S., V. A. Bokil, N. J. Cuniffe, F. M. Hamelin, F. M. Hilker, and M. J. Jeger, 2019. Modelling Vector Transmission and Epidemiology of Co-Infecting Plant Viruses. *Viruses* 11:1153. URL <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC6950130/>.
- van Baalen, M. and M. W. Sabelis, 1995. The dynamics of multiple infection and the evolution of virulence. *The American Naturalist* 146:881–910. URL <https://doi.org/10.1086/285830>.
- Benesh, D. P., 2016. Autonomy and integration in complex parasite life cycles. *Parasitology* 143:1824 – 1846.
- Choisy, M. and J. C. de Roode, 2010. Mixed infections and the evolution of virulence: Effects of resource competition, parasite plasticity, and impaired host immunity. *The American Naturalist* 175:E105–E118. URL <https://doi.org/10.1086/651587>.
- Diekmann, O., J. Heesterbeek, and J. Metz, 1990. On the definition and the computation of the basic reproduction ratio r_0 in models for infectious diseases in heterogeneous populations. *Journal of Mathematical Biology* 28. URL <https://doi.org/10.1007/bf00178324>.

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

372 Fenton, A. and S. A. Rands, 2006. The impact of parasite manipulation and predator
 373 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).

375 Gandon, S., 2018. Evolution and manipulation of vector host choice. *The American Naturalist*
 376 192:23–34. URL <https://doi.org/10.1086/697575>.

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

380 Haderler, K. P. and H. I. Freedman, 1989. Predator-prey populations with parasitic infec-
 381 tion. *Journal of Mathematical Biology* 27:609–631. URL <https://doi.org/10.1007/bf00276947>.

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

385 Hosack, G. R., P. A. Rossignol, and P. van den Driessche, 2008. The control of vector-borne
 386 disease epidemics. *Journal of Theoretical Biology* 255:16–25. URL <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jtbi.2008.07.033>.

388 Hughes, D. P., J. Brodeur, and F. Thomas, 2012. *Host Manipulation by Parasites*. Oxford
 389 University Press, London, England.

390 Hurford, A., D. Cownden, and T. Day, 2010. Next-generation tools for evolutionary invasion
 391 analyses. *Journal of The Royal Society Interface* 7:561–571.

392 Iritani, R. and T. Sato, 2018. Host-manipulation by trophically transmitted parasites: The
 393 switcher-paradigm. *Trends in Parasitology* 34:934–944. URL [https://doi.org/10.](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pt.2018.08.005)
 394 1016/j.pt.2018.08.005.

395 Kalbe, M., K. M. Wegner, and T. B. H. Reusch, 2002. Dispersion patterns of parasites in
 396 0+ year threespined sticklebacks: a cross population comparison. *Journal of Fish Biology*
 397 60:1529–1542.

398 Lotka, A. J., 1920. Analytical note on certain rhythmic relations in organic systems. *Pro-*
 399 ceedings of the National Academy of Sciences 6:410–415. URL [https://doi.org/10.](https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.6.7.410)
 400 1073/pnas.6.7.410.

401 Molyneux, D. H. and D. Jefferies, 1986. Feeding behaviour of pathogen-infected vectors.
 402 *Parasitology* 92:721–736.

403 Parker, G. A., J. C. Chubb, G. N. Roberts, M. Michaud, and M. Milinski, 2003. Optimal
 404 growth strategies of larval helminths in their intermediate hosts. *Journal of Evolutionary*
 405 *Biology* 16:47–54. URL <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1420-9101.2003.00504.x>.

406 Ripa, J. and U. Dieckmann, 2013. Mutant invasions and adaptive dynamics in variable
 407 environments. *Evolution* 67:1279–1290. URL [https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/](https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/evo.12046)
 408 doi/abs/10.1111/evo.12046.

409 Rogawa, A., S. Ogata, and A. Mougi, 2018. Parasite transmission between trophic levels
 410 stabilizes predator–prey interaction. *Scientific Reports* 8. URL [https://doi.org/10.](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-018-30818-7)
 411 1038/s41598-018-30818-7.

412 Rogers, M. E. and P. A. Bates, 2007. *Leishmania* manipulation of sand fly feeding behavior
 413 results in enhanced transmission. *PLoS Pathogens* 3:e91. URL [https://doi.org/10.](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.ppat.0030091)
 414 1371/journal.ppat.0030091.

415 Roosien, B. K., R. Gomulkiewicz, L. L. Ingwell, N. A. Bosque-Pérez, D. Rajabaskar, and
 416 S. D. Eigenbrode, 2013. Conditional vector preference aids the spread of plant pathogens:

- 417 Results from a model. *Environmental Entomology* 42:1299–1308. URL [https://doi.](https://doi.org/10.1603/en13062)
418 [org/10.1603/en13062](https://doi.org/10.1603/en13062).
- 419 Seppälä, O. and J. Jokela, 2008. Host manipulation as a parasite transmission strategy
420 when manipulation is exploited by non-host predators. *Biology Letters* 4:663–666. URL
421 <https://doi.org/10.1098/rsbl.2008.0335>.
- 422 Vickery, W. L. and R. Poulin, 2009. The evolution of host manipulation by parasites: a
423 game theory analysis. *Evolutionary Ecology* 24:773–788. URL [https://doi.org/10.](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10682-009-9334-0)
424 [1007/s10682-009-9334-0](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10682-009-9334-0).
- 425 Wedekind, C. and M. Milinski, 1996. Do three-spined sticklebacks avoid consuming cope-
426 pods, the first intermediate host of *Schistocephalus solidus*? - an experimental analysis
427 of behavioural resistance. *Parasitology* 112:371–383. URL [https://doi.org/10.1017/](https://doi.org/10.1017/s0031182000066609)
428 [s0031182000066609](https://doi.org/10.1017/s0031182000066609).
- 429 Zimmer, C., 2001. *Parasite Rex: Inside the Bizarre World of Nature's Most Dangerous*
430 *Creatures*. Atria Books.