

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 for, incorporating the
13 reality of multiple parasites and their multi-trophic life cycles into the theory of
14 parasite ecology.

15 Introduction

16 Parasites infect life on earth ubiquitously, and many of these parasites have complex life cycles
17 (Zimmer, 2001). While a complex life cycle can be defined as abrupt ontogenic changes in
18 morphology and ecology (Benesh, 2016), a complex parasitic life cycle typically involves
19 numerous hosts that a parasite needs to traverse to complete its life cycle. This complex
20 life cycle 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
25 with simple life cycles to those with a complex life cycle that involves more than one host
26 species (Hughes et al., 2012; Molyneux and Jefferies, 1986). For instance, sand flies infected
27 by *Leishmania* parasites bite more and take more time for a blood meal from mammals (the
28 definitive host of *Leishmania*) compared to their uninfected counterparts (Rogers and Bates,
29 2007). Copepods infected by cestode parasites are more active and accessible to sticklebacks
30 (the cestodes' definitive hosts) than 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 reproduction of
39 the infected definitive host. Seppälä and Jokela (2008) showed that host manipulation could
40 evolve even when it increases the risk of the intermediate host being eaten by a non-host
41 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 both 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; Haderler and Freedman, 1989; Fenton



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 and Rands, 2006). This is often not the case in nature, as parasites are released from the
 70 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

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

89 **Model**

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

96 For simplicity, we assume that hosts can be infected by one (single infection) or, at most,
97 two parasites (double infections). Thus, while I_s and D_s are the susceptible intermediate
98 and definitive hosts, their singly and doubly infected counterparts are denoted by I_w and D_w
99 and I_{ww} and D_{ww} respectively. Our model is, therefore, more relevant to the macroparasitic
100 system. Given that infection occurs, the probability that two parasites from the parasite
101 pool co-transmit to an intermediate host is denoted by p . Thus, $1 - p$ is the probability
102 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 ρ . The dynamics of the free-living parasites in the environment are
130 then given by

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

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

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,

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

146 2009; Hurford et al., 2010) (See SI1 for details).

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

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

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

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

168 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-free 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 $f_w = f_{ww} = 45$

214 $\alpha_w = \alpha_{ww}$, $\sigma_w = \sigma_{ww}$, and reproduction in double infection as a linear function concerning
 215 reproduction in single infections, $f_{ww} = \epsilon f_w$. When $\epsilon > 1$, reproduction in double infections
 216 is enhanced compared to in single infections, whereas $\epsilon \leq 1$, reproduction in double infections
 217 is suppressed or equal to reproduction in single infections. We found that the parasite can
 218 establish if its reproduction value in a single infection f_w is more significant than a threshold
 219 (Figure 4, see section SI 5 and Eq. (SI.19)).

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

231 The effect of host manipulation on ecological dynamics

232 Host manipulation can be cooperative; two parasites increase the predation rate on interme-
 233 diate hosts, or $\beta_{ww} > \beta_w$. However, it can also be uncooperative; the predation rate on
 234 doubly-infected intermediate hosts is lower than that on singly-infected ones or $\beta_{ww} < \beta_w$.
 235 Cooperation in parasite manipulation increases the parasite's basic reproduction ratio R_0 ,
 236 but the manipulation in a single infection substantially affects the value of R_0 (Figure 5).
 237 Intuitively, if the manipulation in a single infection is minor, there is not enough transmission,
 238 and the parasite goes extinct. However, suppose the ability to manipulate the host in a single
 239 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 $\rho = 1.2$, $d = 0.9$, $r = 2.5$, $\gamma = 2.9$, $\alpha_w = 0$, $\alpha_{ww} = 0$, $\beta_w = 1.5$, $\beta_{ww} = 1.5$, $p = 0.05$, $c = 1.4$, $\mu = 3.9$, $\sigma_w = 0$, $\sigma_{ww} = 0$, $q = 0.05$, $\delta = 0.9$, $k = 0.26$, $h = 0.6$.

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

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

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

260 If coinfecting parasites are discordant, i.e. uncooperative in manipulations and show sup-
261 pressed reproduction, they cannot persist (Figure 5). On the other extreme, where they are
262 highly cooperative in manipulation and show enhanced reproduction, i.e., an extreme level
263 of coordination, there is a guaranteed single equilibrium for parasite existence. Note that
264 this happens at the combination of $\beta_{ww}/\beta_w \rightarrow \infty$ and $f_{ww}/f_w \rightarrow \infty$, a scenario that is
265 rather impossible in reality. Very often, we expect intermediate levels of coordination where
266 a bistable area could occur (top left quadrant in Figure 5 at $f_w = (37, 37.5)$). However, the
267 size of this area is sensitive to the value of reproduction and manipulation in a single infection.
268 In particular, higher values of these two parameters reduce the bistability area to the point
269 that sufficiently large reproduction in single infection can guarantee single equilibrium when
270 parasites coordinate (top left quadrant in Figure 5 Left at $f_w = (38)$, Figure SI.2). In con-

trast, slightly reducing values of reproduction and manipulation in single infection increase the bistability area. If the parasites sabotage each other, the system is highly prone to bistability and only has a single equilibrium when reproduction is especially enhanced (left side of vertical line in Figure 5 Left). Interestingly, sufficiently high reproduction enhancement leads to bistability (i.e. f_{ww} is at least four times f_w), and reproductive incoordination, i.e. depressed reproduction and manipulative cooperation, always leads to a single equilibrium of the system (Figure 4A, and bottom right quadrant in Figure 5Left). 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 is advantageous if no significant tradeoffs and reproduction or manipulation in single infections are large enough.

We now explore the effect of co-transmission probability on the bistability of the system (Figure 6). First, extinction is more likely with varying levels of co-transmission from the parasite pool to intermediate host p compared to varying levels of co-transmission from intermediate host to definitive host q . For exceptionally high level of cooperation and not very small values of both p and q , the predator-prey-parasite system will always persist with one stable equilibrium. However, limitations and trade-offs are often unavoidable, and such high values of cooperation may be impossible, putting the system in the parameter space where bistability likely occurs. When the parasite sabotages manipulation, the bistable area decreases with increasing p and q . However, this bistable area disappears with high values of q but not with high values of p . When parasites cooperate in manipulation, reducing p almost always lead to bistability where as reducing q can lead to single equilibrium if cooperation is sufficiently large. Bistability indicates vulnerability to disturbance, and so cooperation in manipulation may be beneficial when q , the co-transmission from the intermediate host to the definitive host decreases. However, cooperation in manipulation may still harm the population with reducing p , the co-transmission from the parasite pool to intermediate host.




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. On the left side of the vertical line, $\beta_{ww} > \beta_w$, indicating cooperation, whereas on the right side of the vertical line, $\beta_{ww} < \beta_w$, indicating sabotage. On the upper part of the horizontal line, $f_{ww} > f_w$, indicating enhanced reproduction, whereas, on the lower part of the horizontal line, $f_{ww} < f_w$, indicating suppressed reproduction. Common parameter: $\rho = 1.2$, $d = 0.9$, $r = 2.5$, $\gamma = 2.9$, $\alpha_w = 0$, $\alpha_{ww} = 0$, $p = 0.05$, $c = 1.4$, $\mu = 3.9$, $\sigma_w = 0$, $\sigma_{ww} = 0$, $q = 0.05$, $\delta = 0.9$, $k = 0.26$, $\beta_w = 1.65$, $h = 0.6$.

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




Figure 6: Left: Effect of cotransmission from parasite pool to intermediate host. Right: Effect of cotransmission from intermediate to definitive host. On the left side of the vertical line, $\beta_{ww} > \beta_w$, indicating cooperation, whereas on the right side of the vertical line, $\beta_{ww} < \beta_w$, indicating sabotage. Common parameters: $\rho = 1.2$, $d = 0.9$, $r = 2.5$, $\gamma = 2.9$, $\alpha_w = 0$, $\alpha_{ww} = 0$, $p = 0.05$, $c = 1.4$, $\mu = 3.9$, $\sigma_w = 0$, $\sigma_{ww} = 0$, $q = 0.05$, $\delta = 0.9$, $k = 0.26$, $\epsilon = 4.5$, $\beta_w = 1.45$, $f_w = 38$, $h = 0.6$.

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

322 between the two host species. Such immediate transmission could directly accelerate the
323 feedback loop between prey and predator. Hence, faster predator-prey dynamics occur,
324 which may lead to cyclic dynamics when parasites are introduced.

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

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

348 Finally, our study focuses on the ecological dynamics of a trophically transmitted para-

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

361 **References**

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

373 evolution of virulence. *The American Naturalist* 146:881–910. URL [https://doi.org/](https://doi.org/10.1086/285830)
374 10.1086/285830.

375 Benesh, D. P., 2016. Autonomy and integration in complex parasite life cycles. *Parasitology*
376 143:1824 – 1846.

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

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

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

387 Fenton, A. and S. A. Rands, 2006. The impact of parasite manipulation and predator
388 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).

390 Gandon, S., 2018. Evolution and manipulation of vector host choice. *The American Naturalist*
391 192:23–34. URL <https://doi.org/10.1086/697575>.

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

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

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

400 Hosack, G. R., P. A. Rossignol, and P. van den Driessche, 2008. The control of vector-borne
401 disease epidemics. *Journal of Theoretical Biology* 255:16–25. URL [https://doi.org/](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jtbi.2008.07.033)
402 10.1016/j.jtbi.2008.07.033.

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

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

407 Iritani, R. and T. Sato, 2018. Host-manipulation by trophically transmitted parasites: The
408 switcher-paradigm. *Trends in Parasitology* 34:934–944. URL [https://doi.org/10.](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pt.2018.08.005)
409 1016/j.pt.2018.08.005.

410 Kalbe, M., K. M. Wegner, and T. B. H. Reusch, 2002. Dispersion patterns of parasites in
411 0+ year three-spined sticklebacks: a cross population comparison. *Journal of Fish Biology*
412 60:1529–1542.

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

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

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

- 421 Ripa, J. and U. Dieckmann, 2013. Mutant invasions and adaptive dynamics in variable
422 environments. *Evolution* 67:1279–1290. URL [https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/](https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/evo.12046)
423 [doi/abs/10.1111/evo.12046](https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/evo.12046).
- 424 Rogawa, A., S. Ogata, and A. Mougi, 2018. Parasite transmission between trophic levels
425 stabilizes predator–prey interaction. *Scientific Reports* 8. URL [https://doi.org/10.](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-018-30818-7)
426 [1038/s41598-018-30818-7](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-018-30818-7).
- 427 Rogers, M. E. and P. A. Bates, 2007. Leishmania manipulation of sand fly feeding behavior
428 results in enhanced transmission. *PLoS Pathogens* 3:e91. URL [https://doi.org/10.](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.ppat.0030091)
429 [1371/journal.ppat.0030091](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.ppat.0030091).
- 430 Roosien, B. K., R. Gomulkiewicz, L. L. Ingwell, N. A. Bosque-Pérez, D. Rajabaskar, and
431 S. D. Eigenbrode, 2013. Conditional vector preference aids the spread of plant pathogens:
432 Results from a model. *Environmental Entomology* 42:1299–1308. URL [https://doi.](https://doi.org/10.1603/en13062)
433 [org/10.1603/en13062](https://doi.org/10.1603/en13062).
- 434 Seppälä, O. and J. Jokela, 2008. Host manipulation as a parasite transmission strategy
435 when manipulation is exploited by non-host predators. *Biology Letters* 4:663–666. URL
436 <https://doi.org/10.1098/rsbl.2008.0335>.
- 437 Vickery, W. L. and R. Poulin, 2009. The evolution of host manipulation by parasites: a
438 game theory analysis. *Evolutionary Ecology* 24:773–788. URL [https://doi.org/10.](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10682-009-9334-0)
439 [1007/s10682-009-9334-0](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10682-009-9334-0).
- 440 Wedekind, C. and M. Milinski, 1996. Do three-spined sticklebacks avoid consuming cope-
441 pods, the first intermediate host of *Schistocephalus solidus*? - an experimental analysis
442 of behavioural resistance. *Parasitology* 112:371–383. URL [https://doi.org/10.1017/](https://doi.org/10.1017/s0031182000066609)
443 [s0031182000066609](https://doi.org/10.1017/s0031182000066609).
- 444 Zimmer, C., 2001. *Parasite Rex: Inside the Bizarre World of Nature's Most Dangerous*
445 *Creatures*. Atria Books.