

# Coevolutionary arms races between bacteria and bacteriophage

J. S. Weitz<sup>\*†</sup>, H. Hartman<sup>‡</sup>, and S. A. Levin<sup>\*</sup>

<sup>\*</sup>Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ 08544; and <sup>‡</sup>Center for Biomedical Engineering, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA 02139

Contributed by S. A. Levin, May 18, 2005

**We propose a computational and theoretical framework for analyzing rapid coevolutionary dynamics of bacteriophage and bacteria in their ecological context. Bacteriophage enter host cells via membrane-bound surface receptors often responsible for nutrient uptake. As such, a selective pressure will exist for the bacteria to modify its receptor configuration and, in turn, for the phage to modify its tail fiber. A mathematical model of these trait adaptations is developed by using the framework of adaptive dynamics. Host strains differ in their efficiency of resource uptake and resistance to phage, whereas phage strains differ in their host preference for adsorption. We solve the evolutionary ecology model and find the conditions for coevolutionary branching and relevant dimensionless parameters leading to distinct quasispecies. We confirm these calculations using stochastic Monte Carlo simulations of populations evolving in a chemostat with fixed washout rate and inflow resource density. We find that multiple quasispecies of bacteria and phage can coexist in a homogeneous medium with a single resource. When diversification occurs, quasispecies of phage adsorb effectively to only a limited subset of the total number of quasispecies of bacteria, i.e., functional differences between quasispecies arise endogenously within the evolutionary ecology framework. Finally, we discuss means to relate predictions of this model to experimental studies in the chemostat, using the model organisms *Escherichia coli* and the virulent strain of  $\lambda$  phage.**

adaptive dynamics | chemostat | coevolution | diversification | model

Over 40 years ago the influential ecologist G. E. Hutchinson proposed “the paradox of the plankton” (1). Many phytoplankton species are functionally equivalent and live in well mixed pelagic environments, or so the paradox contends. As such, their diversity should be limited by the inevitable competitive advantage possessed by a small number of types. However, phytoplankton diversity is observed to be many orders of magnitude greater in natural samples (2) than predicted by the theory of competitive exclusion (3). This gap between theory and empirical data has been debated widely in the literature, and Hutchinson himself offered a number of ecological scenarios that purport to resolve the paradox (1). These scenarios include spatial heterogeneity in the environment, symbiotic interactions and predation, temporal switching in competitive strategies, as well as the catalytic effect of predation. These scenarios constitute a suite of possible approaches for resolving the paradox of the plankton as well as the fundamental question: why are there so many species (4, 5)? The accelerating scientific interest in studies of biodiversity in the intervening decades reflects the importance of this (increasingly practical) problem in evolutionary ecology.

In this paper, we develop a quantitative framework to address aspects of the generation and maintenance of diversity in microbial systems. Typical aquatic samples contain bacterial densities on the order of  $10^7$  ml<sup>-1</sup> (6) and there is evidence that viral density is at least that high (2). These densities support a diversity of strains whose estimation poses a difficult experimental as well as theoretical problem (7). Nonetheless, there is an emerging consensus that there are many, perhaps millions, of

uncultured and as yet unidentified strains of bacteria and phage (8). The presence of this diversity reflects the mutation–selection balance of neutral or near-neutral changes in the individual genomes as well as functional differences in the response of bacteria and phage to their environments (9, 10). The environments bacteria and phage respond to include each other; thus, a theory of the generation and maintenance of diversity should account for the evolutionary and possibly coevolutionary changes among bacteria and bacteriophage.


Previous theoretical models of coevolutionary dynamics (11, 12) of host–parasite interactions have not yet been applied to systems with fluctuating resources such as aquatic environments and the many experimental studies of coevolution of bacteria and bacteriophage in the chemostat (13–18). Coevolutionary models designed for analysis of bacteria–bacteriophage communities have consisted of verbal mathematical constructs (2, 19, 20) or explicit calculations of the pairwise fitness of an invading mutant with respect to a single resident wild type (21). In many of these models, an assumption is made that the interaction of bacteria and bacteriophage rely on exclusive lock–key mechanisms. The biological basis for such an assumption is that bacteriophage insert their DNA into a host cell via membrane-bound surface receptors often responsible for nutrient uptake. Distinct tail fibers of bacteriophage (the key) are then presumed to adsorb exclusively to distinct conformations of a surface receptor (the lock). Changes in the conformation of the surface receptor, among other possible phenotypic changes, drive concomitant changes in the conformation of tail fibers. A possible outcome of such pairwise changes is the generation of a completely resistant bacterial host for which no host-range phage mutant exists (22, 23). However, the collapse of the host–parasitoid interaction web is by no means inevitable. Recent studies suggest the sustainability of complex host–parasitoid webs (17). An alternative view of bacteria and bacteriophage interactions is that of an imperfect lock–key mechanism, for which every tail fiber may adsorb to multiple receptor configurations, though not with equal efficiency. Likewise, a single receptor may be sensitive to adsorption by multiple tail fibers. Such a mechanism is likely to occur whenever there are severely deleterious consequences for the fitness of a bacterium mutant whose surface receptor is severely altered or eliminated altogether. Strong empirical support for such a view is found in the case of the interaction between *Escherichia coli* and  $\lambda$  phage (24–26). The theoretical model presented in this manuscript addresses the case of imperfect lock–key mechanisms.

We begin our analysis by proposing a conceptual framework that involves an ecological model, an evolutionary model, and a means to couple this pair of processes. The ecological model describes the population dynamics of bacteria and virulent phage in continuous culture. The evolutionary model describes

Abbreviation: ESS, evolutionarily stable strategy.

<sup>†</sup>To whom correspondence should be addressed. E-mail: jsweitz@princeton.edu.

© 2005 by The National Academy of Sciences of the USA



**Fig. 1.** A schematic of the linkages between the ecological model of population dynamics, the trait model describing resource uptake and adsorption of phage, and the theoretical and numerical approaches for analyzing the evolutionary ecology. Note that adaptive dynamics is the limit of the evolutionary ecology in the small-mutation limit, results from which are combined with biological parameters to guide stochastic simulations of coevolutionary dynamics of bacteriophage and bacteria in the chemostat.

the changes in phenotypic trait space that control host resource consumption and phage adsorption. A coupled evolutionary ecology model with a specified set of testable assumptions is then solved by the techniques of adaptive dynamics (27, 28), leading to the conditions for coevolutionary diversification. The major assumption of the conceptual model is that bacteria cannot completely block the infection of phage without also losing their ability to uptake resources. Assuming small, but finite, rates of mutagenesis, we also use stochastic simulations to assess the dynamics of coevolution and diversification in multistrain communities of bacteria and bacteriophage. Finally, we discuss the implications, for future coevolutionary studies, of prior work on the specific genetic loci affecting adsorption and uptake in the model organisms *E. coli* and the virulent strain of  $\lambda$  phage.

### Coevolution Model of Bacteria–Bacteriophage Interactions

Recent advances in studies of coevolution suggest means to integrate ecological interactions into a coevolutionary framework (29–32). The system we present describes coevolutionary changes in phenotypic traits; it consists of an explicit trait-driven ecological model and a phenotypic model of trait changes in a continuous trait space. A schematic of the linkages between the analytical techniques and the stochastic simulations is contained in Fig. 1.

The ecological model we consider here is similar to mean field theories of predator–prey dynamics (33–35) and is a standard variant of the population dynamics of lytic phage and bacteria (36–38) in a chemostat (39); more details may be found in *Appendix 1* of *Supporting Text*, which is published as supporting information on the PNAS web site. The change in densities of resource ( $R$ ), bacteria ( $N$ ), and bacteriophage ( $V$ ), depend on phenotypic traits that determine uptake of nutrients and adsorption of phage. We denote the trait of the bacteria by  $x$  and the trait of the phage by  $y$ . These phenotypic traits,  $x$  and  $y$ , are one-dimensional approximations to the state space of the underlying coevolutionary dynamics occurring on what is presumably a large, but finite, number of possible types of bacteria and phage strains, respectively. The population dynamics can be written as

$$\begin{cases} \frac{dR}{dt} = -\omega(R - R_0) - \varepsilon\gamma(x)\frac{RN}{R + K}, \\ \frac{dN}{dt} = -\omega N + \gamma(x)\frac{RN}{R + K} - \phi(x, y)NV, \\ \frac{dV}{dt} = -\omega V + \beta\phi(x, y)NV. \end{cases} \quad [1]$$

This system, given a reasonable choice of parameters, possesses a nonfluctuating steady state with coexisting bacteria and phage; the derivation of the equilibrium state and its stability may be found in *Appendix 1* of *Supporting Text*. The relevant point for the evolutionary model is that the maximal growth rate  $\gamma(x)$  depends on the phenotypic trait of the bacteria, whereas the adsorption rate  $\phi(x, y)$  depends on the phenotypic traits of both the bacteria and the bacteriophage. Note that  $K$  and  $\beta$  are also potentially evolvable phenotypic traits of the bacteria and phage, respectively; however, they will be held constant for the sake of mathematical tractability.

We posit the following functional forms for the dependence of the maximal growth rate,  $\gamma(x)$ , and the adsorption rate,  $\phi(x, y)$ , on the phenotypic traits

$$\gamma(x) = \gamma_0 e^{-\frac{(x-x_0)^2}{2\xi_n^2}} \quad [2]$$

and

$$\phi(x, y) = \phi_0 e^{-\frac{(x-y)^2}{2\xi_v^2}}. \quad [3]$$

Biologically, the form of  $\gamma(x)$  implies that there is an optimal configuration for maximal resource uptake,  $x = x_0$ , and hence an opportunity for a tradeoff between resource uptake and phage avoidance; without loss of generality, we will assume  $x_0 = 0$ . The form of  $\phi(x, y)$  implies that, for every bacterial strain  $x$ , there is a phage strain  $y$  that maximizes the strain-specific adsorption rate. The parameter  $\xi_n$  is the stable uptake range of hosts; in the model, it is defined as the range of possible host phenotypes whose maximal growth rate is within  $e^{-1/2}$  of the maximum for all phenotypes. The parameter  $\xi_v$  is the host range of phage; in the model, it is defined as the range of possible host phenotypes for which any given phage has an adsorption rate within  $e^{-1/2}$  of its maximal adsorption rate.

In this model, new strains continually die or out-compete wild types, possibly drive entire classes of strains to extinction, and give rise to coexistence of multiple types. The mechanism for the introduction of mutant strains is straightforward. For example, a mutant bacteria with trait  $x'$  appears in the system at a rate  $\mu_n B_n(x, y)$ , where  $\mu_n$  is the mutation probability and  $B_n(x, y)$  is the birth rate of the resident bacteria. The mutant can invade only when its fitness when rare is positive,  $r'_n(x'; x, y) > 0$ , for which it has a probability  $p = 1 - m/b$  of avoiding the stochastic loss of beneficial mutations, where  $m$  is the per capita death rate and  $b$  is the per capita birth rate. When a mutant invades, the ecological model in Eq. 1 is expanded by an additional equation, corresponding to the dynamics of the mutant host population,  $N'$ . The introduction of mutants on evolutionary time scales with









22. Lenski, R. E. (1984) *J. Theor. Biol.* **108**, 319–325.
23. Lenski, R. E. & Levin, B. R. (1985) *Am. Nat.* **125**, 585–602.
24. Charbit, A. & Hofnung, M. (1985) *J. Virol.* **53**, 667–671.
25. Gehring, K., Charbit, A., Brissaud, E. & Hofnung, M. (1987) *J. Bacteriol.* **169**, 2103–2106.
26. Werts, C., Michel, V., Hofnung, M. & Charbit, A. (1994) *J. Bacteriol.* **176**, 941–947.
27. Dieckmann, U. & Law, R. (1996) *J. Math. Biol.* **34**, 579–612.
28. Geritz, S. A. H., Metz, J. A. J., Kisdi, E. & Meszéna, G. (1997) *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **78**, 2024–2027.
29. Dieckmann, U. & Doebeli, M. (1999) *Nature* **400**, 354–357.
30. Dieckmann, U. (2002) in *Adaptive Dynamics of Infectious Diseases: In Pursuit of Virulence Management* (Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, U.K.), pp. 39–59.
31. Doebeli, M. & Dieckmann, U. (2003) *Nature* **421**, 259–264.
32. Dybdahl, M. F. & Storfer, A. (2002) *Trends Ecol. Evol.* **18**, 523–530.
33. Berryman, A. A. (1992) *Ecology* **73**, 1530–1535.
34. Dieckman, U., Marrow, P. & Law, R. (1995) *J. Theor. Biol.* **176**, 91–102.
35. Abrams, P. A. (2000) *Annu. Rev. Ecol. System.* **31**, 79–105.
36. Levin, B. R., Stewart, F. M. & Chao, L. (1977) *Am. Nat.* **111**, 3–24.
37. Lenski, R. E. (1988) *Adv. Microbiol. Ecol.* **10**, 1–44.
38. Beretta, E., Solimano, F. & Tang, Y. (2002) *Discrete Continuous Dyn. Syst.* **2**, 495–520.
39. Smith, H. L. & Waltman, P. (1995) *The Theory of the Chemostat: Dynamics of Microbial Competition* (Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, U.K.).
40. Marrow, P., Dieckmann, U. & Law, R. (1996) *J. Math. Biol.* **34**, 556–578.
41. Matessi, C. & Di Pasquale, C. (1996) *J. Math. Biol.* **34**, 613–653.
42. Doebeli, M. & Dieckmann, U. (2000) *Am. Nat.* **156**, S77–S101.
43. Leimar, O. (in press) in *Elements of Adaptive Dynamics*, eds. Dieckmann, U. & Metz, J. A. J. (Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, U.K.).
44. van Valen, L. (1973) *Evol. Theory* **1**, 1–30.
45. Kendall, D. G. (1948) *Ann. Math. Stat.* **19**, 1–15.
46. Bohannan, B. J. M., Kerr, B., Jessup, C. M., Hughes, J. B. & Sandvik, G. (2002) *Antonie Leeuwenhoek* **81**, 107–115.
47. Buckling, A. & Rainey, P. B. (2002) *Nature* **420**, 496–499.
48. Thirion, J. P. & Hofnung, M. (1972) *Genetics* **71**, 207–216.
49. Charbit, A. (2003) *Front. Biosci.* **8**, S265–S274.
50. Luria, S. E. & Delbrück, M. (1943) *Genetics* **28**, 491–511.
51. Horne, M. T. (1970) *Science* **168**, 992–993.
52. Ackermann, M. & Doebeli, M. (2004) *Evolution (Lawrence, Kans.)* **58**, 2599–2612.
53. Egas, M., Dieckmann, U. & Sabelis, M. W. (2004) *Am. Nat.* **163**, 518–531.
54. Cooper, V. S. & Lenski, R. E. (2000) *Nature* **407**, 736–739.
55. Cooper, T. F., Rozen, D. E. & Lenski, R. E. (2003) *Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. USA* **100**, 1072–1077.
56. Dykhuizen, D. E. & Dean, A. M. (2004) *Genetics* **167**, 2015–2026.