



Antagonistic Coevolution Limits the Range of Host Defense in *C. elegans* Populations

Jordan A. Lewis^{1,2*}, McKenna J. Penley¹, Hannan Sylla¹, Sebastián Durán Ahumada^{2,3} and Levi T. Morran¹

¹ Department of Biology, Emory University, Atlanta, GA, United States, ² Population Biology, Ecology, and Evolution Graduate Program, Emory University, Atlanta, GA, United States, ³ Department of Environmental Sciences, Emory University, Atlanta, GA, United States

OPEN ACCESS

Edited by:

Javier E. Irazoqui,
University of Massachusetts Medical
School, United States

Reviewed by:

Christoph Vorburger,
Swiss Federal Institute of Aquatic
Science and Technology, Switzerland
Maurine Neiman,
The University of Iowa, United States

*Correspondence:

Jordan A. Lewis
Jordan.alexander.lewis@emory.edu

Specialty section:

This article was submitted to
Microbiome in Health and Disease,
a section of the journal
Frontiers in Cellular and
Infection Microbiology

Received: 14 August 2021

Accepted: 19 January 2022

Published: 17 February 2022

Citation:

Lewis JA, Penley MJ, Sylla H,
Durán S and Morran LT
(2022) Antagonistic Coevolution
Limits the Range of Host Defense
in *C. elegans* Populations.
Front. Cell. Infect. Microbiol. 12:758745.
doi: 10.3389/fcimb.2022.758745

Host populations often evolve defenses against parasites due to the significant fitness costs imposed by infection. However, adaptation to a specific parasite may alter the effectiveness of the host's defenses in general. Consequently, the specificity of host defense may be influenced by a host population's evolutionary history with parasites. Further, the degree of reciprocal change within an interaction may profoundly alter the range of host defense, given that antagonistic coevolutionary interactions are predicted to favor defense against specific parasite genotypes. Here, we examined the effect of host evolutionary history on host defense range by assessing the mortality rates of *Caenorhabditis elegans* host populations exposed to an array of *Serratia marcescens* bacterial parasite strains. Importantly, each of the host populations were derived from the same genetic background but have different experimental evolution histories with parasites. Each of these histories (exposure to either heat-killed, fixed genotype, or coevolving parasites) carries a different level of evolutionary reciprocity. Overall, we observed an effect of host evolutionary history in that previously coevolved host populations were generally the most susceptible to novel parasite strains. This data demonstrates that host evolutionary history can have a significant impact on host defense, and that host-parasite coevolution can increase host susceptibility to novel parasites.

Keywords: coevolution, experimental evolution, host defense, *Caenorhabditis elegans*, *Serratia marcescens*, antagonistic coevolution

INTRODUCTION

Parasites are ubiquitous in nature and are thought to be a key factor in the evolution and maintenance of genetic diversity within host populations (Hamilton, 1980; Anderson and May, 1982; Rainey et al., 2000; Thomson, 2009). Parasites can impose strong selective pressure on host populations, due to the fitness advantage experienced by uninfected or tolerant individuals, and thus select for the evolution of elevated host defense over time. Generally, natural observations have aligned with expectations, as hosts have evolved a multitude of strategies for defending against infection (Roy and Kirchner, 2000; Ellis, 2001; Lemaitre and Hoffmann, 2007; Diamond et al., 2009; Parker et al., 2011; War et al., 2012; De Roode et al., 2013; Weiss et al., 2014). These observations

have been further supported by experimental studies, which have demonstrated the ability of hosts to evolve defense against novel parasites in experiments across various systems. Some of these systems include beetles (Bérénos et al., 2009), birds (Bonneau et al., 2011), *Daphnia* (Duncan and Little, 2007), *Drosophila* (Kraaijeveld and Godfray, 1997), isopods (Hasu et al., 2009), moths (Fuxa and Richter, 1989; Boots and Begon, 1993), nematodes (Schulte et al., 2010; Penley et al., 2017), paramecium (Lohse et al., 2006) and snails (Webster and Woolhouse, 1999; Koskella and Lively, 2007). Despite the benefit of evolved host defenses and the ubiquity of parasites, natural populations experience considerable variance in levels of host defense over space and time (Allen et al., 2004; Laine, 2004).

Several mechanisms have been proposed to explain the widespread observations of variance in host defense (Koskella, 2018), including the costs associated with maintaining defenses (Sheldon and Verhulst, 1996; Strauss et al., 2002; Lenski, 2007; Graham et al., 2010; Melnyk et al., 2015; Cipollini et al., 2017) and parasite reciprocal adaptation (Ebert and Hamilton, 1996; Carius et al., 2001; Schulte et al., 2010) as mechanisms with strong support. Another potential factor that may contribute to the temporal and spatial variance in host defense is the evolutionary history of host populations. Host defenses exist on a spectrum ranging from more general, and effective against a broad range of parasites, to more specific and tailored to a particular parasite genotype. A host population's evolutionary history with parasites may determine the degree to which broad or specific defenses are evolved or maintained. In particular, the evolution of highly specific host defenses may inhibit, limit, or alter the evolution and maintenance of more general defenses. Coevolutionary interactions can drive the evolution of highly specific host defenses and parasite infection strategies *via* reciprocal adaptation. Such specificity between host and parasite populations is known as local adaptation (Gandon and Zandt, 1998) and has been observed in natural and experimental parasite populations across various systems (Edmunds and Alstad, 1978; Ebert and Hamilton, 1996; Lively and Dybdahl, 2000; Greischar and Koskella, 2007; Hoeksema and Forde, 2008; Leimu and Fischer, 2008; Vos et al., 2009; Morran et al., 2014; Bellis et al., 2021). While local adaptation is more often observed in parasite populations, host populations are capable of exhibiting local adaptation (Gandon et al., 1996; Kawecki and Ebert, 2004). Importantly, host populations that reciprocally evolve in response to locally adapted parasites may also exhibit a degree of specificity in their defense (Aiba et al., 2010; Kniskern et al., 2011; Lemoine et al., 2012). This specificity in host defense may come at a cost and ultimately increase a host population's susceptibility to novel parasites. Therefore, a host population's evolutionary history with parasites may be a factor that contributes to the maintenance of variation in host defense within and between populations.

Here, we aimed to determine the effects of evolved host defense on host interactions with novel parasites. Evolved host defenses are generally the result of coevolved or one-sided evolutionary interactions, which are predicted to produce different outcomes in terms of host defense range

(Antonovics et al., 2013). Given that both one-sided and coevolutionary interactions may determine the nature and specificity of host defense, it is critical to distinguish between the predicted effects of these different evolutionary histories on host defense. Coevolution can drive numerous reciprocal changes in hosts and parasites. The genotypes that evolve to confer host defense under coevolution are likely to be highly specific, diverging substantially between different host populations and providing resistance against the local parasite population (Perlman and Jaenike, 2003; Antonovics et al., 2013). One-sided evolution, which can be accomplished *via* frequent infection of hosts that are incapable of transmitting the parasite (Holt and Gomulkiewicz, 1997), can favor the evolution of host resistance without permitting parasite reciprocal adaptation. The absence of a coevolutionary arms race can limit the degree of evolutionary change and divergence in the host population because evolved host defenses maintain their effectiveness over time and subsequent change is not favored. Thus, one-sided evolution is predicted to generate less host-parasite specificity than coevolutionary interactions, but still result in the evolution of elevated host defense overall.

Therefore, testing the effects of host population evolutionary history on host defense requires a host-parasite system capable of one-sided and coevolution, a known host evolutionary history, and a diverse set of parasite genotypes to assay host defense range. The free-living nematode *Caenorhabditis elegans*, and its bacterial parasite *Serratia marcescens* (Mallo et al., 2002), provide a system suitable for this test. While *C. elegans* lack an adaptive immune system, their innate immune system exhibits specific responses to different bacterial species (Wong et al., 2007), providing the opportunity to measure host defense range. In a previous study, obligately outcrossing populations of host *C. elegans* populations were experimentally evolved under conditions that facilitated coevolution or one-sided evolution with *Serratia marcescens* strain SM2170, or with heat killed SM2170 as a control (Morran et al., 2011). The resulting coevolved and one-sided host populations adapted to their respective parasite populations, and the coevolved parasite populations showed clear signatures of local adaptation (Morran et al., 2014). Control populations, as expected, did not adapt to SM2170. Thus, these experimentally evolved host populations experienced vastly different evolutionary histories with *S. marcescens* parasites.

In this study, we evaluated the impact of evolutionary history on the range of evolved host defense. We exposed populations of *C. elegans*, which had been previously evolved against *S. marcescens* SM2170 in three treatments (coevolved, one-sided & a no parasite control) (Morran et al., 2011), to various genotypes of *Serratia* which either were, or were not, derived from SM2170. We predicted that coevolved host populations would exhibit greater specificity in their defense when compared to one-sided and control populations, and as a result the coevolved populations would be most susceptible to novel (non-SM2170 derived) parasite strains. Further, we predicted that the effectiveness of evolved host defense would generally decrease against parasite strains that were not derived from SM2170.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Host Populations

All *C. elegans* host populations used in this study were derived from the obligately outcrossing and highly inbred PX386 strain, which is a derivative of the CB4856 strain (Morran et al., 2009). To generate PX386, the *fog-2* (*q71*) mutant allele, which prevents hermaphrodites from self-fertilizing (Schedl and Kimble, 1988), was backcrossed into an inbred CB4856 background for five generations and was subsequently inbred for ten additional generations (Morran et al., 2009). Then five populations of PX386 were independently mutagenized with ethyl-methanesulfonate to generate genetically variable populations prior to selection (Morran et al., 2011). Following backcrossing, populations were kept under standard laboratory conditions for 4 generations in order to purge the most deleterious mutations. These populations were maintained on 10cm Petri dishes filled with NGM Lite (Nematode Growth Medium-Lite, US Biological, Swampscott, MA, USA) seeded with 30 μ L of OP50 stored at 20°C.


The methods above were used to generate five independent and genetically unique populations. Previous experimental evolution of these *C. elegans* host populations is fully described in Morran et al. (2011). Briefly, each of the five genetically unique populations of obligately outcrossing *C. elegans* were divided into 3 treatments (one-sided, coevolved and control) and evolved with *S. marcescens* SM2170 on *Serratia* Selection Plates (SSPs) for 30 generations respectively (Figure 1). SSPs consist of a 10 cm Petri dish with a lawn of *Serratia* opposite a lawn of *E. coli*. Worms are placed directly on the *Serratia* lawn which ensures hosts encounter the parasite before reaching their relatively benign lab food source, OP50 *E. coli*

(Morran et al., 2009). Within the context of the experiment, *C. elegans* individuals must survive and reproduce for their offspring to be passed to the next round of selection. Coevolved host populations are unique in that they were passaged along with parasite populations. In these treatments, parasites were required to infect and kill a host to be passaged to the next round of selection, thus allowing for reciprocal evolution in host and parasite populations. One-sided populations were passaged using similar methods, except parasites were not passaged and a static ancestral SM2170 plated each passage. Control populations were passaged with heat killed SM2170. Following thirty generations of experimental evolution, multiple samples from each host and parasite population were frozen (Morran et al., 2011). Prior to being used in this experiment, host populations were thawed and maintained under standard laboratory conditions for approximately 4 generations to permit recovery.

Parasite Populations

S. marcescens is an established bacterial parasite of *C. elegans* (Mallo et al., 2002), with notable variance in mortality rate depending on strain (Schulenburg and Ewbank, 2004). In this experiment, populations were transferred from frozen stock to Luria Broth (LB) and grown overnight at 28°C. Colonies in LB were then used to seed 10cm Petri dishes filled with NGM-Lite and grown up at 28°C. Parasite mortality assays were completed using *S. marcescens* strains Db11, ES1, SMD1, SM2170, coevolved SM2170, and SM933.

The SM2170 genotype is highly virulent to *C. elegans* (Schulenburg and Ewbank, 2004). The ES1 strain was derived from SM2170, via passaging with *C. elegans* strain CB4856 under



selection for increased virulence for 30 generations (Lynch et al., 2018). The coevolved SM2170 assays were conducted using parasite populations that were coevolved with hosts in the previous experiment and isolated after 20 passages (Morran et al., 2011). Each of the five coevolved host populations thus has its own respective sympatric coevolved parasite population. Db11 is a streptomycin resistant derivative of Db10 (Flyg et al., 1980) and has been shown to be moderately virulent in comparison to SM2170. The other *Serratia* strains used for our treatments, SMD1 and SM933, are strains available via Carolina Biological Supply (Burlington, NC). Importantly, Db11, SMD1, SM933 were not directly derived from SM2170 and thus represent novel parasite strains.

Measuring Adaptation and Defense Specificity

Here we use host mortality as a measure of host defense, and a representative measure of host fitness (Penley et al., 2017). Mortality assays were conducted using SSPs identical to those used during experimental evolution (Figure 1C), with the exception of the parasite strain used. A mortality rate was calculated for every treatment against *S. marcescens* Db11, SMD1, SM933, SM2170, and the coevolved SM2170 populations. Approximately 200 L4 *C. elegans* were suspended in M9 buffer and transferred to a lawn of SM2170 on a 10 cm Petri dish (NGM-Lite agar). The average number of individuals transferred was calculated by determining densities of *C. elegans* in the buffer and taking the mean of plated controls. After 48 hours of exposure, we counted the number of surviving worms on the plate. Mortality rates are calculated by dividing the number of dead nematodes by the total number transferred (Morran et al., 2011). It is important to note that while the majority of resistant worms move from the *Serratia* lawn to the opposite *E. coli* lawn, some individuals remain in the parasite lawn and those individuals are also counted. Every population (5) in each treatment (3) was replicated 4 times per bacterial strain (technical replicates). Mean mortality rates were analyzed using a generalized linear model (GLM) fitted with a normal distribution and identity link function, testing for effects of Bacteria, Treatment (coevolved, one-sided, control), and the interaction between Bacteria and Treatment. Contrast tests were used to compare mean mortality between treatments *post hoc*. Additionally, we tested for overdispersion using a Pearson test, and did not detect a significant level of overdispersion. Finally, we performed a binomial GLM after converting our mortality data into a binomial distribution (alive vs dead). The results of our binomial analysis were qualitatively similar to the normal GLM, thus we report the stats of the GLM fitted with the normal distribution. We used JMP Pro (v13) for the GLM analyses.

RESULTS

We first tested for the evolution of elevated host defense (decreased mortality) in our coevolved and one-sided host populations against the coevolved parasite populations derived from SM2170. We found that the coevolved hosts exhibited lower

rates of mortality than the control hosts when exposed to the coevolved populations of SM2170 (Figure 2; $\chi^2_1 = 5.174$, $P = .023$), indicating the coevolved hosts adapted to their respective antagonists during experimental coevolution. Interestingly, the one-sided hosts also performed significantly better than the control groups against coevolved parasites (Figure 2). We then found that the one-sided evolution hosts adapted to the SM2170 strain as they exhibited reduced mortality in comparison to both the control and coevolved populations when exposed to SM2170 (Figure 2; $\chi^2_1 = 9.798$, $P = .002$). Thus, the coevolved and one-sided evolution hosts evolved greater levels of host defense and exhibited unique evolutionary trajectories relative to one another and the controls.

To determine the impact of host evolutionary history on the specificity of evolved defense, we compared mortality rates of three groups of hosts with different evolutionary histories (control, coevolved & one-sided) against four strains of *S. marcescens* (Db11, ES1, SMD1, and SM933). Overall, we found a significant difference in the mortality exhibited by hosts with different evolutionary histories. Specifically, coevolved hosts exhibited higher overall mortality rates than one-sided ($\chi^2_{71} = 8.44$, $P = .004$) and control ($\chi^2_{71} = 4.85$, $P = .028$) host populations (Supplementary 1, 2). However, the dynamics of host mortality




FIGURE 2 | Host Mortality across related parasites. For each mortality assay 200 Worms were exposed to *S. marcescens* for a period of 48 hours using *Serratia* Selection Plates. Surviving worms were counted and the mortality is expressed as (worms plated – worms counted)/worms plated). Black circles represent the average mortality rate across all host populations for each bacterial treatment group. White circles represent the average mortality rate across all replicates for one host population. Points which share letters are statistically indistinguishable from each other, and only apply within their respective column. Error bars represent standard error. Letters are differentiated by $\alpha = 0.05$.

responses varied significantly between parasite strains (**Figures 2, 3**; $\chi^2_{10} = 26.221$, $P = .004$).

In the presence of ES1, which is derived from SM2170, one-sided host populations experienced lower mortality than control and coevolved populations (**Figure 3**; $\chi^2_1 = 4.86$, $P = .028$). Conversely, control hosts exhibited reduced mortality against the SM933 relative to the coevolved and one-sided evolution hosts (**Figure 3**; $\chi^2_1 = 9.68$, $P = .002$). Then, coevolved hosts performed significantly worse on DB11 relative to both control and one-sided evolution hosts (**Figure 3**; $\chi^2_1 = 5.64$, $P = .018$). Finally, SMD1 did not inflict significantly different mortality rates regardless of host evolutionary history (**Figure 3**; $\chi^2_1 = 2.16$, $P = 0.142$). Therefore, host evolutionary history significantly altered host defense against novel parasite strains.

DISCUSSION

In this study, we investigated the effects of a host population's evolutionary history with parasites on the subsequent defense range of those hosts. Our data support the hypothesis that a host population's defense range can be altered by its past evolutionary interactions with parasites. Further, they suggest that coevolution and reciprocal adaptation can have a significant effect on host defense, beyond adaptation, to a coevolving antagonist. Among

our host populations, coevolved hosts displayed elevated defense against only their co-evolved parasitic partner relative to the control hosts (**Figures 2, 3**). Otherwise, the coevolved host populations were overall more susceptible to novel parasites. This aligns with theory suggesting coevolution can lead to highly specific host defenses, due in part to the “arms-race” dynamics surrounding the evolution of those selected traits (Antonovics et al., 2013). This idea is further supported by the coevolved hosts performance against SM2170, where they experienced mortality rates statistically similar to the *S. marcescens* naive control populations (**Figure 2**). Importantly, the SM2170 strain was the ancestral strain for each of the coevolved parasite populations, and yet the hosts maintained a very limited ability to defend against the strain. Thus, an evolutionary history of reciprocal adaptation with the parasite resulted in a very high degree of specificity over a relatively short period of time.

As expected, one-sided host populations displayed elevated defense when assayed with SM2170, the same genotype they had been exposed to for 30 generations. However, the one-sided host populations also showed elevated defense against all SM2170 derived parasite genotypes, exhibiting the lowest mortality rates against ES1 and rates similar to coevolved hosts against the coevolved parasites (**Figure 2**). This provides further evidence that one-sided populations adapted to their parasites, and points towards those defenses as having some general applicability against similar parasite genotypes. This also aligns with theory, as one-sided evolution is predicted to favor any genetic combination in the host which provides adequate defense, rather than a genotype-specific response (Antonovics et al., 2013). Interestingly, the control populations consistently experienced lower mortality rates when assayed against parasites that were not derived from SM2170 (**Figure 3**). Taken into context with the comparatively high mortality rates control populations experienced when exposed to SM2170 derived genotypes, this validates the control populations by showing a lack of defense evolution during experimental evolution and points toward a certain degree of evolutionary naiveté being beneficial for general defense. In other words, a lack of evolutionary history with parasites seems to confer an overall greater ability to defend against novel parasite strains. Therefore, host evolutionary history with a parasite, or lack thereof, can be an important factor shaping host defense range.

One limitation of this experiment is that coevolution was done in the presence of a single parasite population. This distinction is important, as research suggests infections in the wild commonly consist of multiple strains or species (Petney and Andrews, 1998; Cox, 2001; Telfer et al., 2008; Balmer and Tanner, 2011). Further, multi-genotype infections can alter the fitness of both hosts and parasites, thus having implications on their respective evolutionary trajectories (Alizon et al., 2013; Lange et al., 2014; King et al., 2016). Thus, passaging host populations on single genotype bacterial lawns may have biased evolution in ways which are not applicable to some natural settings. However, while multi-strain infections are commonplace, particular strains may still disproportionately drive the host's adaptive response, particularly those which




FIGURE 3 | Host Mortality across unrelated parasites. For each mortality assay 200 Worms were exposed to *S. marcescens* for a period of 48 hours using Serratia Selection Plates. Surviving worms were counted and the mortality is expressed as (worms plated – worms counted)/worms plated. Black circles represent the average mortality rate across all host populations for each bacterial treatment group. White circles represent the average mortality rate across all replicates for one host population. Points which share letters are statistically indistinguishable from each other, and only apply within their respective column. Error bars represent standard error. Letters are differentiated by $\alpha = 0.05$.

invoke the most drastic fitness costs. Indeed, in some natural systems host defense evolution is predominantly driven by interactions with one highly virulent parasite, despite the presence of other parasites (Lively et al., 1990; Paczesniak et al., 2019). An additional limitation of this experiment is that experimental evolution itself may have biased our results by relaxing the strength of non-parasite selective pressures on host populations (Kawecki, 2012). As such, genes conferring defense may have risen in frequency which would not have in nature due to adverse pleiotropic effects. However, as such effects would be constant among all treatment groups, this still allows for the identification of relevant differences between treatments groups. Further, parasites can dictate host evolutionary trajectories through strong selection pressure. This may allow sufficiently beneficial defense alleles to increase in frequency despite other pleiotropic effects (Otto, 2004; Olson-Manning et al., 2012), or closely linked deleterious alleles (Hartfield and Otto, 2011). An additional limitation of this experiment is that all host populations were derived from the same genetic background. As such, while treatments can respond differently to selection pressures during experimental evolution, the responses of the host populations are not fully representative of all possible genotypes. This work demonstrates that the evolutionary history of host populations can shape host defense range. However, such effects of evolutionary history may differ between host genetic backgrounds, which could account for some of the variation in host defense within and between host populations in nature.

In this experiment, we showed that evolution with a parasite can have a profound impact on the characteristics of host defenses. Specifically, the amount of evolutionary reciprocity within the interaction can influence the effective range of host defenses, with increased reciprocity resulting in more narrow ranges (Figures 2, 3). This aligns with research showing that parasites evolved with homogenous host populations exhibited more narrow host ranges (White et al., 2020; Gibson et al., 2020a; Gibson et al., 2020b). Therefore, host and parasite populations with an immediate evolutionary history of coevolution may often be constrained in genotypic space, pigeonholed by combinations of alleles that were previously advantageous but are contemporarily unfavorable. Further, host-parasite interactions may alter the evolutionary trajectories of host populations in many ways, including reducing levels of genetic variation in host populations (White et al., 2021) and favoring the evolution of certain traits beyond host defense (Lively, 1987; Morran et al., 2011). Generally, evolutionary history influences the evolutionary trajectory of a population because the genetic background of the population is determined to some extent by past interactions. This is made more complex due to pleiotropy and epistasis (Tyler et al., 2009; Hansen, 2013). These phenomena can impact how a population adapts to a given environment (Østman et al., 2012; Hansen, 2013) and determine the underlying genetic architecture of host defense (Wilfert and Schmid-Hempel, 2008; Lambrechts, 2010). Thus, host-parasite interactions can have implications that extend far beyond the direct outcome of the interaction itself.

Future adaptation may be limited by past adaptation, perhaps constraining the evolution of novel defense, or increasing rates of extinction in tightly co-evolved hosts that encounter significantly different parasites. Coevolutionary interactions can dominate a population's evolutionary trajectory as reciprocal adaptation occurs, but a population's evolutionary path can also be influenced by coevolution after the interaction has ended. Within the context of the wider phenomena of host defense varying within and between populations, and over space and time, this suggests evolutionary history does matter. It is said that host-parasite interactions reflect a "mosaic" of coevolution, with various coevolutionary processes occurring between populations across a landscape (Thompson, 2009). It is clear that coevolution in the past can influence the composition of the present and, perhaps, future coevolutionary mosaic.

DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

The raw data supporting the conclusions of this article will be made available by the authors, without undue reservation.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

JL and LM contributed to the conception of the study, writing of the manuscript and the statistical analysis. JL, LM, and MP assisted in designing the experiment. JL, HS, and SA conducted the experimental protocols. All authors contributed to the article and approved the submitted version.

FUNDING

This work was funded by the National Science Foundation (Graduate Research Fellowship Program 2017246734 to JL and DEB-1750553 to LM).

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We would like to thank Arthur Menezes and Raythe Owens for logistical assistance.

SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL

The Supplementary Material for this article can be found online at: <https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fcimb.2022.758745/full#supplementary-material>

REFERENCES

- Aiba, S., Huet, M., and Kaltz, O. (2010). Experimental Evolution of Local Parasite Maladaptation. *J. Evol. Biol.* 23, 1195–1205. doi: 10.1111/j.1420-9101.2010.01985.x
- Alizon, S., Roode, J. C. D., and Michalakis, Y. (2013). Multiple Infections and the Evolution of Virulence. *Ecol. Lett.* 16, 556–567. doi: 10.1111/ele.12076
- Allen, R. L., Bittner-Eddy, P. D., Grenville-Briggs, L. J., Meitz, J. C., Rehmany, A. P., Rose, L. E., et al. (2004). Host-Parasite Coevolutionary Conflict Between Arabidopsis and Downy Mildew. *Science* 306, 1957–1960. doi: 10.1126/science.1104022
- Anderson, R. M., and May, R. M. (1982). Coevolution of Hosts and Parasites. *Parasitology* 85, 411–426. doi: 10.1017/S0031182000055360
- Antonovics, J., Boots, M., Ebert, D., Koskella, B., Poss, M., and Sadd, B. M. (2013). The Origin of Specificity by Means of Natural Selection: Evolved and Nonhost Resistance in Host-Pathogen Interactions. *Evolution* 67, 1–9. doi: 10.1111/j.1558-5646.2012.01793.x
- Balmer, O., and Tanner, M. (2011). Prevalence and Implications of Multiple-Strain Infections. *Lancet Infect. Dis.* 11, 868–878. doi: 10.1016/S1473-3099(11)70241-9
- Bellis, E. S., McLaughlin, C. M., Depamphilis, C. W., and Lasky, J. R. (2021). The Geography of Parasite Local Adaptation to Host Communities. *Ecography* 44, 1205–1217. doi: 10.1111/ecog.05730
- Bérénos, C., Schmid-Hempel, P., and Wegner, K. M. (2009). Evolution of Host Resistance and Trade-Offs Between Virulence and Transmission Potential in an Obligately Killing Parasite. *J. Evol. Biol.* 22, 2049–2056. doi: 10.1111/j.1420-9101.2009.01821.x
- Bonneaud, C., Balenger, S. L., Russell, A. F., Zhang, J., Hill, G. E., and Edwards, S. V. (2011). Rapid Evolution of Disease Resistance is Accompanied by Functional Changes in Gene Expression in a Wild Bird. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* 108, 7866–7871. doi: 10.1073/pnas.1018580108
- Boots, M., and Begon, M. (1993). Trade-Offs With Resistance to a Granulosis Virus in the Indian Meal Moth, Examined by a Laboratory Evolution Experiment. *Funct. Ecol.* 7, 528–528. doi: 10.2307/2390128
- Carius, H. J., Little, T. J., and Ebert, D. (2001). Genetic Variation in a Host-Parasite Association: Potential for Coevolution and Frequency-Dependent Selection. *Evolution* 55, 1136–1145. doi: 10.1111/j.0014-3820.2001.tb00633.x
- Cipollini, D., Walters, D., and Voelckel, C. (2017). Costs of Resistance in Plants: From Theory to Evidence. *Annu. Plant Rev. Online* 47, 263–307. doi: 10.1002/9781119312994.apr0512
- Cox, F. E. G. (2001). Concomitant Infections, Parasites and Immune Responses. *Parasitology* 122, S23–S38. doi: 10.1017/S003118200001698X
- De Roode, J. C., Lefèvre, T., and Hunter, M. D. (2013). Self-Medication in Animals. *Science* 340, 150–150. doi: 10.1126/science.1235824
- Diamond, G., Beckloff, N., Weinberg, A., and Kisich, K. (2009). The Roles of Antimicrobial Peptides in Innate Host Defense. *Curr. Pharm. Design* 15, 2377–2392. doi: 10.2174/138161209788682325
- Duncan, A. B., and Little, T. J. (2007). Parasite-Driven Genetic Change in a Natural Population of Daphnia. *Evolution* 61, 796–803. doi: 10.1111/j.1558-5646.2007.00072.x
- Ebert, D. (1994). Virulence and Local Adaptation of a Horizontally Transmitted Parasite. *Science* 265, 1084–1086. doi: 10.1126/science.265.5175.1084
- Ebert, D., and Hamilton, W. D. (1996). Sex Against Virulence: The Coevolution of Parasitic Diseases. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* 11, 79–82. doi: 10.1016/0169-5347(96)81047-0. PMID: 21237766.
- Edmunds, G. F., and Alstad, D. N. (1978). Coevolution in Insect Herbivores and Conifers. *Science* 199, 941–945. doi: 10.1126/science.199.4332.941
- Ellis, A. E. (2001). Innate Host Defense Mechanisms of Fish Against Viruses and Bacteria. *Dev. Comp. Immunol.* 25, 827–839. doi: 10.1016/S0145-305X(01)00038-6
- Flyg, C., Kenne, K., and Boman, H. G. (1980). Insect Pathogenic Properties of *Serratia marcescens*: Phage-Resistant Mutants With a Decreased Resistance to Cecropia Immunity and a Decreased Virulence to *Drosophila*. *Microbiology* 120, 173–181. doi: 10.1099/00221287-120-1-173
- Fuxa, J. R., and Richter, A. R. (1989). Reversion of Resistance by Spodoptera Frugiperda to Nuclear Polyhedrosis Virus. *J. Invertebr. Pathol.* 53, 52–56. doi: 10.1016/0022-2011(89)90073-6
- Gandon, S., Capowiez, Y., Dubois, Y., Michalakis, Y., and Olivieri, I. (1996). Local Adaptation and Gene-for-Gene Coevolution in a Metapopulation Model. Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. *Ser. B: Biol. Sci.* 263, 1003–1009. doi: 10.1098/rspb.1996.0148
- Gandon, S., and Zandt, P. A. V. (1998). Local Adaptation and Host-Parasite Interactions. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* 13, 214–216. doi: 10.1016/S0169-5347(98)01358-5
- Gibson, A. K., Baffoe-Bonnie, H., Penley, M. J., Lin, J., Owens, R., Khalid, A., et al. (2020a). The Evolution of Parasite Host Range in Heterogeneous Host Populations. *J. Evol. Biol.* 33, 773–782. doi: 10.1111/jeb.13608
- Gibson, A. K., White, P. S., Penley, M. J., Roode, J. C. D., and Morran, L. T. (2020b). An Experimental Test of Parasite Adaptation to Common Versus Rare Host Genotypes. *Biol. Lett.* 16, 20200210–20200210. doi: 10.1098/rsbl.2020.0210
- Graham, A. L., Hayward, A. D., Watt, K. A., Pilkington, J. G., Pemberton, J. M., and Nussey, D. H. (2010). Fitness Correlates of Heritable Variation in Antibody Responsiveness in a Wild Mammal. *Science* 330, 662–665. doi: 10.1126/science.1194878
- Greischar, M. A., and Koskella, B. (2007). A Synthesis of Experimental Work on Parasite Local Adaptation. *Ecol. Lett.* 10, 418–434. doi: 10.1111/j.1461-0248.2007.01028.x
- Hamilton, W. D. (1980). Sex Versus Non-Sex Versus Parasite. *Oikos* 35, 282–282. doi: 10.2307/3544435
- Hansen, T. F. (2013). Why Epistasis is Important for Selection and Adaptation. *Evolution* 67, 3501–3511. doi: 10.1111/evo.12214
- Hartfield, M., and Otto, S. P. (2011). Recombination and Hitchhiking of Deleterious Alleles. *Evolution* 65, 2421–2434. doi: 10.1111/j.1558-5646.2011.01311.x
- Hasu, T., Benesh, D. P., and Valtonen, E. T. (2009). Differences in Parasite Susceptibility and Costs of Resistance Between Nexposed and Unexposed Host Populations. *J. Evol. Biol.* 22, 699–707. doi: 10.1111/j.1420-9101.2009.01704.x
- Hoeksema, J. D., and Forde, S. E. (2008). A Meta-Analysis of Factors Affecting Local Adaptation between Interacting Species. *Am. Nat.* 171, 3, 275–3, 290.
- Holt, R. D., and Gomulkiewicz, R. (1997). How Does Immigration Influence Local Adaptation? A Reexamination of a Familiar Paradigm. *Am. Nat.* 149, 3, 563–3, 572.
- Kawecki, T. J., and Ebert, D. (2004). Conceptual Issues in Local Adaptation. *Ecol. Lett.* 7 (12), 1225–1241. doi: 10.1111/j.1461-0248.2004.00684.x
- Kawecki, T. J., Lenski, R. E., Ebert, D., Hollis, B., Olivieri, O., and Whitlock, M. C. (2012). Experimental Evolution. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* 27 (10), 547–560. doi: 10.1016/j.tree.2012.06.001
- King, K. C., Brockhurst, M. A., Vasieva, O., Paterson, S., Betts, A., Ford, S. A., et al. (2016). Rapid Evolution of Microbe-Mediated Protection Against Pathogens in a Worm Host. *ISME J.* 10, 8 10, 1915–1924. doi: 10.1038/ismej.2015.259
- Kniskern, J. M., Barrett, L. G., and Bergelson, J. (2011). Maladaptation in Wild Populations of the Generalist Plant Pathogen *Pseudomonas syringae*. *Evolution* 65, 818–830. doi: 10.1111/j.1558-5646.2010.01157.x
- Koskella, B. (2018). Resistance Gained, Resistance Lost: An Explanation for Host-Parasite Coexistence. *PLoS Biol.* 16, e3000013–e3000013. doi: 10.1371/journal.pbio.3000013
- Koskella, B., and Lively, C. M. (2007). Advice of the Rose: Experimental Coevolution of a Trematode Parasite and its Snail Host. *Evolution* 61, 152–159. doi: 10.1111/j.1558-5646.2007.00012.x
- Kraaijeveld, A. R., and Godfray, H. C. J. (1997). Trade-Off Between Parasitoid Resistance and Larval Competitive Ability in *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Nature* 389, 6648 389, 278–280. doi: 10.1038/38483
- Laine, A.-L. (2004). Resistance Variation Within and Among Host Populations in a Plant-Pathogen Metapopulation: Implications for Regional Pathogen Dynamics. *J. Ecol.* 92, 990–1000. doi: 10.1111/j.0022-0477.2004.00925.x
- Lambrechts, L. (2010). Dissecting the Genetic Architecture of Host-Pathogen Specificity. *PLoS Pathog.* 6, e1001019–e1001019. doi: 10.1371/journal.ppat.1001019
- Lange, B., Reuter, M., Ebert, D., Muylaert, K., and Decaestecker, E. (2014). Diet Quality Determines Interspecific Parasite Interactions in Host Populations. *Ecol. Evol.* 4, 3093–3102. doi: 10.1002/ece3.1167
- Leimu, R., and Fischer, M. (2008). A Meta-Analysis of Local Adaptation in Plants. *PLoS One* 3, e4010–e4010. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0004010
- Lemaitre, B., and Hoffmann, J. (2007). The Host Defense of *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Annu. Rev. Immunol.* 25, 697–743. doi: 10.1146/annurev.immunol.25.022106.141615
- Lemoine, M., Doligez, B., and Richner, H. (2012). On the Equivalence of Host Local Adaptation and Parasite Maladaptation: An Experimental Test. *Am. Nat.* 179, 270–281. doi: 10.1086/663699

- Lenski, R. E. (1997). The Cost of Antibiotic Resistance—from the Perspective of a Bacterium. In *Ciba Foundation Symposium 207 - Antibiotic Resistance: Origins, Evolution, Selection and Spread*. (eds D. J. Chadwick and J. Goode). doi: 10.1002/9780470515358.ch9
- Lively, C. M. (1987). Evidence From a New Zealand Snail for the Maintenance of Sex by Parasitism. *Nature* 328, 6130–6132, 519–521. doi: 10.1038/328519a0
- Lively, C. M., Craddock, C., and Vrijenhoek, R. C. (1990). Red Queen Hypothesis Supported by Parasitism in Sexual and Clonal Fish. *Nature* 344, 6269–6271, 864–866. doi: 10.1038/344864a0
- Lively, C. M., and Dybdahl, M. F. (2000). Parasite Adaptation to Locally Common Host Genotypes. *Nature* 405, 679–681. doi: 10.1038/35015069
- Lohse, K., Gutierrez, A., and Kaltz, O. (2006). Experimental Evolution of Resistance in *Paramecium Caudatum* Against the Bacterial Parasite *Holospora Undulata*. *Evolution* 60, 1177–1186. doi: 10.1111/j.0014-3820.2006.tb01196.x
- Lynch, Z. R., Penley, M. J., and Morran, L. T. (2018). Turnover in Local Parasite Populations Temporarily Favors Host Outcrossing Over Self-Fertilization During Experimental Evolution. *Ecol. Evol.* 8, 6652–6662. doi: 10.1002/ece3.4150
- Mallo, G. V., Kurz, C. L., Couillault, C., Pujol, N., Granjeaud, S., Kohara, Y., et al. (2002). Inducible Antibacterial Defense System in *C. Elegans*. *Curr. Biol.* 12, 1209–1214. doi: 10.1016/S0960-9822(02)00928-4
- Melnyk, A. H., Wong, A., and Kassen, R. (2015). The Fitness Costs of Antibiotic Resistance Mutations. *Evol. Appl.* 8, 273–283. doi: 10.1111/eva.12196
- Morran, L. T., Parmenter, M. D., and Phillips, P. C. (2009). Mutation Load and Rapid Adaptation Favour Outcrossing Over Self-Fertilization. *Nature* 462, 7271–7273, 350–352. doi: 10.1038/nature08496
- Morran, L. T., Parrish, R. C., Gelarden, I. A., Allen, M. B., and Lively, C. M. (2014). Experimental Coevolution: Rapid Local Adaptation by Parasites Depends on Host Mating System. *Am. Nat.* 184, S91–S100. doi: 10.1086/676930
- Morran, L. T., Schmidt, O. G., Gelarden, I. A., Parrish, R. C., and Lively, C. M. (2011). Running With the Red Queen: Host-Parasite Coevolution Selects for Biparental Sex. *Science* 333, 216–218. doi: 10.1126/science.1206360
- Olson-Manning, C. F., Wagner, M. R., and Mitchell-Olds, T. (2012). Adaptive Evolution: Evaluating Empirical Support for Theoretical Predictions. *Nat. Rev. Genet.* 13, 12–13, 867–877. doi: 10.1038/nrg3322
- Ostman, B., Hintze, A., and Adami, C. (2012). Impact of Epistasis and Pleiotropy on Evolutionary Adaptation. *Proc. R. Soc. B: Biol. Sci.* 279, 247–256. doi: 10.1098/rspb.2011.0870
- Otto, S. (2004). Two Steps Forward, One Step Back: The Pleiotropic Effects of Favoured Alleles. *Proc. R. Soc. B: Biol. Sci.* 271, 705–714.
- Paczesniak, D., Klappert, K., Kopp, K., Neiman, M., Seppälä, K., Lively, C. M., et al. (2019). Parasite Resistance Predicts Fitness Better Than Fecundity in a Natural Population of the Freshwater Snail *Potamopyrgus Antipodarum*. *Evolution* 73, 1634–1646. doi: 10.1111/evo.13768
- Parker, B. J., Barribeau, S. M., Laughton, A. M., De Roode, J. C., and Gerardo, N. M. (2011). Non-Immunological Defense in an Evolutionary Framework. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* 26, 242–248. doi: 10.1016/j.tree.2011.02.005
- Penley, M. J., Ha, G. T., and Morran, L. T. (2017). Evolution of *Caenorhabditis Elegans* Host Defense Under Selection by the Bacterial Parasite *Serratia Marcescens*. *PLoS One* 12, e0181913–e0181913. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0181913
- Perlman, S. J., and Jaenike, J. (2003). Infection Success in Novel Hosts: An Experimental and Phylogenetic Study of *Drosophila*-Parasitic Nematodes. *Evolution* 57, 544–557. doi: 10.1111/j.0014-3820.2003.tb01546.x
- Petney, T. N., and Andrews, R. H. (1998). Multiparasite Communities in Animals and Humans: Frequency, Structure and Pathogenic Significance. *Int. J. Parasitol.* 28, 377–393. doi: 10.1016/S0020-7519(97)00189-6
- Rainey, P. B., Buckling, A., Kassen, R., and Travisano, M. (2000). The Emergence and Maintenance of Diversity: Insights From Experimental Bacterial Populations. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* 15, 243–247. doi: 10.1016/S0169-5347(00)01871-1
- Roy, B. A., and Kirchner, J. W. (2000). Evolutionary Dynamics of Pathogen Resistance and Tolerance. *Evolution* 54, 51–63. doi: 10.1111/j.0014-3820.2000.tb00007.x
- Schedl, T., and Kimble, J. (1988). Fog-2, a Germ-Line-Specific Sex Determination Gene Required for Hermaphrodite Spermatogenesis in *Caenorhabditis Elegans*. *Genetics* 119, 43–61. doi: 10.1093/genetics/119.1.43
- Schulenburg, H., and Ewbank, J. J. (2004). Diversity and Specificity in the Interaction Between *Caenorhabditis Elegans* and the Pathogen *Serratia Marcescens*. *BMC Evol. Biol.* 4, 1–4, 1–4, 8. doi: 10.1186/1471-2148-4-49
- Schulte, R. D., Makus, C., Hasert, B., Michiels, N. K., and Schulenburg, H. (2010). Multiple Reciprocal Adaptations and Rapid Genetic Change Upon Experimental Coevolution of an Animal Host and its Microbial Parasite. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* 107, 7359–7364. doi: 10.1073/pnas.1003113107
- Sheldon, B. C., and Verhulst, S. (1996). Ecological Immunology: Costly Parasite Defences and Trade-Offs in Evolutionary Ecology. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* 11, 317–321. doi: 10.1016/0169-5347(96)10039-2
- Strauss, S. Y., Rudgers, J. A., Lau, J. A., and Irwin, R. E. (2002). Direct and Ecological Costs of Resistance to Herbivory. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* 17, 278–285. doi: 10.1016/S0169-5347(02)02483-7
- Telfer, S., Birtles, R., Bennett, M., Lambin, X., Paterson, S., and Begon, M. (2008). Parasite Interactions in Natural Populations: Insights From Longitudinal Data. *Parasitology* 135, 767–781. doi: 10.1017/S0031182008000395
- Thompson, J. N. (2009). *The Coevolutionary Process* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press).
- Tyler, A. L., Asselbergs, F. W., Williams, S. M., and Moore, J. H. (2009). Shadows of Complexity: What Biological Networks Reveal About Epistasis and Pleiotropy. *BioEssays* 31, 220–227. doi: 10.1002/bies.200800022
- Vos, M., Birkett, P. J., Birch, E., Griffiths, R. I., and Buckling, A. (2009). Local Adaptation of Bacteriophages to Their Bacterial Hosts in Soil. *Science* 325, 833–833. doi: 10.1126/science.1174173
- War, A. R., Paulraj, M. G., Ahmad, T., Buhroo, A. A., Hussain, B., Ignacimuthu, S., et al. (2012). Mechanisms of Plant Defense Against Insect Herbivores. *Plant Signaling Behav.* 7, 1306–1320. doi: 10.4161/psb.21663
- Webster, J. P., and Woolhouse, M. E. J. (1999). Cost of Resistance: Relationship Between Reduced Fertility and Increased Resistance in a Snail Schistosome Host Parasite System. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Ser. B: Biol. Sci.* 266, 391–396. doi: 10.1098/rspb.1999.0650
- Weiss, J., Bayer, A. S., and Yeaman, M. (2014). Cellular and Extracellular Defenses Against Staphylococcal Infections. In *Gram-Positive Pathogens* (eds V. A. Fischetti, R. P. Novick, J. J. Ferretti, D. A. Ferretti, D. A. Portnoy and J. I. Rood). doi: 10.1128/9781555816513.ch45
- White, P. S., Arslan, D., Kim, D., Penley, M., and Morran, L. (2021). Host Genetic Drift and Adaptation in the Evolution and Maintenance of Parasite Resistance. *J. Evol. Biol.* 34, 845–851. doi: 10.1111/jeb.13785
- White, P. S., Choi, A., Pandey, R., Menezes, A., Penley, M., Gibson, A. K., et al. (2020). Host Heterogeneity Mitigates Virulence Evolution. *Biol. Lett.* 16, 20190744. doi: 10.1098/rsbl.2019.0744
- Wilfert, L., and Schmid-Hempel, P. (2008). The Genetic Architecture of Susceptibility to Parasites. *BMC Evol. Biol.* 8, 187–187. doi: 10.1186/1471-2148-8-187
- Wong, D., Bazopoulou, D., Pujol, N., Tavernarakis, N., and Ewbank, J. J. (2007). Genome-Wide Investigation Reveals Pathogen-Specific and Shared Signatures in the Response of *Caenorhabditis Elegans* to Infection. *Genome Biol.* 8, 9–9, 1–9, 18. doi: 10.1186/gb-2007-8-9-r194
- Woolhouse, M. E. J., Webster, J. P., Domingo, E., Charlesworth, B., and Levin, B. R. (2002). Biological and Biomedical Implications of the Co-Evolution of Pathogens and Their Hosts. *Nat. Genet.* 32(4), 569–577. doi: 10.1038/ng1202-569

Author Disclaimer: Any opinion, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this material are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views of the National Science Foundation.

Conflict of Interest: The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

Publisher's Note: All claims expressed in this article are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of their affiliated organizations, or those of the publisher, the editors and the reviewers. Any product that may be evaluated in this article, or claim that may be made by its manufacturer, is not guaranteed or endorsed by the publisher.

Copyright © 2022 Lewis, Penley, Sylla, Ahumada and Morran. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY). The use, distribution or reproduction in other forums is permitted, provided the original author(s) and the copyright owner(s) are credited and that the original publication in this journal is cited, in accordance with accepted academic practice. No use, distribution or reproduction is permitted which does not comply with these terms.