



Deposited via The University of Sheffield.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:

<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/id/eprint/122008/>

Version: Accepted Version

Article:

Best, A., Ashby, B., White, A. et al. (2017) Host-parasite fluctuating selection in the absence of specificity. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 284 (1866). 20171615. ISSN: 0962-8452

<https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2017.1615>

Reuse

Items deposited in White Rose Research Online are protected by copyright, with all rights reserved unless indicated otherwise. They may be downloaded and/or printed for private study, or other acts as permitted by national copyright laws. The publisher or other rights holders may allow further reproduction and re-use of the full text version. This is indicated by the licence information on the White Rose Research Online record for the item.

Takedown

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing eprints@whiterose.ac.uk including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.

1 **Host-parasite fluctuating selection in the absence of specificity**

2

3 Alex Best^{1*}, Ben Ashby^{2,3}, Andy White⁴, Roger Bowers⁵, Angus Buckling⁶, Britt

4 Koskella³ and Mike Boots^{3,6}

5

6 *¹School of Mathematics & Statistics, University of Sheffield, Sheffield, S3 7RH, UK.*

7 *²Department of Mathematical Sciences, University of Bath, Claverton Down, Bath,*

8 *BA2 7AY, UK.*

9 *³Department of Integrative Biology, University of California Berkeley, Berkeley, CA,*

10 *USA.*

11 *⁴Department of Mathematics and the Maxwell Institute for Mathematical Sciences,*

12 *Heriot-Watt University, Edinburgh, EH14 4AS, Scotland, UK.*

13 *⁵Department of Mathematical Sciences, Division of Applied Mathematics,*

14 *Mathematical Sciences Building, The University of Liverpool, L69 7ZL, UK.*

15 *⁶Biosciences, College of Life and Environmental Sciences, University of Exeter,*

16 *Cornwall Campus, Treliiever Road, Penryn, Cornwall, TR10 9EZ, UK.*

17

18 ** Corresponding author*

19

20 *Running Head: Cycles in host-parasite coevolution*

21

22 **Abstract**

23 Fluctuating selection driven by coevolution between hosts and parasites is
24 important for the generation of host and parasite diversity across space and
25 time. Theory has focused primarily on infection genetics, with highly specific
26 'matching allele' frameworks more likely to generate fluctuating selection
27 dynamics (FSD) than 'gene-for-gene' (generalist-specialist) frameworks.
28 However, the environment, ecological feedbacks, and life-history characteristics
29 may all play a role in determining when FSD occurs. Here, we develop eco-
30 evolutionary models with explicit ecological dynamics to explore the ecological,
31 epidemiological and host life-history drivers of FSD. Our key result is to
32 demonstrate for the first time that specificity between hosts and parasites is not
33 required to generate FSD. Furthermore, highly specific host-parasite interactions
34 produce unstable, less robust stochastic fluctuations in contrast to interactions
35 that lack specificity altogether or those that vary from generalist to specialist,
36 which produce predictable limit cycles. Given the ubiquity of ecological
37 feedbacks and the variation in the nature of specificity in host parasite
38 interactions, our work emphasizes the underestimated potential for host-
39 parasite coevolution to generate fluctuating selection.

40

41

42 **Key Words**

43 Coevolution, infectious disease, fluctuating selection, specificity

44

45 **Introduction**

46

47 Understanding the coevolution of hosts and parasites is important given the
48 central role that infectious disease plays in human health, agriculture and natural
49 systems. Theory predicts that the coevolution of hosts and their parasites may
50 lead to a number of distinct outcomes, including a co-evolutionary stable
51 strategy (co-ESS) for both host and parasite [1,2]; static within population
52 dimorphism or polymorphism [2-5]; escalation (known as arms race dynamics,
53 ARD) [6]; and fluctuating selection dynamics (FSD) [7-11]. Arms race dynamics
54 cannot continue indefinitely due to associated fitness costs or physiological
55 constraints (e.g. [12]), which means that, in the long term, coevolution will
56 eventually lead to either a stable evolutionary equilibrium (including
57 polymorphisms) or fluctuating selection. Fluctuating selection is therefore of
58 particular importance because it is the only dynamic coevolutionary outcome
59 that can be maintained indefinitely in a constant environment. The presence of a
60 constantly changing antagonist is thought to play a key role in the maintenance
61 of diversity [13], and also has implications for selection for sex and
62 recombination [14-16], and local adaptation [17-19]. Understanding the
63 processes and mechanisms that promote FSD therefore has significant
64 implications for our understanding of a wide range of biological phenomena.

65

66 Theoretical work has primarily focused on how different forms of genetic
67 specificity between hosts and parasites lead to fluctuating selection [7-11;19-21].
68 Highly specific 'matching allele' interactions, where parasites must 'match' the
69 host at each loci to infect, commonly generate coevolutionary 'cycles' (i.e. FSD) as

70 selection favors parasite genotypes capable of infecting common host genotypes,
71 thereby generating negative frequency-dependent selection [20-22]. Effectively,
72 hosts constantly evolve to 'escape' parasites that can infect them while parasites
73 play 'catch-up'. In contrast, 'gene-for-gene' interactions (where there is variation
74 in specificity such that hosts and parasites vary from specialists to generalists)
75 often produce arms race dynamics (ARD), where directional selection favors
76 increasing resistance and infectivity ranges, although there can be a transition to
77 FSD if there are costs to infection and defense [7-11]. While some empirical
78 evidence appears consistent with the notion that different genetic interactions
79 are associated with ARD or FSD [23-25], recent experimental work has shown
80 that changing environmental conditions can cause host-parasite interactions to
81 switch between ARD and FSD [26-28], suggesting either that the environment
82 determines specificity or that the same genetic specificity has different
83 consequences depending on the environment.

84

85 One way to investigate the importance of genetic specificity alongside ecological
86 feedbacks in determining FSD is to directly compare coevolutionary dynamics
87 with no specificity with those generated under various different forms of
88 specificity. This can be achieved using eco-evolutionary models, which allow for
89 varying population sizes due to changes in host defence and parasite infectivity.
90 These models are increasingly used to examine the role of environmental and
91 ecological feedbacks on the coevolution of hosts and parasites [1,2,4,5,29] and
92 have largely considered the processes that determine co-ESS levels of host
93 defense and parasite infectivity, and the potential for diversification through
94 evolutionary branching. For example, it has been shown that the likelihood of

95 static, within-population diversification depends on the nature of host-parasite
96 genetic specificity, associated fitness costs, and explicit ecological dynamics [5].
97 The form of the infection interaction was crucial to the level of diversity that
98 could arise, with non-specific 'universal' functions (parasite A always has higher
99 transmission than parasite B against any host) leading to dimorphism at most,
100 but 'range' functions with variation in specificity (whereby the relative success of
101 parasite strains depends on the target host) potentially leading to higher levels
102 of polymorphism [5]. This work emphasized the important role that ecological
103 feedbacks play in host-parasite coevolution. Little of this work, however, has
104 considered the potential for fluctuating selection [4,27] and none has provided a
105 full exploration of the ecological, epidemiological and host life-history drivers of
106 FSD.

107

108 Here we examine how host and parasite life-history characteristics and the
109 specificity of their interaction, in combination with ecological feedbacks,
110 determine the likelihood of fluctuating selection. By 'specificity', we mean the
111 degree to which parasite strains specialise on a subset of host types. An
112 interaction is defined to be 'specific' if each parasite strain has higher
113 transmission against some hosts and lower transmission against others
114 compared to another parasite strain. Conversely, an interaction is 'non-specific' if
115 each parasite strain always has either higher or lower transmission against all
116 hosts compared to another parasite strain. We consider interactions between
117 hosts and parasites starting from 'universal' (all non-specific), to 'range'
118 (variation from highly specific to generalist, and therefore phenotypically
119 equivalent to gene-for-gene models but with continuous phenotypic variation),

120 and ‘matching’ (highly specific, where all parasite strains are specialists on
121 respective host strains, and therefore phenotypically equivalent to matching
122 allele models but again with continuous phenotypic variation). Furthermore we
123 explicitly consider the ecological and epidemiological settings that promote
124 cycles. As such we determine what factors and which types of host-parasite
125 interactions promote fluctuating selection.

126

127 **Model and Methods**

128

129 We base our mathematical analysis within the eco-evolutionary invasion
130 framework known as adaptive dynamics [30-33] and combine this with explicit
131 evolutionary simulations that relax some of the restrictive assumptions of the
132 mathematical approach (see §A1 in SI for a fuller description of the analytic
133 methods, and §B for a description of the numerical simulations). We assume that
134 resident strains of host and parasite have reached a population dynamic
135 equilibrium of a Susceptible – Infected – Susceptible model [5,34],

136

$$137 \quad (1) \frac{dS}{dt} = (a - q(S + I))(S + fI) - bS - \beta SI + \gamma I$$

$$138 \quad (2) \frac{dI}{dt} = \beta SI - (b + \alpha + \gamma)I.$$

139

140 Susceptible hosts reproduce at rate a , with the rate for infected hosts reduced by
141 $f \in [0,1]$, with reproduction limited by competition by a density-dependent
142 factor q . All hosts die at natural mortality rate b , but infected hosts suffer an
143 additional mortality at rate α , which we define as ‘virulence’ (in contrast to the
144 plant-pathogen literature where virulence is often defined as infectivity).

145 Transmission is assumed to be a mass action density-dependent interaction with
 146 coefficient β . We assume that both the host and parasite have some ‘control’
 147 over the transmission rate, so that transmission is dependent on the host trait, h ,
 148 and parasite trait p , with $\beta = \beta(h, p)$. We will generally define h as susceptibility
 149 (I.e., inversely, resistance) and p as infectivity. Finally hosts can recover from
 150 infection at rate γ . For our algebraic analysis we will make the simplifying
 151 assumptions that $\gamma = 0$ and $f = 0$, but we shall relax these assumptions in our
 152 numerical investigations.

153

154 We assume that a resident host (h) and parasite (p) are at their endemic steady
 155 state and that a rare mutant strain of either the host (\bar{h} ; overbars denoting
 156 mutant traits) or parasite (\bar{p}) attempts to invade (with trait values limited to $h \in$
 157 $[0,1]$ and $p \in [0,1]$ by some physiological constraints). The mutant has small
 158 phenotypic differences to the current resident strain and therefore a different
 159 transmission coefficient. We assume trade-offs in which a decrease in
 160 transmission (either an absolute reduction or an increase in resistance range;
 161 see below) caused by a host mutation confers a cost to the host birth rate, $a(h)$,
 162 while an increase in the base transmission rate caused by a parasite mutation
 163 confers either an increase in virulence, $\alpha(p)$, or a reduced infection range [4,5].
 164 The success of the mutant depends on its invasion fitness when the resident is at
 165 its ecological equilibrium. In the simplified case where $\gamma = 0$, $f = 0$ (see SI §A1
 166 for general case), the respective host and parasite fitnesses are,

167

168 (3) $s(\bar{h}; h, p) = a(\bar{h}) - q(\hat{S} + \hat{I}) - b - \beta(\bar{h}, p)\hat{I}$,

169 (4) $r(\bar{p}; h, p) = \beta(h, \bar{p})\hat{S} - b - \alpha(\bar{p})$

170

171 (where hats denote equilibrium densities of the resident). If a mutant has
172 positive invasion fitness it will invade to replace or coexist with the current
173 resident (subject to demographic stochasticity [30]), while if it has negative
174 fitness it will die out. Through a series of mutations and substitutions the two
175 species will coevolve in the directions of their local selection gradients, with the
176 canonical equations [30,31] given by

177

178 (5) $\frac{dh}{dt} = \varphi^h \hat{S} \left. \frac{\partial s}{\partial \bar{h}} \right|_{\bar{h}=h} = \varphi^h \hat{S} [a_{\bar{h}} - \beta_{\bar{h}} \hat{I}]$

179 (6) $\frac{dp}{dt} = \varphi^p \hat{I} \left. \frac{\partial r}{\partial \bar{p}} \right|_{\bar{p}=p} = \varphi^p \hat{I} [\beta_{\bar{p}} \hat{S} - \alpha_{\bar{p}}]$

180

181 where subscripts denote derivatives (i.e. $\beta_{\bar{h}} = \partial \beta(\bar{h}, p) / \partial \bar{h}$) and φ^i controls the
182 respective speeds of mutation (which are products of the mutation rate and
183 variance and a factor of 1/2). To simplify what follows we shall set $\varphi^h = \varphi^p = 1$.
184 Note that all the derivatives are evaluated at the resident trait values, $\bar{h} = h, \bar{p} =$
185 p .

186

187 A coevolutionary ‘singular point’ is a point at which the two selection gradients
188 are simultaneously zero (i.e. there is no longer directional selection on either
189 species). There are four behaviors at a singular point that are of particular
190 interest. First, the singular point can be a long-term attractor of evolution
191 (*Continuously Stable Strategy* or CSS; a dynamic counterpart to the classic
192 Evolutionarily Stable Strategy (ESS)). Second, the singular point can be an
193 *evolutionary branching point* for that species. Here one of the species will

194 undergo disruptive selection and branch into two coexisting strains. Third, if
195 varying parameter values causes the system to pass a critical point (a Hopf
196 bifurcation [36]) then *coevolutionary cycles* will result (although further work is
197 required to find whether the resulting cycles are stable, resulting in FSD, or
198 unstable, resulting in bistability). Finally, a repelling singular point could cause
199 directional selection in the host and/or parasite to *maximize or minimize* their
200 investment to bounds of evolution (recall $h, p \in [0,1]$), while the other species
201 may reach a purely evolutionary CSS (i.e. a host CSS may exist where $p=1$), may
202 branch or may also maximize/minimize.

203

204 It is clearly important to examine the precise nature of the infection function,
205 $\beta(h, p)$, to determine coevolutionary dynamics. Following previous work [5],
206 here we use three key functional forms: ‘universal’ (no specificity), ‘range’
207 (variation from specialism to generalism), and ‘matching’ (highly specific). These
208 are shown as heat maps in figure 1, where red denotes high transmission rates
209 for combinations of h and p and blue low transmission. In detail:

210

211 The universal function is given by,

212

$$213 \quad (7) \quad \beta(h, p) = \sigma(h)\rho(p) + k,$$

214

215 where k is a constant giving the minimum value of the infection function. In this
216 case there is no specificity, as figure 1a highlights that parasites retain the same
217 relative ordering of infection rates against any host (see also fig S1a in the SI). As
218 such, each host is ‘universally’ more resistant moving from right-to-left (here

219 $\beta_h > 0$, where the subscript denotes differentiation with respect to h) and
220 similarly for parasites ($\beta_p > 0$).

221

222 The range function is given by,

223

224 (8) $\beta(h, p) = \beta_0(p) \left(1 - \frac{1}{1 + \exp(\kappa(p-h))} \right)$,

225

226 where κ is a constant controlling the steepness of the curve. In this case there is
227 variation in specificity, representing hosts and parasites that range from
228 specialist to generalist. A parasite trade-off, $\beta_0(p)$, is built in to the infection
229 function so that parasites with a narrow range (low p) achieve higher
230 transmission against the least resistant hosts (the cost of a large range is thus a
231 low transmission rate, and we assume no further parasite trade-offs to virulence;
232 including an additional virulence trade-off has no qualitative impact on the
233 results presented here). The range function, as shown in figure 1b (see also fig
234 S1b) therefore includes specificity as for low h parasites with low p have the
235 highest transmission, but for high h parasites with high p are the most infectious.
236 Hence, parasites vary in the range of hosts that they can successfully infect, and
237 similarly for host resistance.

238

239 For the matching function,

240

241 (9) $\beta(h, p) = \beta_0(p) \exp\left(-\left(\frac{p-h}{\eta p + c}\right)^2\right)$,

242

243 where η and c are constants controlling the variance of the infection curves. Here
244 a ‘match’ between host and parasite strains is required for optimal infection,
245 with the transmission rate falling away as they become more distant. This
246 function therefore corresponds to a high degree of specificity between host and
247 parasite. The case where $\eta=0$ and $\beta_0(p)$ is constant (i.e. there are no costs to the
248 parasite) represents a continuous analogy of matching alleles infection genetics,
249 as shown in figure 1c (see also fig S1c; e.g. [5]). When $\eta>0$ and we assume costs,
250 the trade-off ensures that parasites with a narrow range achieve higher
251 transmission against their matching hosts relative to parasites with a broader
252 range (again, there is no virulence trade-off in the matching model), as shown in
253 figure 1d (see also fig S1d). This is in some sense a hybrid matching-range
254 function, but the maximum transmission of a parasite is not always against the
255 least resistant hosts (compare figs 1b and 1d).

256

257 **Results**

258

259 ***Specificity of the infection function***

260 In the SI §A2 we show that if there are no fitness costs to host resistance or
261 parasite infectivity, then a coevolutionary singular point can never exist for the
262 universal or range functions. Since selection now only acts on transmission the
263 host will always evolve to minimize investment and the parasite to maximise (to
264 bounds of evolution). For the matching function with no costs (i.e. figure 1c),
265 there will be a continuum of singular points at $h=p$ none of which are attracting.
266 Under the full assumptions of adaptive dynamics, this will lead to a random walk

267 through trait space. However, if we relax the assumption of mutations occurring
268 rarely, fluctuating selection occurs due to the ‘trail’ of strains on one side of the
269 current resident. This build up of strains keeps the host or parasite evolving in
270 the same direction for longer, with reversals in selection due to one antagonist
271 ‘passing’ the other becoming more rare. We term these ‘*stochastic oscillations*’,
272 since they are non-deterministic, unstable cycles whose existence depends on
273 the discrete and stochastic assumptions of the simulations. An example of these
274 stochastic oscillations can be found in [5]. For the remainder of this study we
275 assume that host resistance and parasite infectivity are costly.

276

277 We initially consider whether coevolutionary cycles can ever emerge for each
278 infection function. This is particularly important for the universal function since
279 cycles in this model have never been demonstrated (see [4] and [27] for
280 examples of cycles in the range model). To achieve this, initially we simply wish
281 to show that parameters and trade-offs exist that produce a Hopf bifurcation,
282 using a method previously employed to find cycles between parasite virulence
283 and predator population densities [36]. The full analysis is given in the SI §A2.

284

285 In the universal model (7) cycles will be possible (for some parameters and
286 trade-offs) wherever $k > 0$. However, there is a special case for $k=0$ (i.e. the
287 minimum value of the infection function is 0), where we show there can never be
288 cycles (see SI §A2i). Biologically, this means that cycles in quantitative levels of
289 resistance and infectivity will not occur unless parasites have a non-zero
290 baseline level of transmission, and is due to the host trait having no impact on
291 parasite selection in this special case (see SI §A2i). This explains why in a

292 previous study we found no evidence of coevolutionary cycles with the universal
293 transmission function $\beta(h, p) = hp$ [2]. Figure 2a shows numerical simulations
294 of the coevolutionary dynamics for the case where $\beta(h, p) = hp + 0.5$ (i.e. $k > 0$)
295 with regular coevolutionary cycles. These cycles lead to regular increases and
296 decreases in quantitative host resistance and parasite infectivity (transmission)
297 and virulence. The cycles arise simply due to the negative frequency dependence
298 resulting from the epidemiological feedbacks on disease prevalence from the
299 evolution of resistance and infectivity.

300

301 We find that a Hopf bifurcation may occur for any form of the range infection
302 function (8). The cycles that emerge will be in the respective resistance and
303 infection ranges of hosts and parasites, as demonstrated previously [4,27].
304 Figure 2b shows the output from simulations of the coevolutionary dynamics,
305 once again showing regular cycles.

306

307 Assuming costs in the matching model (9) we again find that a Hopf bifurcation
308 may always occur. However, in this case numerical analysis of the system
309 indicated that the Hopf bifurcation is always *subcritical*, meaning that the cycles
310 are unstable (i.e. not attracting) [35,36]. We explored a comprehensive range of
311 parameter sets and trade-offs but saw no examples of stable coevolutionary
312 cycles in bifurcation diagrams or numerical simulations. Instead there is
313 generally a bistability such that, under the full assumptions of adaptive
314 dynamics, the system should evolve either to an intermediate singular point or to
315 a minimum. However, as is the case when there were no costs, when the
316 assumptions are relaxed in numerical simulations we typically see fluctuating

317 selection. An example of these dynamics are shown in figure 2c where we see
318 rather irregular oscillations. These are once more non-deterministic, stochastic
319 oscillations. Such stochastic effects are inherent in natural systems and therefore
320 these oscillations are likely to occur in nature, but we emphasize that these are
321 less regular and predictable than those seen for the universal and range models
322 (c.f. figures 2a,b). Why do such oscillations emerge? In general the host will
323 always evolve away from the parasite and the parasite will evolve to match the
324 host, leading to a ‘chase’ across phenotypic space (which is again linked to the
325 presence of the ‘trail’ of strains present when mutations are not strictly rare).
326 However, we found that provided the trade-offs are not too strongly decelerating
327 or accelerating, the h and p nullclines generally remain very close to the main
328 diagonal ($h=p$) meaning that a small mutation can easily cross the nullclines and
329 reverse the direction of selection, causing the ‘chase’ to go in the other direction
330 (see figure S6 in the SI). These repeated crossings of the nullcline by small, finite
331 mutations are what drive the oscillations.

332

333 ***Host and parasite life-history characteristics***

334 We now explicitly consider the ecological conditions that favour FSD by varying
335 host and parasite life-history traits for each infection function. For the stable
336 cycles we do this by computing bifurcation diagrams using the numerical
337 continuation software AUTO-07p [37]. For the stochastic oscillations we examine
338 numerical simulations. In each case we shall explore the effects of altering (a)
339 resource competition, q , and (b) the virulence, β . Plots for the other parameters
340 (b , α and f) can be found in figures S2, S3 and S5 in the SI.

341

342 The behavior in the universal model as resource competition, q , is varied is
343 representative of all of the bifurcation diagrams (figure 3a, S2). The red vertical
344 dashed lines in figure 3 separate the regions of behavior, as annotated along the
345 bottom. Starting from the right-hand end of figure 3a, the trend as q is decreased
346 is: no singular point, leading to minimization; the emergence of a pair of singular
347 points through a saddle-node bifurcation (solid line: a branching point, dashed
348 line: a repeller) often leading to branching; a Hopf bifurcation leading to the
349 onset of cycles which increase in size (solid grey line marks the maximum and
350 minimum values reached on a cycle); the loss of cycles such that both host and
351 parasite maximize (i.e. ARD). We see similar behavior in figure 3b as virulence is
352 varied (although here the saddle-node bifurcation occurs for rates of virulence
353 beyond the domain of this plot). Decreasing values of q and α lead to increased
354 densities of infectious individuals, and hence higher encounter rates with
355 susceptible hosts. It is interesting to note that “static diversity” (branching to
356 coexistence) occurs for lower encounter rates than “temporal diversity” (FSD).
357 We conclude that FSD will be promoted in intermediate/large sized populations
358 (intermediate q , low b , intermediate f) with an intermediate infectious period
359 (intermediate τ , low b , intermediate β). In §A3 and figure S5 in the SI we also
360 show that cycles occur for a range of weakly decelerating trade-offs in both the
361 host and parasite.

362

363 The bifurcation plots for the range model in figures 3c,d show very similar
364 behavior to those for the universal model (figures 3a,b), except that a new
365 behavior emerges with regions where the singular point is an attracting

366 *Continuously Stable Strategy* (CSS). The conditions that promote FSD in the range
367 model are qualitatively similar to those in the universal model.

368

369 To explore the effects of life-history characteristics on the stochastic oscillations
370 in the matching model we ran evolutionary simulations and measured the
371 variance in the host trait over the final 20% of each run. A higher variance
372 indicates larger stochastic oscillations (the values where there is zero variance
373 actually relate to parasite extinction). In figure 4 (figure S3 in the SI) we see a
374 similar pattern to the above results – the variance is greatest in long-lived (low
375 b), large populations (low q , low b) with high infectious periods
376 (low α , low γ , low b).

377

378

379 **Discussion**

380

381 We have analyzed a series of host-parasite coevolutionary models to understand
382 how ecological dynamics, life-history characteristics, and the specificity of
383 interactions between hosts and parasites impact fluctuating selection dynamics
384 (FSD). A key finding is that FSD in host resistance and parasite infectivity may
385 occur without the need for any specificity in the interaction between hosts and
386 parasites. When there is specificity, we find that the nature of fluctuating
387 selection is very different in a highly specific matching interaction (akin to
388 matching alleles in that all parasite strains are specialists on respective host
389 strains) compared to when there is variation in the range of specificity (akin to
390 gene-for-gene in that there is variation in specificity such that hosts and

391 parasites vary from specialists to generalists). Therefore, although it is already
392 known that both types of specific infection mechanism can lead to FSD, our
393 models suggest that the nature of the underlying fluctuations are fundamentally
394 different [see also 9]. Finally, we show how both host and parasite
395 characteristics influence the likelihood of fluctuating selection, which allows us
396 to predict the ecological conditions that are most likely to show FSD. This is
397 important because it tells us when fluctuating selection is likely to generate
398 genetic diversity through time [13].

399

400 The fact that fluctuating selection can arise without specificity between hosts
401 and parasites is of particular interest because much theoretical and empirical
402 work has focused on identifying the relationship between different types of
403 specificity and FSD rather than considering the potential for FSD in non-specific
404 interactions [7-11; 23-25]. We have shown that costs associated with non-
405 specific resistance and infectivity can be sufficient to generate coevolutionary
406 cycles in an eco-evolutionary setting. In principle, these cycles would also be
407 possible in a non-ecological framework where selection is frequency-dependent
408 but not density-dependent, as one could choose fitness functions whereby the
409 selection gradients are never simultaneously zero on a closed trajectory.
410 However, it is realistic to assume that the relative population densities, and thus
411 the prevalence of infection, will vary with changes in host resistance and parasite
412 infectivity. The feedbacks generated by these changes provide a natural route for
413 frequency-dependent selection to operate and generate fluctuations. The drivers
414 of the cycles in both the universal and range models are thus due to a mix of
415 frequency-dependence (i.e. relative infection rates) and density-dependence (i.e.

416 varying population sizes due to ecological feedbacks). Cycles without specificity
417 have not been described previously, as most studies on FSD have neglected
418 ecological dynamics and feedbacks. Those evolutionary studies that do include
419 ecology have either assumed specificity between host and parasite and not
420 examined universal interactions [16, 38-44], or, have assumed universal
421 infection but focused on optimal investment or evolutionary branching rather
422 than cycling [1-5; 29]. Our work examines models with explicit ecological
423 dynamics and focuses on the potential for FSD both with and without specificity.

424

425 Ecology has been shown to drive fluctuating selection in predator-prey systems
426 with specificity [31,45] (although we note that the 'matching' function
427 considered in these studies is different from the one used here). However, our
428 work shows that it also occurs in non-specific host-parasite interactions. This
429 result has important relevance to the role host-parasite coevolution may play in
430 shaping host diversity across space and time. When host fitness depends on the
431 frequency of different parasite genotypes, there are predicted to be differences
432 among populations in terms of which host and parasite genotypes are being
433 selected for at a given point in time. Hence, the propensity for fluctuating
434 selection will have impacts on host-parasite local adaptation, as isolated
435 populations are likely to be out of sync with one another [19,46]. There are also
436 implications to the theory surrounding the evolution of sexual reproduction.
437 While evolution of sex studies typically take a population genetics approach with
438 a few major loci, it has been shown that sex can be beneficial where there are
439 many loci with small additive effects [47]. One common criticism of the Red
440 Queen hypothesis for the maintenance of sex is the lack of highly specific and

441 virulent parasites that are generally assumed to be necessary for FSD [48]. Our
442 work suggests these restrictive assumptions could be relaxed; future theory
443 must test whether selection for sex can be generated in the absence of specificity
444 and for parasites with only intermediate levels of virulence.

445

446 While we found that FSD could occur across all of the interactions we considered,
447 we found that the nature of the cycles are fundamentally different. We have
448 shown that both the universal and range infection functions can lead to regular,
449 deterministic cycles when there are costs. For the universal function this leads to
450 fluctuations in the transmission rate, while for the range function the
451 fluctuations are between pure generalists and pure specialists. However, when
452 there is a matching function we found that stable deterministic cycles do not
453 exist. Instead we have shown that oscillations occur driven by the inherent
454 incompatibility of the optimal host and parasite strategies. This result is in
455 accordance with models of matching alleles in continuous time, which have
456 shown only damped cycles rather than deterministic stable limit cycles [43,49].
457 This result also relates to the idea of 'stochastic persistence' [50], since regular
458 input of mutations (i.e. faster than a full separation of ecological and
459 evolutionary timescales) is essential for the cycles to be sustained. There are a
460 number of implications to these different types of cycles. The deterministic
461 cycles generated by the universal and range models are more regular and
462 consistent, making their behavior more predictable. In contrast, the stochastic
463 oscillations of the matching interaction tend to be irregular and vary in period
464 and amplitude, making their behavior unpredictable. Stochastic fluctuations may
465 also be less robust to changes in assumptions about mutation and standing

466 variation. Distinguishing between these two forms of cycles empirically would be
467 challenging due to environmental variation, but if FSD can be observed over
468 multiple cycles, evidence of regularity could be looked for. An exciting question
469 that thus emerges is whether the inherent differences among the fluctuating
470 dynamics observed across infection interactions might support different levels of
471 genetic diversity within and among populations. It is yet unclear whether cycles
472 generated under a specialist-generalist continuum (i.e. range or gene-for-gene)
473 framework can be considered equivalent to those generated under a purely
474 specialist (i.e. matching) framework.

475

476 By including explicit ecological dynamics in our models we have been able to
477 assess how host and parasite life-history characteristics impact the potential for
478 FSD. We have found that, no matter the infection function, cycles are most likely
479 when hosts are long-lived and exist at high, but not the highest, densities. These
480 results suggest that cycles are promoted when encounter rates are reasonably
481 high. When encounter rates are low, so too is the potential for infection;
482 therefore selection for costly host resistance is likely to be limited. At the other
483 extreme, if encounter rates are very high then there will be considerable
484 selection for resistance leading to an 'arms race dynamic' (ARD). It is in between
485 these two extremes when cycles are most likely to occur. These results
486 emphasise the role ecology plays in driving FSD in our models, since cycles only
487 arise for certain regions of parameter space. Empirical studies in bacteria-phage
488 systems agree with the predictions from our models, with environmental
489 conditions that increase host-parasite encounter rates causing a shift from FSD
490 to ARD [26-28]. This pattern is consistently seen in the stochastic oscillations

491 from the matching model as well as the stable cycles of the universal and range
492 models, suggesting this parameter dependency is robust.

493

494 Our models have demonstrated that there are a wide range of interactions
495 between hosts and parasites that can lead to fluctuating selection. We require
496 that there are costs to resistance and infectivity to produce deterministic cycles
497 in range or universal models, consistent with previous theory showing that costs
498 are necessary but not sufficient for FSD to occur in gene-for-gene systems [3].

499 However, highly specific matching interactions produce stochastic oscillations.

500 Our models are novel in that they demonstrate that specificity is not required for
501 fluctuating selection to occur. Both the host life-history and the disease
502 characteristics that promote FSD are consistent across all the different infection
503 interactions. We can therefore make robust predictions for the types of host-
504 parasite interactions that are most likely to lead to coevolutionary cycles. We
505 note that the timescale of the cycles seen in our models is somewhat slower than
506 those seen in classic gene-for-gene or matching-allele models. This is because we
507 assume a separation of ecological and evolutionary timescales, whereas the
508 genetic models are essentially at an ecological timescale with multiple competing
509 strains. The cycles considered here are purely at the evolutionary timescale, with
510 the population dynamics always being at, or close to (in simulations), an
511 equilibrium. We also note that our methods assume a large number of loci with
512 small additive effects, as opposed to classic population genetics models, which
513 generally assume a small number of loci and epistasis between them. Future
514 work will address when the discreteness that arises from a smaller number of
515 loci has a significant effect on the results, but without a detailed understanding of

516 the genetic basis of a particular interaction the quantitative assumption gives
517 general insights.

518

519 Empirical evidence from a number of host-parasite systems indicates that
520 fluctuating selection is a common form of coevolutionary dynamics. Several
521 studies have reported indirect evidence of FSD (or host-parasite relationships
522 capable of FSD) based on phylogenetic data (e.g. *Arabidopsis* plants and
523 *Pseudomonas* bacteria [51]), highly specific genetic interactions (e.g. sticklebacks
524 and trematodes [52]), or high levels of polymorphism in immune genes (e.g. in
525 the vertebrate Major Histocompatibility Complex [53]). Direct evidence of FSD
526 primarily comes from time-shift experiments [54] between crustaceans and
527 bacteria [55], water snails and trematodes [56], and bacteria and phages [26-28;
528 57]. The predictions from our models therefore have wide relevance within
529 coevolutionary host-parasite systems. Given the ubiquity of ecological feedbacks
530 and the diversity of different infection interactions our work emphasizes the
531 considerable potential for host-parasite coevolution to generate fluctuating
532 selection.

533

534 **Author Contributions**

535 ABe conceived of and designed the study, carried out the mathematical modeling
536 and simulations, and drafted the manuscript. BA carried out mathematical
537 modeling and simulations, and helped draft the manuscript. AW helped design
538 the study and helped draft the manuscript. RB helped carry out the mathematical
539 modelling and helped draft the manuscript. ABu helped design the study and

540 helped draft the manuscript. BK helped design the study and helped draft the
541 manuscript. MB conceived of and designed the study and drafted the manuscript.

542

543 **Acknowledgements**

544 We thank two anonymous reviewers for their comments on an earlier version of
545 this manuscript.

546

547 **Ethics**

548 No ethics approval was needed for this study.

549

550 **Funding**

551 Alex Best was funded by a Leverhulme Early Career Fellowship, and this work
552 was supported by NERC grants NE/J009784/1 and NE/N014979/1.

553

554 **Data Accessibility**

555 No data is used in this study. C++ code used for the simulations can be found in
556 the supplementary material.

557

558 **Competing Interests**

559 We have no competing interests.

560

561 **References**

- 562 1. van Baalen, M. (1998). Coevolution of recovery ability and virulence. *Proc*
563 *R. Soc. B.*, 265(1393):317–325.
- 564 2. Best, A., White, A. and Boots, M.. (2009). The Implications of
565 Coevolutionary Dynamics to Host-Parasite Interactions. *American*
566 *Naturalist* 173:779-791.
- 567 3. Tellier, A. and J. K. M. Brown (2007). Stability of genetic polymorphism in
568 host-parasite interactions. *Proc R. Soc. B.*, 274:809–817.
- 569 4. Best, A., A. White, E. Kisdi, J. Antonovics, M. A. Brockhurst, and M. Boots.
570 (2010). The Evolution of Host-Parasite Range. *American Naturalist*
571 176:63-71.
- 572 5. M. Boots, A. White, A. Best, and R. G. Bowers (2014). How specificity and
573 epidemiology drive the coevolution of static trait diversity in hosts and
574 parasites. *Evolution*, 68:1594-1606.
- 575 6. Gandon, S., Buckling, A., Decaestecker, E. and Day, T. (2008). Host-parasite
576 coevolution and patterns of adaptation across time and space. *J. Evol. Biol.*,
577 21:1861-1866.
- 578 7. Flor, H.H. (1956). The complementary genetic systems in flax and flax
579 rust. *Adv. Genet.*, 8:29-54.
- 580 8. Jayakar, S. (1970). A mathematical model for interaction of gene
581 frequencies in a parasite and its host. *Theor Pop Biol.*, 1:140-164.
- 582 9. Sasaki, A. (2000). Host-parasite coevolution in a multilocus gene-for-gene
583 system. *Proc R. Soc. B.* 267:2183-2188.

- 584 10. Agrawal, A. and C. M. Lively. (2002). Infection genetics: gene-for-gene
585 versus matching-alleles models and all points in between. *Evolutionary*
586 *Ecology Research* 4:79-90.
- 587 11. Ashby, B. and Boots, M. (2017). Multi-mode fluctuating selection in host-
588 parasite coevolution. *Ecology Letters*, 20:357-365.
- 589 12. Hall, A., Scanlan, P., Morgan, A. and Buckling, A. (2011). Host-parasite
590 coevolutionary arms races give way to fluctuating selection. *Ecology*
591 *Letters*, 14:635-642.
- 592 13. Clarke, B. (1979). Evolution of genetic diversity. *Proc Roy Soc. B.*, 205:453-
593 474.
- 594 14. Hamilton, W. D. (1980). Sex versus non-sex versus parasite. *Oikos*, 35:
595 282-290.
- 596 15. Lively, C. (2009). The maintenance of sex: host-parasite coevolution with
597 density-dependent virulence. *J. Evol. Biol.*, 22:2086-2093.
- 598 16. Lively, C. (2010). An epidemiological model of host-parasite coevolution
599 and sex. *J. Evol. Biol.*, 23:1490-1497.
- 600 17. Lively, C. (1999). Migration, virulence and the geographic mosaic of
601 adaptation by parasites. *Am. Nat.*, 153:S34-S47.
- 602 18. Gandon, S. (2002). Local adaptation and the geometry of host-parasite
603 coevolution. *Ecology Letters*, 5: 246-256.
- 604 19. Morgan, A., Gandon, S. and Buckling, A. (2005). The effect of migration on
605 local adaptation in a coevolving host-parasite system. *Nature*, 437:253-
606 256.
- 607 20. Frank, S. A. (1993). Coevolutionary genetics of plants and pathogens. *Evol.*
608 *Ecol.* 7:45-75.

- 609 21. S. A. Frank (1994). Coevolutionary genetics of hosts and parasites with
610 quantitative inheritance. *Evol. Ecol.* 8:74–94.
- 611 22. Hamilton, WD (1993). Haploid dynamic polymorphism in a host with
612 matching parasites – effects of mutation subdivision, linkage and patterns
613 of selection. *J. Heredity*, 84:328-338.
- 614 23. Thrall, P and Burdon, J. (2003). Evolution of virulence in a plant host-
615 pathogen metapopulation. *Science*, 299:1735-1737.
- 616 24. Scanlan, P., Hall, A., Lopez-Pascua, L, et al. (2011). Genetic basis of
617 infectivity evolution in bacteriophage. *Mol. Ecol.*, 20:981-989.
- 618 25. Luijckx, P., Fienberg, H., Duneau, D. et al. (2013). A matching allele model
619 explains host resistance to parasites. *Curr. Biol.*, 23:1085-1088.
- 620 26. Gomez, P. and A. Buckling (2011). Bacteria-phage antagonistic
621 coevolution in soil. *Science*, 332:106–109.
- 622 27. Lopez-Pascua, L., A. Hall, A. Best, A. D. Morgan, M. Boots, and A. Buckling
623 (2014). Higher resources decrease fluctuating selection during host-
624 parasite coevolution. *Ecology Letters*, 17:1380–1388.
- 625 28. Gomez, P., Ashby, B. and Buckling, A. (2015). Population mixing promotes
626 arms race host-parasite coevolution. *Proc. Roy. Soc. B.*, 282:20142297.
- 627 29. Gandon, S., P. Agnew, and Y. Michalakis (2002). Coevolution between
628 parasite virulence and host life-history traits. *American Naturalist*,
629 160(3):374–388.
- 630 30. Dieckmann, U. and R. Law (1996). The dynamical theory of coevolution: a
631 derivation from stochastic ecological processes. *Journal of Mathematical*
632 *Biology*, 34(5-6):579–612.

- 633 31. Marrow, P., U. Dieckmann, and R. Law (1996). Evolutionary dynamics of
634 predator-prey systems: an ecological perspective. *Journal of Mathematical*
635 *Biology*, 34:556–578.
- 636 32. Metz, J.A.J., S. A. H. Geritz, G. Mesz ena, F. J. A. Jacobs, and J. S. Van
637 Heerwaarden (1996). Adaptive dynamics: a geometrical study of the
638 consequences of nearly faithful reproduction. In S. J. van Strein and S. M.
639 Verduyn Lunel, editors, *Stochastic and Spatial Structures of Dynamical*
640 *Systems*, pages 183– 231. Elsevier: North-Holland.
- 641 33. Geritz, S. A. H., E. Kisdi, G. Meszena, and J. A. J. Metz. (1998). Evolutionarily
642 singular strategies and the adaptive growth and branching of the
643 evolutionary tree. *Evolutionary Ecology* 12:35-57.
- 644 34. Anderson, R. M. and R. M. May (1979). Population biology of infectious
645 diseases: Part I. *Nature*, 280:361–367.
- 646 35. Kuznetsov, Y.. *Elements of Applied Bifurcation Theory*. Springer, 1995.
- 647 36. Kisdi E., Geritz, S. and Boldin, B. (2013). Evolution of pathogen virulence
648 under selective predation: a construction method to fins eco-evolutionary
649 cycles. *J. Theor. Biol.* 339:140-150.
- 650 37. Doedel, E. J. and B. E. Oldeman. *AUTO-07P: Continuation and bifurcation*
651 *software for ordinary differential equations*. Technical report, Concordia
652 University, Montreal, Canada, 2009.
- 653 38. May, R. M. and Anderson, R. M. (1983). Epidemiology and genetics in the
654 coevolution of parasites and hosts. *Proc. R. Soc. B.*, 219:281-313.
- 655 39. Tellier, A. and Brown, J. (2008). The relationship of host-mediated
656 induced resistance to polymorphism in gene-for-gene relationships.
657 *Phytopathology*, 98:128-136.

- 658 40. Gandon, S. and Day, T. (2009). Evolutionary epidemiology and the
659 dynamics of adaptation. *Evolution*, 826-838.
- 660 41. Quigley, B. Z., Garcia Lopez, D., Buckling, A. *et al.* (2012). The mode of
661 host-parasite interaction shapes coevolutionary dynamics and the fate of
662 host cooperation. *Proc R. Soc. B.*, 279:3742-3748.
- 663 42. Gokhale, C., Papkou, A., Traulsen, A. and Schulenburg, H. (2013). Lotka-
664 Volterra dynamics kills the Red Queen: population size fluctuations and
665 associated stochasticity dramatically change host-parasite coevolution.
666 *BMC Evol. Biol.*, 13:254.
- 667 43. Ashby, B. and Gupta, S. (2014). Parasitic castration promotes
668 coevolutionary cycling but also imposes a cost on sex. *Evolution*, 68:2234-
669 2244.
- 670 44. Ashby, B., Gupta, S. and Buckling, A. (2014). Effects of epistasis on
671 infectivity range during host-parasite coevolution. *Evolution*, 68:2972-
672 2982.
- 673 45. Marrow, P., R. Law, and C. Cannings. (1992). The coevolution of predator-
674 prey interactions: ESSs and Red Queen dynamics. *Proc R. Soc. B.*, 250:133-
675 141.
- 676 46. Gandon, S., Buckling, A., Decaestecker, E. and Day, T. (2008). Host-parasite
677 coevolution and patterns of adaptation across time and space. *J. Evol. Biol.*,
678 21:1861-1866.
- 679 47. Doebeli, M. (1996). Quantitative genetics and population dynamics.
680 *Evolution*, 50:532-546.
- 681 48. Otto, S. and Nuismer, S. (2004). Species interactions and the evolution of
682 sex. *Science*, 304:1018-1020.

683 49. Kouyos, R., Aslathé, M. and Bonhoeffer, S. (2007). The Red Queen and the
684 persistence of linkage-disequilibrium oscillations in finite and infinite
685 populations. *BMC Evol. Biol.*, 7:211.

686 50. Allen, J. (1975). Mathematical models of species interactions in time and
687 space. *Am. Nat.*, 967:319-342.

688 51. Stahl, E., Dwyer, G., Mauricio, R. et al. (1999). Dynamics of disease
689 resistance polymorphism at the Rpm1 locus of Arabidopsis. *Nature*,
690 400:667-671.

691 52. Rauch, G., Kalbe, M., and Reusch, T. (2006). One day is enough: rapid and
692 specific host-parasite interactions in a stickleback-trematode system.
693 *Biology Letters*, 2:382-384.

694 53. Penman, B., Ashby, B. Buckee, C. et al. (2013). Pathogen selection drives
695 nonoverlapping associations between HLA loci. *Proc Nat. Acad. Sci.*,
696 110:19645-19650.

697 54. Gaba, S. and Ebert, D. (2009). Time-shift experiments as a tool to study
698 antagonistic evolution. *Trends in Ecol. Evol.*, 24:226-232.

699 55. Decaestecker, E., Gaba, S., Raeymaekers, J. et al. (2007). Host-parasite 'Red
700 Queen' dynamics archived in pond sediment. *Nature*, 450:870-U16.


701 56. Koskella, B. and Lively, C. (2007). Advice of the rose: experimental
702 coevolution of a trematode parasite and its snail host. *Evolution*, 61:152-
703 159.

704 57. Koskella, B. (2014). Bacteria-phage interactions across time and space:
705 merging local adaptation and time-shift experiments to understand phage
706 evolution. *Am Nat*, 184:S9-S21

707

708

709 **Figure Legends**



710

711 **Figure 1**

712 Heat maps showing the level of transmission, β , of parasite strains, p , against
713 host strains, h , for our key infection functions: (a) Universal, (b) Range, (c)

714 Matching without costs and (d) Matching with costs. The key shows that red

715 indicates the highest transmission and blue the lowest transmission. Horizontal

716 slices through these plots, showing β as a function of h for particular values of p ,

717 can be found in figure S1 in the SI. The exact forms are: (a) $\beta(h, p) = hp + 0.5$,

718 (b) $\beta(h, p) = \beta_0(p)(1 - 1/(1 + \exp(3(p - h))))$ with $\beta_0(p) = 0.3 + 0.5(1 -$


719 $p)/(1 + 1.45p)$, (c) $\beta(h, p) = \exp(-(p - h)^2/0.25^2)$, (d) $\beta(h, p) =$

720 $\beta_0(p)(\exp(-(p - h)^2/(0.8p + 0.25)^2))$ with $\beta_0(p) = 15 - 12p/(1 + 0.85(p - 1))$.

721 We note that the explicit form of our trade-offs link maximum and minimum trait

722 values through a smooth, polynomial-like curve where the second-derivative has

723 constant sign (i.e. no inflections).




724

725 **Figure 2**

726 Output from numerical simulations showing the investment in host defence, h ,
727 and parasite infectivity, p , over evolutionary time using the three infections
728 functions from figure 1: (a) Universal, (b) Range, (c) Matching. Simulations were
729 conducted as described in the SI. In (a) $q = 0.1, b = 1, f = 0, \alpha_c = 5, \gamma = 0.1$, in
730 (b) $q = 0.2, b = 1, f = 0, \alpha = 9, \gamma = 0.001$ and in (c) $q = 0.1, b = 1, f = 0, \alpha = 9$
731 $\gamma = 0.1$. The parasite trade-off in (a) is $\alpha(p) = \alpha_c + 0.67 + 6.67p/(1 -$
732 $0.001(1 - p))$ and in (b) and (c) as given in figure 1. The host trade-offs are (a)
733 $a(h) = 7.77 + 4.51h/(1 + 0.04(1 - h))$, (b) $a(h) = 55 + 45(1 - h)/(1 + 0.13h)$,
734 (c) $a(h) = 30 - 20h/(1 + 0.2(h - 1))$. We note that these trade-offs are not
735 subject to the assumptions made when proving the existence of the Hopf
736 bifurcation in the SI (indeed if we chose trade-offs that satisfied those conditions,
737 we would not see cycles in the simulations).

738



739

740 **Figure 3**

741 Bifurcation diagrams for (top row) the universal and (bottom row) range models

742 showing the change in behavior at the singular point as we vary: (a), (c)

743 competition, q , and (b), (d) virulence, α , in terms of host investment, h . Solid

744 black lines denote convergence stable singular points, dashed black lines non-

745 convergence stable singular points (i.e. repellers) and solid gray lines the upper

746 and lower limits of a coevolutionary cycle. The red vertical dashed lines separate

747 regions of behavior as annotated along the bottom of the plots. The *Maximize* and

748 *Minimize* labels refer to the host's behaviour. In these regions the parasite either


749 displays the same behavior or reaches a CSS. Default parameter values are: $q =$

750 $0.1, b = 1, f = 0$ with (a) and (b) $\alpha_c = 5, \gamma = 0.1$, and (c) and (d) $\alpha = 9, \gamma =$

751 0.001 with the trade-offs as given in figures 1 and 2. Again, we note that these

752 trade-offs are not subject to the assumptions made when proving the existence
753 of the Hopf bifurcation

754



755

756 **Figure 4**

757 Plots showing the variance in the host trait over the final 20% of numerical
758 simulations, using the matching model for (a) competition, q , and (b) virulence,
759 α . A larger variance indicates larger cycles. Zero variance occurs where there is
760 parasite extinction. Parameter values are as of figure 2.

761