

This is a repository copy of *Experimental coevolution of species interactions*.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:

<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/id/eprint/77995/>

Version: Submitted Version

Article:

Brockhurst, Michael orcid.org/0000-0003-0362-820X and Koskella, Britt (2013)
Experimental coevolution of species interactions. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*. pp. 367-375. ISSN: 0169-5347

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2013.02.009>

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.

Experimental coevolution of species interactions

Michael A. Brockhurst¹ and Britt Koskella²

¹ Department of Biology, University of York, York, YO10 5DD, UK

² BioSciences, University of Exeter, Cornwall Campus, Tremough, TR10 9EZ, UK

Coevolution, the process of reciprocal adaptation and counter-adaptation between ecologically interacting species, affects almost all organisms and is considered a key force structuring biological diversity. Our understanding of the pattern and process of coevolution, particularly of antagonistic species interactions, has been hugely advanced in recent years by an upsurge in experimental studies that directly observe coevolution in the laboratory. These experiments pose new questions by revealing novel facets of the coevolutionary process not captured by current theory while also providing the first empirical tests of longstanding coevolutionary ideas, including the influential Red Queen hypothesis. We highlight emerging directions for this field, including experimental coevolution of mutualistic interactions and understanding how pairwise coevolutionary processes scale-up within species-rich communities.

Keywords: experimental evolution; coevolution; species interactions; host-parasite; mutualism

Published in Trends in Ecology and Evolution 28:367-375 doi: 10.1016/j.tree.2013.02.009

The rise of experimental coevolution

Naturalists have long recognised the importance of species interactions as a driving force of adaptation. Indeed, 19th-century evolutionary biologists often cited the conspicuous coadaptations of interspecific pollination and mimicry **mutualisms** as exemplars of evolution by natural selection. It is perhaps surprising then that coevolution, the process of reciprocal adaptation and counter adaptation by ecologically interacting species, was not studied in earnest until the mid-20th century. The first wave of empirical coevolution research was predominantly observational and field-based [1, 2]. Such studies inferred the action of reciprocal selection indirectly, typically from spatial patterns of trait co-variation between populations or by comparative and phylogenetic analyses of ecologically interacting clades. These early studies strongly suggested that coevolution was a central process driving natural selection and shaping the structure and function of communities, while never being able to provide unequivocal evidence of reciprocal evolutionary changes.

To overcome certain limitations of fieldwork - chiefly that the action of other sources of selection driving the observed patterns can never be ruled out - researchers have sought to bring the study of coevolution into the lab. Here, environments can be precisely controlled to exclude extraneous sources of selection, and the use of fast-growing organisms like microbes or classic lab-model animals, allows for the direct observation of coevolution in real time (Figure 1 & Box 1). Significantly, since many such experimental systems are amenable to cryogenic preservation, this allows experimenters to perform “**time-shifts**,” for instance, testing the performance of parasites against hosts from the evolutionary past or future (Figure 2). By analyzing these time-shifted interactions between coevolving species the temporal dynamics of coevolution can be directly estimated [3]. Moreover, while time-shifts

are possible in certain field systems [4], a crucial advantage of laboratory coevolution experiments is that control lineages, propagated under identical environmental conditions but where a given species is absent or where one species is held in **evolutionary stasis**, can also be established (Figure 1). Comparison of coevolving lineages against control lineages allows unequivocal identification of adaptations that evolved in response to reciprocal selection, i.e. those adaptations that are present only in coevolving lineages.

Coevolution experiments were first pioneered using simple microbial communities in the 1970s [5-7]. While these kinds of microbial associations remain the most intensively studied due to their ease of propagation, the experimental coevolution approach has recently been extended to a much wider range of species interactions involving more complex host organisms such as snails, beetles, bees and worms (Table 1). Moreover, whereas early studies largely focused on antagonisms, in part due to the intensity of reciprocal selection and rapid evolution generated by such interactions, today experimental coevolution researchers are studying other forms of species interaction, such as mutualisms. Experimental coevolution is providing causal tests of longstanding coevolutionary hypotheses, and also revealing novel facets of the coevolutionary process that are not captured or predicted by current theory. In this article we do not aim to provide an exhaustive account of experimental coevolution research but rather to review the key areas in which experimental coevolution has advanced our understanding of the coevolutionary process, identify the main gaps in our knowledge for future research, and highlight the ways in which coevolutionary research can be of applied importance.

Experimental coevolution of antagonistic species interactions

The tempo and mode of antagonistic coevolution

According to the **Red Queen hypothesis**, reciprocal selection arising from **interspecific antagonisms**, such as host-parasite interactions, should accelerate evolutionary rates through the need for continual adaptation and counter-adaptation [8, 9]. (The history of the use of the Red Queen metaphor is described in refs. [10, 11].) Recent tests of this prediction have compared evolutionary rates under coevolution against controls where coevolution is prevented, for example in the presence versus absence of an antagonist (Figure 1), and provide strong support for this hypothesis from a range of species interactions. When co-cultured, *Caenorhabditis elegans*, and a bacterial parasite, *Bacillus thuringiensis*, both exhibit greater molecular evolutionary change, assessed by microsatellites and gene content respectively, than do control populations of the nematode or bacterium propagated alone [12]. However, for parasite species in particular the complete removal of the host is an extreme environmental alteration, necessitating comparison of populations propagated *in vivo* with *in vitro* controls. A more subtle manipulation is to allow one antagonist to evolve while holding the other in evolutionary stasis, by regularly replacing its entire population with individuals of the ancestral genotype. By this approach, it has been demonstrated, using pooled whole-genome resequencing, that genomes of bacteriophage virus $\Phi 2$ coevolving with the bacterium *Pseudomonas fluorescens* evolve at double the rate of $\Phi 2$ populations evolving against a fixed, ancestral *P. fluorescens* genotype [13]. Similarly, whole genome analysis of *Escherichia coli* and the bacteriophage Q β revealed increased mutational change in coevolving, relative to evolving populations of both host and parasite [14]. These studies strongly support the Red Queen view of interspecific antagonisms as a strong driver of evolutionary change and, for the first time, have allowed for direct tests of causation rather than correlation.

The process of rapid reciprocal adaptation inherent to antagonistic coevolution can be driven by at least two contrasting modes of reciprocal selection. Specifically, frequency dependent selection, where changing allele frequencies in host and parasite populations are driven by parasite-mediated selection against common host resistance alleles; or directional selection, where recurrent selective sweeps of novel host resistance and parasite infectivity alleles occur through time, leading to increases in a parasite's **host range** and the subsequent host resistance traits. These possibilities have been termed **Fluctuating Selection Dynamics** (FSD) and **Arms Race Dynamics** (ARD), respectively [3, 15]. Distinguishing these dynamics requires either time-shifts to detect contrasting patterns of phenotypic evolution in host resistance and parasite infectivity traits (Figure 2), or alternatively, direct estimation of temporal change in the frequencies of resistance and infectivity alleles, or of linked genetic markers.

Experimental coevolution has revealed evidence for the operation of both of these modes of reciprocal selection. A response to frequency-dependent selection by parasites has been observed by tracking host genotypic markers in coevolving laboratory populations of the freshwater snail, *Potamopyrgus antipodarum*, infected by a sterilizing trematode parasite, *Microphallus sp.* [16]. However, several other studies reveal signatures of both FSD and ARD within the same coevolving population, suggesting that these contrasting modes of selection are not mutually exclusive. For example, genotypic data from *C. elegans* – *B. thuringiensis* coevolution experiments suggest that different host loci are under different modes of selection; perhaps reflecting that the infection/resistance process comprises multiple steps of interaction, each with independent genetic bases [12, 17, 18]. Furthermore, patterns of phenotypic and molecular evolution suggest that the interaction between *P. fluorescens* and $\Phi 2$,

while initially dominated by ARD, becomes increasingly FSD-like through time [19]. This appears to arise because, after a certain point, the costs to individual genotypes of accruing additional mutations that further increase the breadth of infectivity or resistance were unviable. The increasing costs act to prevent fixation of super-generalist genotypes and progressively weaken the response to directional selection over time. These findings suggest that, at least in part, the prevailing mode of reciprocal selection is determined by the coevolutionary history of an association and more long-term studies are required to resolve this. There is now a clear need for the development of coevolutionary theory targeted at resolving the impact of mixed modes of reciprocal selection on coevolutionary processes and at understanding the genetic and ecological factors driving switches in the prevailing mode of reciprocal selection.

Antagonistic coevolution and evolvability

The pressure for continual innovation during **antagonistic coevolution** can, in theory, select for mechanisms that increase **evolvability**, particularly in hosts, since they are often assumed to possess less evolutionary potential than their parasites [20]. Greater genetic diversity within a population increases the efficacy of selection and, notwithstanding immigration, can be achieved through increased rates of mutation or recombination. Studies across a range of species interactions strongly support the hypothesis that antagonistic coevolution selects for evolvability in hosts. The evolution of **hypermutable** *P. fluorescens* genotypes, with defective DNA proofreading enzymes, was found to occur at a higher frequency in populations coevolving with phage Φ 2 than those evolving alone [21]. Similarly, more spontaneous mutations were observed in *C. elegans* that had been coevolving with *B. thuringiensis* compared to parasite-free controls [12]. For sexual host populations,

recombination offers another potential escape from coevolving parasites. Populations of the flour beetle, *Tribolium castaneum*, coevolving with a microsporidian parasite, *Noseum whitei*, displayed higher rates of meiotic recombination than both parasite-free controls [22] and populations exposed to an insecticide [23]. Similarly, higher rates of outcrossing have been observed in populations of *C. elegans* coevolving against the bacterial parasite *Serratia marcescens* relative to populations where the bacterium was held in evolutionary stasis [24]. Moreover, the rate of host population extinction was higher in coevolving populations where *C. elegans* outcrossing was prevented compared to populations where outcrossing was possible. While host evolvability has been well studied, the effect of antagonistic coevolution on parasite evolvability has not been addressed and provides a fruitful avenue for future studies particularly in sexually recombining parasites.

Antagonistic coevolution as a driver of diversification and divergence

Antagonistic coevolution can lead to higher levels of within-population polymorphism through either the transient coexistence of contending alleles undergoing selective sweeps or the operation of negative frequency-dependent selection. Several bacteria-phage coevolution studies reveal antagonistic coevolution as a driver of phenotypic and genetic diversification in both bacteria and phage [13, 25, 26]. Similarly, populations of *T. castaneum* coevolving with *N. whitei* harbor significantly more allelic diversity than parasite-free control populations [27]. The intense selection associated with antagonistic coevolution can also drive divergence among populations, as each takes a subtly different coevolutionary trajectory. Experimentally coevolving populations of phage $\Phi 2$ undergo an almost 10 \times higher level of between-population genomic divergence, compared to populations evolving against an evolutionarily fixed bacterial population [13]. Correspondingly, phage-mediated selection lead to greatly

increased allopatric diversity (i.e., diversity among populations) among experimentally coevolved *P. fluorescens* populations [28].

Among-population divergence of parasite infectivity and host resistance traits can also be detected using local adaptation assays, whereby, for example, parasite performance is compared against their sympatric and allopatric host genotypes (Figure 2). These experiments reveal a wide range of local adaptation patterns across various species interactions including parasite local adaptation, host local adaptation or lack of local adaptation (Table 1). Crucially, however, these studies allow explicit tests of theoretical predictions on the effects of key ecological and life-history parameters on the evolution of local adaptation. For instance, several studies of bacteria-phage metapopulations have revealed that moderate parasite dispersal drives the evolution of parasite local adaptation [29-31] (for detailed reviews of the parasite local adaptation literature see refs. [32, 33]). Among-population divergence of coevolving species interactions can be further enhanced if there exists environmental heterogeneity among patches [34, 35]. For example, variation in productivity between populations drives the evolution of greater parasite local adaptation in populations of *P. fluorescens* and $\Phi 2$ [36]. Between-population divergence of traits at the coevolutionary interface, i.e., resistance and infectivity, can be accompanied by correlated divergence in other phenotypic traits, such as colony morphology and biofilm formation in bacteria coevolving with phages [28, 37, 38]. Moreover, recent evidence from experimental populations of *T. castaneum* and *N. whitei* suggest that between population divergence caused by antagonistic coevolution can even drive the correlated evolution of reproductive isolation, and therefore could play a role in speciation [39].

Specificity of antagonistic coevolutionary interactions

Key to our understanding of coevolutionary dynamics is the underlying genetic specificity of the interaction and the emergent patterns of interaction specificity. Experiments with bacteria and phage have revealed that coevolution can lead to a nested interaction structure [40, 41], such that hard to infect bacterial genotypes are infected by generalist but not specialist phage genotypes [42]. Moreover, coevolving bacteria phage populations can harbor, at any given time, a diverse mix of phenotypes, ranging from specialists to generalists [26, 40], which is dynamic and variable through time. Interestingly, coevolution itself appears to be crucial in shaping host-range of some phages. In $\Phi 2$, spontaneous host-range mutants selected to infect a novel host genotype evolved narrower host ranges than did phages with a history of coevolution against this host genotype [43]. Here, broad host ranges relied upon the accumulation of multiple adaptive mutations acquired through repeated rounds of selection for infectivity. Similarly, the evolution of particular resistant bacterial genotypes in coevolving populations of *E. coli* and λ were necessary for the subsequent evolution by phage of the ability to bind to a new host receptor, OmpF, which was found to require the stepwise accumulation of four adaptive mutations [44]. Both studies highlight the importance of historical contingency in determining the trajectory of coevolution.

In addition to the effects of limited mutational supply, the evolution of generalists can also be constrained by costs associated with resistance and infectivity mutations. Often such trade-offs are expected due to **antagonistic pleiotropy**. In the case of bacteria-phage coevolution, phages often bind to bacterial cell-surface proteins that perform important functions, such as nutrient uptake or motility, and mutations conferring resistance to phages typically impair these functions [45, 46]. In addition, evolved resistance against one phage

can often come at a cost of increased susceptibility to another; experimentally evolved *Prochlorococcus* hosts that were resistance to one phage genotype showed increased susceptibility to another phage genotype [47]. Correspondingly, mutations allowing host-range expansion in phages are also frequently associated with trade-offs, leading to impaired growth on the original host. For example, during experimental host range expansion of phage $\phi 6$, spontaneous mutants able to infect novel hosts were found to be less infective to their native hosts [48]. However, surprisingly few studies have attempted to explicitly determine how costs of multiple resistance and infectivity mutations accumulate and interact through time during experimental coevolution (although see [49]) and correspondingly how this shapes coevolutionary dynamics and trajectory [50].

Emerging directions in experimental coevolution

The major contributions of experimental coevolution thus far have been to provide direct evidence of the tempo and mode of antagonistic coevolutionary dynamics, the role of antagonistic coevolution in increasing diversity within and among populations, including the role of parasitism in maintaining sexual recombination, and the structure of specificity in coevolving antagonistic interactions. But as the field matures it is taking some exciting new directions; in what follows, we outline several promising emerging research directions.

Experimental coevolution in ‘real-world’ environments

While an original motivation behind laboratory coevolution experiments was to exclude the confounding selection pressures of complex natural environments, there is currently a shift towards performing experiments in more naturalistic ‘real world’ environments. Such studies are valuable, particularly when performed using well-studied species associations, as they

239 reveal ecological constraints on coevolution imposed by natural environments. Moreover,
240 such studies can guide analysis of natural communities. Zbinden and coauthors (2008)
241 infected populations of *Daphnia magna* with the microsporidian parasite *Octospora bayeri* under
242 natural conditions in field mesocosms to examine the evolution of host resistance and
243 associated life-history changes and demonstrated rapid evolution with some associated costs
244 of evolved resistance [51]. Gomez & Buckling [52] have performed experimental
245 coevolution of *P. fluorescens* and $\Phi 2$ in soil microcosms, where in contrast to previous lab
246 studies in rich liquid media, the coevolutionary dynamics follow FSD rather than ARD
247 during the early stage of coevolution. This is likely to have been caused by much higher costs
248 of resistance mutations in soil compared to liquid media thereby weakening the response of
249 bacteria to directional selection.

251 *Experimental coevolution of other forms of species interaction*

252 Several researchers have begun to apply the experimental coevolution approach to study
253 other forms of species interaction beyond antagonisms; in particular, mutualisms. This is an
254 important step because such interactions are widespread in nature and, while antagonistic
255 coevolution can promote diversification, theory suggests that those species interactions in
256 which there is no cost to **phenotypic matching** (e.g. mutualistic interactions) may actually
257 hinder diversification [53]. Hillesland et al. (2009) have demonstrated the rapid evolution of
258 trait complementarity in an experimentally imposed obligate **syntrophic mutualism** [54].
259 They co-cultured a sulphate reducing bacterium, *Desulfovibrio vulgaris*, and a methanogenic
260 archaeon, *Methanococcus maripaludis*, on lactate, where the two players had to collaborate to
261 perform an energy yielding reaction. Communities initially underwent large population
262 density fluctuations, but stabilized after around 300 generations. These coevolved

communities had faster growth rates and higher yields than ancestral communities. Time-shifted pairings confirmed that adaptations in each species contributed to community-level improvements in growth rate and yield. This study highlights the utility of experimental coevolution for understanding species interactions in general, and beyond antagonistic interactions, and furthermore demonstrates the need for more studies of mutualistic species interactions.

Coevolution of complex communities

While most experimental coevolution has employed pairs of species, species interaction networks in nature are often complex. Scaling experimental coevolution studies up to the community level is a key next step. A study of *P. syringae* coevolving with multiple phages found that bacterial hosts are able to evolve resistance against multiple phages simultaneously, but that they pay a higher cost for these multiple resistances when grown in the absence of phage [55]. Addition of a protist predator, *Tetrahymena thermophila*, to coevolving populations of *P. fluorescens* and $\Phi 2$ impeded ARD coevolution between the bacteria and phage, and favoured the maintenance of coexisting resistance phenotypes specialized against one or other of these natural enemies [56]. Generalist bacterial resistance presumably did not evolve in these communities due to the existence of fitness trade-offs associated with multiple resistances. Networks of species interactions can also shape the evolution and stability of the community as a whole. Experimental communities of naturally co-occurring bacteria collected from holes in beech trees found that the interactions among these species were key to their ability to adapt to novel environments in the laboratory [57]. These species, when propagated in communities, evolved more over 70 generations than when grown in monoculture, and adapted to fill different niches, for example to utilize the

waste products generated from another species within the community. Indeed, **interspecific facilitation** was a common outcome of coevolution in these competitive communities. Future work will certainly allow great insight to the assembly, structure, function, and dynamics of communities.

Cophylogeny and cospeciation

Early work on coevolution utilized macroevolutionary patterns to infer microevolutionary processes (e.g. [58]), for example by comparing phylogenies of species pairs to look for cospeciation. However, while frequently cited as evidence for coevolution it cannot be ruled out that the same biogeographical or ecological process that drove speciation among one species was responsible, independently, for speciation of the other [59]. Similarly, divergence among lineages of one species might lead to subsequent divergence in the other (i.e., concordant phylogeny) but may also lead to the evolution of more generalist interaction networks or “escape” of one player if the new lineage no longer interacts with the other player [60]. Although there exists theory predicting when diversification of one species might lead to diversification of the other (e.g., [61]), there is little data testing the validity of these predictions. Combining experimental coevolution with phylogenetic methods has great potential to reveal the underlying dynamics that lead both to codiversification and the breakdown of **cophylogeny** patterns [62]. Towards this goal, several experimental evolution studies have created known phylogenies through population splitting and then attempted to infer their structure from genome sequences of viruses at the nodes. Experiments with bacteriophages Φ X174 and phi-6 have demonstrated that the high degree of convergent evolution and reversions made phylogenetic reconstruction incapable of accurately explaining the evolutionary history of the phage [63, 64]. By revealing whether convergence

is a general phenomenon of viral evolution, further studies could inform use of molecular epidemiology in tracking viral outbreaks. More generally, long-term experimental coevolution holds great promise in testing whether codivergence and/or cospeciation among interacting species is the exception or the rule.

Concluding remarks and potential for application

Overall, experimental evolution has afforded remarkable strides forward in our understanding of population-level responses to selection, the underlying genetics of adaptation, and the limits of evolution [65]. Although still in its infancy, experimental coevolution has great potential for informing our understanding of community stability, species invasions, and the spread of disease, and as such holds promise in more applied fields, most notably human health. Experimental coevolution techniques have already been successfully applied to understand the evolution of human parasites: Webster et al. (2007) found that experimental coevolution of the human parasite, *Schistosoma mansoni*, with different genotypes of the intermediate host snail, *Biomphalaria glabrata*, led to rapid adaptation to the snails but also altered infectivity on the definitive host [66]. Furthermore, it is now abundantly clear that our own microbiota determine key aspects of our physical and mental health, and experimental coevolution could play a critical part in testing how these microbial communities evolve and change over time, both as a function of microbe-microbe interactions and of host-microbe interactions [67]. The efficacy and long-term implications of **phage therapy** for controlling bacterial pathogens and the use of probiotics for promoting healthy gut flora is also ripe for experimental coevolution testing, and good headway is already being made using experimental evolution of bacteria in response to phages [55, 68-70] and to test evolution of bacteria in the gut [71]. Expanding this research

to explore the coevolutionary implications of these treatments is a clear next step and experimental coevolution could be fruitfully employed to select for stable microbial consortia with desirable traits for use in probiotics.

Acknowledgements

We are grateful to the reviewers for constructive comments on a previous version of this manuscript. This work was supported by a project grant (NE/H005080/1) to MAB and a research fellowship (R16150) to BK from the Natural Environment Research Council (UK).

Cited literature

- 1 Janzen, D.H. (1966) Coevolution of Mutualism between Ants and Acacias in Central America. *Evolution* 20, 249-&
- 2 Ehrlich, P.R. and Raven, P.H. (1964) Butterflies and Plants - a Study in Coevolution. *Evolution* 18, 586-608
- 3 Gaba, S. and Ebert, D. (2009) Time-shift experiments as a tool to study antagonistic coevolution. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* 24, 226-232
- 4 Decaestecker, E., *et al.* (2007) Host-parasite 'Red Queen' dynamics archived in pond sediment. *Nature* 450, 870-U816
- 5 Horne, M.T. (1970) Coevolution of Escherichia-Coli and Bacteriophages in Chemostat Culture. *Science* 168, 992-&
- 6 Cowlshaw, J. and Mersa, M. (1975) Co-Evolution of a Virus-Alga System. *Appl Microbiol* 29, 234-239
- 7 Chao, L., *et al.* (1977) Complex Community in a Simple Habitat - Experimental-Study with Bacteria and Phage. *Ecology* 58, 369-378

359 8 Van Valen, L. (1973) A new evolutionary law. *Evol. Theory* 1, 1-30

360 9 Bell, G. (1982) *The Masterpiece of Nature: The Evolution and Genetics of Sexuality*. University of
361 California Press

362 10 Wilkinson, D.M. (2000) Running with the Red Queen: reflections on 'Sex versus non-sex
363 versus parasite'. *Oikos* 91, 589-596

364 11 Brockhurst, M.A. (2011) Sex, Death and the Red Queen. *Science* 333, 166-167

365 12 Schulte, R.D., *et al.* (2010) Multiple reciprocal adaptations and rapid genetic change upon
366 experimental coevolution of an animal host and its microbial parasite. *P Natl Acad Sci USA*
367 107, 7359-7364

368 13 Paterson, S., *et al.* (2010) Antagonistic coevolution accelerates molecular evolution. *Nature*
369 464, 275-278

370 14 Kashiwagi, A. and Yomo, T. (2011) Ongoing Phenotypic and Genomic Changes in
371 Experimental Coevolution of RNA Bacteriophage Q β and Escherichia coli. *PLoS Genet.*

372 15 Gandon, S., *et al.* (2008) Host-parasite coevolution and patterns of adaptation across time
373 and space. *J Evolution Biol* 21, 1861-1866

374 16 Koskella, B. and Lively, C.M. (2009) Evidence for Negative Frequency-Dependent
375 Selection During Experimental Coevolution of a Freshwater Snail and a Sterilizing
376 Trematode. *Evolution* 63, 2213-2221

377 17 Fenton, A., *et al.* (2012) Two-step infection processes can lead to coevolution between
378 functionally independent infection and resistance pathways. *Evolution* 66, 2030-2041

379 18 Agrawal, A.F. and Lively, C.M. (2003) Modelling infection as a two-step process
380 combining gene-for-gene and matching-allele genetics. *P Roy Soc Lond B Bio* 270, 323-334

381 19 Hall, A.R., *et al.* (2011) Host-parasite coevolutionary arms races give way to fluctuating
382 selection. *Ecol. Lett.* 14, 635-642

383 20 Gandon, S. (2002) Local adaptation and the geometry of host-parasite coevolution. *Ecol.*
384 *Lett.* 5, 246-256

385 21 Pal, C., *et al.* (2007) Coevolution with viruses drives the evolution of bacterial mutation
386 rates. *Nature* 450, 1079-1081

387 22 Kerstes, N., *et al.* (2012) Antagonistic experimental coevolution with a parasite increases
388 host recombination frequency. *BMC Evol. Biol.* 12, 18

389 23 Greeff, M. and Schmid-Hempel, P. (2010) Influence of co-evolution with a parasite,
390 *Nosema whitei*, and population size on recombination rates and fitness in the red flour
391 beetle, *Tribolium castaneum*. *Genetica* 138, 737-744

392 24 Morran, L.T., *et al.* (2011) Running with the Red Queen: Host-Parasite Coevolution
393 Selects for Biparental Sex. *Science* 333, 216-218

394 25 Forde, S.E., *et al.* (2008) Coevolution drives temporal changes in fitness and diversity
395 across environments in a bacteria-bacteriophage interaction. *Evolution* 62, 1830-1839

396 26 Marston, M.F., *et al.* (2012) Rapid diversification of coevolving marine *Synechococcus*
397 and a virus. *P Natl Acad Sci USA* 109, 4544-4549

398 27 Bérénos, C., *et al.* (2011) Antagonistic coevolution with parasites maintains host genetic
399 diversity: an experimental test. *Proc. R. Soc. Lond. B Biol. Sci.* 278, 218-224

400 28 Buckling, A. and Rainey, P.B. (2002) The role of parasites in sympatric and allopatric host
401 diversification. *Nature* 420, 496-499

402 29 Morgan, A.D., *et al.* (2005) The effect of migration on local adaptation in a coevolving
403 host-parasite system. *Nature* 437, 253-256

404 30 Forde, S.E., *et al.* (2004) Adaptation varies through space and time in a coevolving host-
405 parasitoid interaction. *Nature* 431, 841-844

406 31 Vogwill, T., *et al.* (2010) How does spatial dispersal network affect the evolution of

407 parasite local adaptation? *Evolution; international journal of organic evolution* 64, 1795-1801
 408 32 Hoeksema, J.D. and Forde, S.E. (2008) A meta-analysis of factors affecting local
 409 adaptation between interacting species. *Am Nat* 171, 275-290
 410 33 Greischar, M.A. and Koskella, B. (2007) A synthesis of experimental work on parasite
 411 local adaptation. *Ecol Lett* 10, 418-434
 412 34 Thompson, J.N. (1994) *The Coevolutionary Process*. University of Chicago Press
 413 35 Thompson, J.N. (2005) *The geographic mosaic of coevolution*. University of Chicago Press
 414 36 Lopez Pascua, L., *et al.* (2012) Abiotic heterogeneity drives parasite local adaptation in
 415 coevolving bacteria and phages. *J. Evol. Biol.* 25, 187-195
 416 37 Brockhurst, M.A., *et al.* (2004) The effect of spatial heterogeneity and parasites on the
 417 evolution of host diversity. *P Roy Soc Lond B Bio* 271, 107-111
 418 38 Vogwill, T., *et al.* (2011) Coevolving parasites enhance the diversity-decreasing effect of
 419 dispersal. *Biol Letters* 7, 578-580
 420 39 Bérénos, C., *et al.* (2012) Antagonistic coevolution accelerates the evolution of
 421 reproductive isolation in *Tribolium castaneum*. *Am Nat* 180, 520-528
 422 40 Poullain, V., *et al.* (2008) The evolution of specificity in evolving and coevolving
 423 antagonistic interactions between a bacteria and its phage. *Evolution; international journal of*
 424 *organic evolution* 62, 1-11
 425 41 Scanlan, P.D., *et al.* (2011) Genetic basis of infectivity evolution in a bacteriophage. *Mol*
 426 *Ecol* 20, 981-989
 427 42 Flores, C.O., *et al.* (2011) Statistical structure of host-phage interactions. *P Natl Acad Sci*
 428 *USA* 108, E288-E297
 429 43 Hall, A.R., *et al.* (2011) Bacteria-Phage Coevolution and the Emergence of Generalist
 430 Pathogens. *Am Nat* 177, 44-53

431 44 Meyer, J.R., *et al.* (2012) Repeatability and Contingency in the Evolution of a Key
432 Innovation in Phage Lambda. *Science* 335, 428-432

433 45 Bohannan, B.J.M., *et al.* (1999) Epistatic interactions can lower the cost of resistance to
434 multiple consumers. *Evolution* 53, 292-295

435 46 Brockhurst, M.A., *et al.* (2005) The effect of a bacteriophage on diversification of the
436 opportunistic bacterial pathogen, *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*. *P R Soc B* 272, 1385-1391

437 47 Avrani, S., *et al.* (2012) Virus-host swinging party in the oceans: Incorporating biological
438 complexity into paradigms of antagonistic coexistence. *Mobile Genetic Elements* 2, 88-95

439 48 Duffy, S., *et al.* (2006) Pleiotropic costs of niche expansion in the RNA bacteriophage $\Phi 6$.
440 *Genetics* 172, 751-757

441 49 Buckling, A., *et al.* (2006) Antagonistic coevolution with parasites increases the cost of
442 host deleterious mutations. *P R Soc B* 273, 45-49

443 50 Fenton, A. and Brockhurst, M.A. (2007) Epistatic Interactions Alter Dynamics of
444 Multilocus Gene-for-Gene Coevolution. *Plos One* 2, -

445 51 Zbinden, M., *et al.* (2008) Experimental evolution of field populations of *Daphnia magna*
446 in response to parasite treatment. *J. Evol. Biol.* 21, 1068 - 1078

447 52 Gomez, P. and Buckling, A. (2011) Bacteria-Phage Antagonistic Coevolution in Soil.
448 *Science* 332, 106-109

449 53 Jeremy B. Yoder and Scott L. Nuismer (2010) When Does Coevolution Promote
450 Diversification? *Am Nat* 176, 802-817

451 54 Hillesland, K.L. and Stahl, D.A. (2010) Rapid evolution of stability and productivity at the
452 origin of a microbial mutualism. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 107, 2124-2129

453 55 Koskella, B., *et al.* (2012) The costs of evolving resistance in heterogeneous parasite
454 environments. *Proc. R. Soc. Lond. B Biol. Sci.* 279, 1896-1903

455 56 Friman, V.P. and Buckling, A. (2012) Effects of predation on real-time host-parasite
456 coevolutionary dynamics. *Ecol Lett*

457 57 Lawrence, D., *et al.* (2012) Species Interactions Alter Evolutionary Responses to a Novel
458 Environment. *PLoS Biol* 10, e1001330

459 58 Dougherty, E.C. (1949) The phylogeny of the nematode family Metastrongylidae Leiper,
460 [1909]: a correlation of host and symbiote evolution. *Parasitology* 39, 222-234

461 59 Weber, M.G. and Agrawal, A.A. (2012) Phylogeny, ecology, and the coupling of
462 comparative and experimental approaches. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution* 27, 394-403

463 60 Thompson, J.N. (2005) *The Geographic Mosaic of Coevolution*. The University of Chicago
464 Press

465 61 Best, A., *et al.* (2010) The Evolution of Host-Parasite Range. *Am Nat* 176, 63-71

466 62 Weber, M.G. and Agrawal, A.A. (2012) Phylogeny, ecology, and the coupling of
467 comparative and experimental approaches. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution* 27, 394-403

468 63 Bull, J.J., *et al.* (1997) Exceptional Convergent Evolution in a Virus. *Genetics* 147, 1497-
469 1507

470 64 Turner, P.E., *et al.* (2012) Evolutionary genomics of host-use in bifurcating demes of
471 RNA virus phi-6. *Bmc Evol Biol* 12, 153

472 65 Buckling, A., *et al.* (2009) The Beagle in a bottle. *Nature* 457, 824-829

473 66 Webster, J., *et al.* (2007) Is host-schistosome coevolution going anywhere? *BMC Evol. Biol.*
474 7, 91

475 67 Van den Abbeele, P., *et al.* (2011) The host selects mucosal and luminal associations of
476 coevolved gut microorganisms: a novel concept. *FEMS Microbiol. Rev.* 35, 681-704

477 68 O'Flynn, G., *et al.* (2004) Evaluation of a Cocktail of Three Bacteriophages for Biocontrol
478 of Escherichia coli O157:H7. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* 70, 3417-3424

479 69 Hall, A.R., *et al.* (2012) Effects of Sequential and Simultaneous Applications of
 480 Bacteriophages on Populations of *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* In Vitro and in Wax Moth
 481 Larvae. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* 78, 5646-5652
 482 70 Barbas, A.S., *et al.* (2009) Altering and Assessing Persistence of Genetically Modified *E.*
 483 *coli* MG1655 in the Large Bowel. *Exp. Biol. Med.* 234, 1174-1185
 484 71 Lee, S.M., *et al.* (2010) Adaptation in a Mouse Colony Monoassociated with *Escherichia*
 485 *coli* K-12 for More than 1,000 Days. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* 76, 4655-4663
 486 72 Janzen, D.H. (1980) When is it coevolution? *Evolution* 34, 611-612
 487 73 Blanquart, F. and Gandon, S. (2013) Time-shift experiments and patterns of adaptation
 488 across time and space. *Ecol Lett* 16, 31-38
 489 74 Schulte, R.D., *et al.* (2011) Host–parasite local adaptation after experimental coevolution
 490 of *Caenorhabditis elegans* and its microparasite *Bacillus thuringiensis*. *Proc. R. Soc. Lond. B*
 491 *Biol. Sci.* 278, 2832-2839
 492 75 Morran, L.T., *et al.* (2012) TEMPORAL DYNAMICS OF OUTCROSSING AND
 493 HOST MORTALITY RATES IN HOST–PATHOGEN EXPERIMENTAL
 494 COEVOLUTION. *Evolution*, no-no
 495 76 Koskella, B. and Lively, C.M. (2007) Advice of the rose: Experimental coevolution of a
 496 trematode parasite and its snail host. *Evolution* 61, 152-159
 497 77 Béréños, C., *et al.* (2009) Evolution of host resistance and trade-offs between virulence
 498 and transmission potential in an obligately killing parasite. *J. Evol. Biol.* 22, 2049-2056
 499 78 Webster, J.P. and Woolhouse, M.E.J. (1998) Selection and Strain Specificity of
 500 Compatibility between Snail Intermediate Hosts and Their Parasitic Schistosomes. *Evolution*
 501 52, 1627-1634
 502 79 Lohse, K., *et al.* (2006) Experimental evolution of resistance in *Paramecium caudatum* against

the bacterial parasite *Holospira undulate* *Evolution* 60, 1177-1186

80 Buckling, A. and Rainey, P.B. (2002) Antagonistic coevolution between a bacterium and a
bacteriophage. *Proc. R. Soc. Lond. B Biol. Sci.* 269, 931-936

81 Brockhurst, M.A., *et al.* (2003) Population mixing accelerates coevolution. *Ecol. Lett.* 6,
975-979

82 Brockhurst, M., Buckling, A, Rainey, PB (2006) Spatial heterogeneity and the stability of
host-parasite coexistence. *J. Evol. Biol.* 19, 374-379

83 Kashiwagi, A. and Yomo, T. (2011) Ongoing Phenotypic and Genomic Changes in
Experimental Coevolution of RNA Bacteriophage Q β and Escherichia coli. *PLoS Genet.* 7,
e1002188

84 Bohannan, B. and Lenski, R. (1997) Effect of resource enrichment on a chemostat
community of bacteria and bacteriophage. *Ecology* 78, 2303-2315

85 Mizoguchi, K., *et al.* (2003) Coevolution of bacteriophage PP01 and Escherichia coli
O157: H7 in continuous culture. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* 69, 170-176

86 Marston, M.F., *et al.* (2012) Rapid diversification of coevolving marine Synechococcus
and a virus. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 109, 4544-4549

87 Friman, V.-P. and Laakso, J. (2011) Pulsed-Resource Dynamics Constrain the Evolution
of Predator-Prey Interactions. *Am Nat* 177, 334-345

88 Friman, V.P., *et al.* (2008) Availability of prey resources drives evolution of predator-prey
interaction. *Proc. R. Soc. Lond. B Biol. Sci.* 275, 1625-1633

Box 1. When is it experimental coevolution?

In a classic article, Janzen defined the term coevolution [72], which at the time had become broadly and imprecisely applied by researchers of species interactions. Janzen stressed the requirement for the demonstration of adaptations in both species arising from reciprocal selection before a pattern should be attributed to coevolution. This definition of coevolution based on evolutionary outcomes is valuable for distinguishing coevolved adaptations but is not useful for defining an experimental approach to the study of coevolution. We propose that the term “experimental coevolution” should be applied to experiments where either: (a.) interacting species are co-cultured *and* experimenters attempt to quantify evolutionary responses in both (or all if >2) interacting species; or (b.) interacting species are co-cultured *and* evolutionary responses of populations from coevolving treatments are compared to evolutionary responses of populations from control treatments where coevolution is prevented.

One of the most powerful aspects of experimental coevolution is that control treatments can be used to tease apart evolutionary change, based on adaptation to the abiotic environment and/or drift, from coevolutionary change. The exact approach depends on the system being used and the question being addressed, but one option is to compare the evolution of each species alone with the coevolution of the two. This approach can be used to tease apart selection imposed by abiotic versus biotic factors, for example by specifically identifying the responses to parasite-mediated selection. However, to specifically tease apart evolution in response to a biotic agent of selection from coevolutionary change requires the introduction of a “one-sided evolution” treatment, where one of the partners is held in evolutionary stasis while the other is allowed to evolve. This one-sided evolution treatment can be directly compared to the coevolution treatment to determine which evolutionary

changes are the result of an evolutionary response to the biotic agent versus a result of
coevolutionary interactions.

As experimental (co)evolution proceeds, fitness of the (co)evolving populations can
be measured over time to determine, for example, whether parasites become more or less
prudent on their hosts and whether hosts evolve towards complete resistance. In coevolving
populations, fitness can be measured both on the ancestral antagonist populations, allowing
for observation of absolute changes in population fitness, and on the coevolved antagonist.
As illustrated in figure 1, this latter relative fitness might not change over time, as the other
species is responding to any adaptations and countering. Finally, for many experimental
evolution systems, populations from each time point can be frozen and later resurrected to
perform time shifts in which the fitness of one species can be tested on populations of the
other from the past (i.e. populations which have not yet responded to any new adaptations),
the same time point, or from the future (i.e. populations that have potentially already
responded to any new adaptations). Note however, that for frequency-dependent selection,
populations may be unfit on past populations of the antagonist if, for example, they have
moved on to infect/resist common types in the contemporary antagonist populations.

Glossary of terms

Antagonistic coevolution/Interspecific antagonism: Coevolution is the reciprocal adaptation and counter adaptation of species that interact ecologically. When the fitnesses of the two species are negatively correlated, such that an adaptation that increases fitness in one species decreases in fitness of the other species and *vice versa*, these species interactions are termed antagonistic.

Antagonistic pleiotropy: A situation where one gene underlies more than one trait, and where an adaptation that is advantageous in one biotic or abiotic environment is deleterious in another.

Arms Race Dynamics (ARD): A mode of antagonistic coevolution driven by directional selection whereby hosts and parasites respectively accumulate resistance or infectivity alleles through a series of recurrent selective sweeps. This process leads, through time, to an increase in the range of parasite genotypes hosts can resist and an increase in the range of host genotypes that parasites can infect.

Cophylogeny: An approach by which the macroevolutionary histories of two clades are compared, for example to determine whether evolutionary branching of one species is correlated with branching in another.

Evolutionary stasis: This occurs when a population remains genetically constant over time. This can be manipulated during experimental coevolution by continually replacing the population of one of the two partners with the ancestral genotype in order to prevent evolution in this species.

Evolvability: The ability of a population to generate genetic diversity thereby allowing it to respond to selection.

Host-range: The subset of hosts that a parasite can successfully infect. Note that the known

host range for a given parasite is necessarily determined by the reference panel against which it has been tested and that parasite performance can vary within a given host range, such that the parasite performs better on some hosts than others.

Fluctuating Selection Dynamics: A mode of antagonistic coevolution driven by negative-frequency dependent selection whereby parasites evolve to infect common host genotypes, thereby favouring rare host alleles, which subsequently become common, leading to sustained oscillations in host and parasite allele frequencies. FSD does not lead to the evolution of broader parasite host ranges or increasing host resistance through time.

Hypermutable: Strains of bacteria with mutation rates far in excess of the wild-type; these typically arise through mutations altering mismatch repair enzymes.

Interspecific facilitation: A scenario whereby one species enhances the fitness or growth of another either directly, for example by increasing the availability of nutrients, or indirectly, for example by reducing competition or predation. Facilitatory interactions can benefit either one or both participants, and in the latter case are considered to be interspecific **mutualisms**.

Mutualisms: Mutually beneficial species interactions, which in reality are often mutually exploitative interactions but where net benefits accrue to both parties.

Phage therapy: The use of bacteriophage viruses to control the growth and/or harmfulness of pathogenic bacteria.

Phenotypic matching: The clustering of or correlation between traits governing a coevolutionary interaction, such that the common phenotype in the local populations of one partner is matched by the reciprocal trait in the other.

Red Queen hypothesis: The idea that, for antagonistic species interactions, the relative fitness of each antagonist does not increase over time, despite continual adaptation, due to the counteracting adaptations of their opponent. This hypothesis was later formalized to

617 describe the potential role of coevolving parasites in generating an advantage for sexual
618 recombination.

619 Syntrophic mutualism: A form of microbial mutualism where the transfer of metabolites
620 between species is essential for growth.

621 Time-shift experiment: Studies in which samples of coevolving populations are collected
622 through time (either artificially by cryogenic freezing, or naturally by the deposition of resting
623 stages) and then resurrected to challenge against coevolving partners from past,
624 contemporary and future time-points.

625

Table and Figure Legends:

Table 1. The experimental systems of antagonistic experimental coevolution.

Examples of study systems used and approaches taken using experimental coevolution so far. Although this list is not exhaustive, it is representative of the types of systems for which this approach has proven successful due, in part, to ease of use in the laboratory, short generation times (although note exceptions below), cryogenic preservation and large population sizes. Broadening the taxonomic range of study systems employed in experimental coevolution is an important future challenge to explore the generality of the patterns observed thus far. Moreover, it is clear that even for existing study systems there is work to be done in terms of employing the full range of assays available (i.e., both time-shift and local adaptation assays) and in terms of simultaneously analyzing the evolution of both victim and exploiter species.

Figure 1. The experimental designs of experimental coevolution.

A simplified illustration of experimental coevolution of host and parasite, where one can compare single species evolution (controlling for both adaptation to lab conditions and drift), one-sided experimental evolution (*i.e.*, one species evolving in response to another which is unable to respond) and experimental coevolution, where it is possible to directly measure evolutionary change of one species in response to the other and any reciprocal adaptations that occur. Line graphs represent one scenario of evolutionary change in parasite populations (top) or host populations (bottom) over the course of the experiment. In the case of a parasite or host evolving alone, adaptation to the lab environment and/or drift could result in increased success against the host/parasite, decreased success against the host/parasite, or no change in fitness.

Figure 2. Approaches to quantifying reciprocal adaptation.

An illustrative example of techniques used to compare coevolution of two species (in this case, host and parasite) by examining changes in replicate experimental populations (or metapopulations, if connected by gene flow). A time shift experiment (a) can be performed across experimental time within each population by comparing the fitness of one player against the other from past, contemporary or future time points. This method can give unique insight into the coevolutionary dynamic underlying the change. For example, a scenario in which fitness is lowest against populations from the future and highest against those from the past might indicate arms race dynamics with directional selection whereas a pattern of peak fitness against contemporary populations or those from only the recent past is more in line with negative frequency dependent selection. However, note that the exact pattern will depend on the lag in evolutionary response of one player against the other [73].

664 A local adaptation experiment (b) compares performance of parasites against their sympatric
665 hosts with their performance against allopatric hosts; higher parasite performance against
666 sympatric versus allopatric hosts indicates that parasites are locally adapted.
667

Model system	Control treatment	Time shift	Local adaptation	Victim change?	Exploiter change?	Reference
Invertebrate victim						
<i>C. elegans</i> - <i>B. thuringiensis</i>	Single species	•	✓	✓	✓	[12, 74]12, 73]
<i>C. elegans</i> - <i>S. marcescens</i>	Evolution	•	•	✓	✓	[75]
<i>P. antipodarum</i> - <i>Microphallus</i> sp.	Single species	•	✓	✓	✓	[[16, 76]
<i>T. castaneum</i> - <i>Noseum whitei</i>	Single species	✓	•	✓	✓	[[22, 27, 77]
<i>B. glabrata</i> - <i>S. mansoni</i>	Single species	•	✓	✓	✓	[[66, 78]
<i>D. Magna</i> - <i>O. bayeri</i>	Single species	•	•	✓	•	[51]
Protist victim						
<i>P. caudatum</i> - <i>H. undulata</i>	Single species	•	✓	✓	x	[79]
Bacterial victim						
<i>P. fluorescens</i> - phage Φ2	Evolution	✓	✓	✓	✓	[[40, 80, 81]
<i>P. aeruginosa</i> - phage PP7	None	✓	•	✓	x	[82]
<i>E. coli</i> - phage Qβ	Evolution	•	•	✓	✓	[83]
<i>E. coli</i> - phage T7	None	•	✓	✓	✓	[30]
<i>E. coli</i> - phage T4	Single species	•	•	✓	•	[84]
<i>E. coli</i> - phage PP01	None	•	•	✓	✓	[85]
<i>Synechococcus</i> sp. - phage RIM8	Single species	•	•	✓	✓	[86]
<i>S. marcescens</i> - <i>T. thermophila</i>	Single species	•	•	✓	x	[[87, 88]

668

669 Table 1




Figure 1




Figure 2