

1 ***On the cause and consequences of coinfection:***

2 **A general mechanistic framework of within-host parasite competition**

3
4 Ashwini Ramesh^{1,2*} and Spencer R Hall²

5 ¹Department of Integrative Biology; Department of Molecular & Microbial Genetics, Michigan State
6 University, East Lansing, USA – 48823

7 ²Department of Biology, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana, USA – 47405

8
9 *Corresponding author email: rameshas@msu.edu

10 Co-author email: sprhall@iu.edu

11
12 **Competing Interest:** Authors declare no competing interests

13 **Short title:** On the cause and consequences of coinfection

14 **Key words:** competition, coinfection, priority effects, founder control, nutrient supply, host health,
15 nutritional immunity, infectious disease

16 **Type:** Synthesis; review; framework; mathematical modelling; infectious disease; public health

17 **Number of words in abstract:** 200

18 **Number of words in main text:** 7154

19 **Number of references:** 54

20 **Number of figures, and tables:** 9 figures and 1 table

21
22
23
24
25
26
NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

27

28 **ABSTRACT**

29 Coinfections pose serious threats to health and exacerbate parasite burden. If coinfection is
30 detrimental, then what within-host factors facilitate it? Equally importantly, what hinders it, say via
31 exclusion or priority effects? Such interactions ought to stem from their within-host environment ('niche'),
32 i.e., resources that parasites steal from hosts and immune cells that kill them. Yet, despite two decades of
33 empirical focus on within-host infection dynamics, we lack a mechanistic framework to understand why
34 coinfection arises and the diverse range of its' consequences. Hence, we construct a trait-based niche
35 framework, one that illustrates general principles that govern parasite competition for a resource and
36 apparent competition for immune cells. We show that coinfection requires a competition-resistance tradeoff
37 and that each parasite most impacts the niche factor to which it is most sensitive. These predictions then
38 provide mechanistic interpretation for infection outcomes seen in a variety of extant experiments: Why does
39 nutrient supplementation shift relative frequencies of coinfecting parasites? When and how does sequence
40 of parasite invasion allow only early invading parasites to win? How does intrinsic variation in immune
41 response shape coinfection burden? Together, this mechanistic framework of parasite competition offers
42 new perspectives to better predict within-host infection dynamics and improve individual health.

43

44

45 INTRODUCTION

46 Coinfections pose a serious threat to health both at the individual and population scale for hosts.
47 Broadly, coinfection is the successful concurrent infestation of a host with two or more parasite species.
48 Coinfection worsens human health (76% of 2000 publications in a meta-analysis) and exacerbates infection
49 burden (57%; Griffiths *et al* 2011). For instance, bacterial co-infections cause two-fold increase in mortality
50 in COVID patients (Shah *et al* 2023). Similarly, coinfecting helminth species increased the odds of anaemia
51 five-to-eight-fold among children (Ezeamama *et al* 2005). Coinfection at the individual scale can also
52 influence population-scale disease dynamics (Ezenwa & Jolles 2011). Populations having higher frequency
53 of coinfection experience larger epidemics than those with epidemics of one parasite (Susi *et al* 2015). Yet,
54 despite virulent costs, coinfections are pervasive amongst hosts, including humans, wildlife, and livestock
55 / agriculture (Vogels *et al* 2018; Ezenwa *et al* 2010; Halliday, Penczykowski *et al* 2020). Therefore, we
56 need to better understand why and how parasites coinfect their hosts.

57 Nonetheless, coinfection represents just one of numerous outcomes of concurrent pathogenesis. That
58 fact poses fundamental questions about coinfection. First, if coinfection is indeed detrimental, then what
59 within-host factors facilitate it? Equally importantly, what prevents it? Within-host parasite competition
60 can lead to coinfection (*i.e.*, within-host parasite coexistence), singly infection (through exclusion or
61 priority effects), or clearance (no infection) from hosts (Vogel *et al* 2018). Yet, we lack theoretical
62 predictions to elucidate those outcomes of competition. For instance, irrespective of timing, sequential
63 exposure to some parasites always lead to coinfection, yet to others, only early infecting parasites prevail
64 (Fig. 1A; Clay *et al* 2019; Devevey *et al* 2015). Second, when they coinfect why do some parasites become
65 more abundant than others in relative and absolute senses? For instance, nutrient supply or resources can
66 shift this ‘community structure’ of parasites within hosts favouring one parasite over the other (Fig. 1B;
67 Fellous & Koella 2009, Budischak *et al* 2015). Finally, not all coinfecting hosts are equal. Some hosts
68 present higher coinfection burden than others, hinting at variation in immunological resistance (Fig. 1C;
69 Fuess *et al* 2021, Halliday *et al* 2018). How does such variation govern coinfection burden? Presently, these
70 disparate bits about coinfection remain unconnected, lacking a synthetic glue. Here, we seek to catalyse
71 creation of a framework linking genesis of coinfection to its consequences (Lively *et al* 2014; Restif &
72 Graham 2015).

73 A mechanistic, within-host framework of parasite competition provides a start. To illustrate, we
 74 develop and evaluate within-host models of coinfection, synthesizing insights through an ecological lens
 75 (following Ramesh & Hall 2023). Broadly, coinfection (*i.e.*, within-host coexistence of parasites) occurs
 76 when each parasite species competes more strongly with themselves (intraspecifically) than with each other
 77 (interspecifically; Fig. 1D). Those competitive differences could be measured phenomenologically. Even
 78 better, they can be quantified from trait-based niche models for parasites competing within hosts (Graham
 79 *et al* 2008, Cressler *et al* 2014). In such models, parasites interact within host ‘ecosystems’ for shared
 80 resources while facing attack by energetically costly immune cells. Simple ecological rules, then, govern
 81 within-host parasite competition. To illustrate, we first borrow from old and new niche models to outline
 82 how shared energy (resources) and/or immune cells could govern divergent coinfection outcomes (Fig. 2).
 83 Second, using a case study of a two parasite – immune cells – energy model (2PIE) niche model, we link
 84 outcomes of infection to competitive abilities, nullclines (niches), feedback, and key traits (Figs. 3-7; Table
 85 S1,2). Third, our approach scripts how to link *a priori* predictions to interpretation of experimental
 86 outcomes using these types of models (Fig. 8-9). Finally, we offer suggestions for future theory and
 87 experiments (Fig. 10, Table 1). Taken together, we lay a general mechanistic framework to understand
 88 coinfection using within-host niche-based competition model.

89

90 Section I: A phenomenological approach to coinfection

91 To visualize these interactions, we label the direct effect of species *j* on growth rate of species *i*,
 92 yielding (hereafter) interspecific *positive effects* (black arrow) and *negative effects* (red arrow) and
 93 intraspecific *self-limitation* (red curve; Fig. 1,2). Then, we can write the two-species Lotka–Volterra
 94 competition model in terms of intra (a_{ii})- and inter (a_{ij})-specific per capita competition coefficients:

$$95 \quad \underbrace{\frac{1}{P_i} \cdot \frac{dP_i}{dt}}_{\text{per capita growth rate}} = \underbrace{r_i}_{\text{intrinsic growth rate}} \left(1 - \underbrace{a_{ii}P_i}_{\text{effect of intrasp competition}} - \underbrace{a_{ij}P_j}_{\text{effect of intersp competition}} \right) \quad (1)$$

96 where P_i is the density of parasite species *i*, and r_i is its intrinsic (maximum per capita) growth rate. This
 97 model assumes that per capita growth rates (fitness) decrease linearly with density of each species with
 98 slopes a_{ii} and a_{ij} (Table 1A). Successful coinfection satisfies two conditions. First, each single-species

99 ('boundary') carrying capacity ($1/a_{ii}$) must be invulnerable by the other parasite when rare. That condition is
100 met when each species reduces its own growth rate more than that of its competitor (i.e., $a_{11} > a_{21}$ and $a_{22} >$
101 a_{12}). Second, joint intraspecific ($a_{11} a_{22}$) must exceed joint interspecific competition ($a_{12} a_{21}$). When both
102 are met, the feasible coexistence ('interior') equilibrium is stable with negative feedback (Table 1A).

103 Coinfection is hindered in one of two ways. First, strong positive feedback at the interior generates
104 priority effects when joint inter- exceeds intra-specific competition ($a_{12} a_{21} > a_{11} a_{22}$). Priority effects also
105 require mutually invulnerable boundary equilibria and a feasible interior (which are both met when $a_{11} < a_{21}$
106 and $a_{22} < a_{12}$). Here, high enough initial density of parasites determines the winner. Second, competitive
107 exclusion arises with asymmetric competition. Specifically, if P_2 cannot invade P_1 's boundary ($a_{11} < a_{21}$)
108 but P_1 can invade P_2 's boundary ($a_{22} > a_{12}$), then P_1 excludes P_2 . Conversely, P_2 excludes P_1 when $a_{11} > a_{21}$
109 but $a_{22} < a_{12}$. Hence, mutually or asymmetrically strong interspecific competition can hinder coinfection.

110 Empirically, estimates of competition coefficients can come from densities and growth rates of
111 parasites. Various methods exist, including a response surface design. In the context of macroparasites, this
112 design involves growing species either alone or at the lowest densities that lead to infection. It also involves
113 growing species with increasing density of intra- and inter-specific competitors. Through this design, a_{ii}
114 and a_{ij} can be estimated, then used to predict if species can successfully infect when rare (Freckleton &
115 Watkinson 2000; reviewed in Hart *et al* 2018; see Table 1A). However, this approach remains
116 phenomenological, measuring coefficients only in a specific environment. That context-dependence limits
117 predictions of infection outcomes across gradients of traits, nutrient supply, or in allocation to immunity.
118 Instead, predictions in these other contexts require a mechanistic framework of competition between
119 parasites involving host immunity and/or host resources.

120

121 **Section II: Within-host feedbacks driving divergent infection outcomes**

122 To move toward creation of such a framework, we outline six models of within-host competition
123 between parasites involving immunity, resources, and/or direct interference (Fig. 2). All potentially contain
124 mechanisms for coinfection, single infection due to exclusion or priority effects (aka, alternative states or
125 founder control), and no infection. Although details can vary, such divergent outcomes in these models
126 follow general principles of species competition as outlined above. In essence, coinfection occurs when

127 strong intraspecific competition (mediated directly or looped indirectly via ‘niche’ factors such as resources
128 or immune cells) outweighs strong interspecific competition. Stronger intraspecific competition leads to
129 net negative feedback on the feasible (‘interior’) stable equilibrium, facilitating coinfection.

130

131 *Two parasite – shared energy (2PE) or – shared immune cells (2PI)*

132 Parasite species that share a resource (energy) or suffer attack from a shared immune system engage
133 in exploitative or apparent competition, respectively (Fig. 2A,B). In exploitative competition (Fig. 2A), a
134 parasite that can survive at the lower equilibrium energy (resource) level (E^*) can outcompete the other. For
135 instance, among two clones of a rodent malaria (*P. chabaudi*), the superior competitor for red blood cells
136 (RBC) always excludes the inferior clone (De Roode *et al* 2005). Competition for a single, shared resource
137 can lead to a competitive hierarchy among multiple parasite species. For instance, in a malarial-hookworm
138 system, one Plasmodium species (*P. falciparum*) outcompetes hookworms which themselves outcompete
139 another Plasmodium (*P. vivax*) for red blood cells (Budischak *et al* 2018). Analogous rules can characterize
140 host systems with a shared immune system (Fig. 2B). In models, when two exponentially growing parasites
141 share immune cells, the species that can withstand highest density of immune cells (*i.e.*, highest I^*) wins
142 via apparent competition (Fenton & Perkins 2010). In a possibly analogous experiment, immune-mediated
143 interactions led to competitive suppression of an avirulent malarial clone, allowing the virulent clone to
144 dominate (Råberg *et al* 2006). Therefore, exploitative competition for a single resource or apparent
145 competition involving shared immune cells can lead to competitive exclusion alone.

146 Three aspects of within-host parasite biology can introduce coinfection or priority effects to pure
147 resource or apparent competition. First, if some mechanism imposes self-limitation on both parasites, then
148 they can coinfect even if they share only one immune niche. For instance, donor-controlled reproduction
149 can create strong self-limitation on macroparasite density (Fenton & Perkins 2010). Second, non-linearity
150 in immune clearance rates can generate self-limitation, particularly when clearance accelerates at higher
151 parasite density (Fenton & Perkins 2010). Third, interference competition between parasites can facilitate
152 priority effects or coinfection (Amarasekare 2002; Fig. 2A-B with mutually inhibitory effects between P_1
153 and P_2 [grey shading]). If the inferior energy competitor is superior at interference, priority effects ensue.
154 Then, at high enough initial densities, the inferior energy competitor can win instead of being excluded.

155 However, if the interference also confers a benefit to the interacting species (e.g., if killing competitor larvae
156 and consuming it increases per capita growth rate), then coinfection ensues (following Amarasekare 2002).
157 These general principles for joint interference and exploitative competition (Fig. 2A) likely also apply to
158 immune-mediated apparent competition, a possibility for future exploration (Fig. 2B).

159

160 *Two parasite – two energy (2P2E; Resource ratio) or Two parasite – two immune cells (2P2I; Immune*
161 *ratio)*

162 When parasites (P_j) simultaneously compete for two resource or energy sources (E_i) via exploitative
163 competition, infection outcomes can include coinfection and priority effects (Tilman 1982). Consider two
164 parasite species competing for two substitutable resources (like in the resource ratio model: Fig. 2C). Here,
165 coinfection minimally requires each species to trade off their requirements for each energy resource. Then
166 sufficiently intermediate supply ratios must permit each single-species ('boundary') equilibria to fall within
167 each competitors' niches (enabling mutual invasibility). With both conditions met, coinfection arises if each
168 parasite has larger impact on the resource to which its fitness is most sensitive (see Appendix Section 2).
169 In testing the resource ratio model, Lacroix *et al.* observed a distinct competitive hierarchy, where one plant
170 virus altered success of a competing cereal dwarf virus under nitrogen: phosphorus (N:P) supply. In co-
171 inoculated plants, the cereal dwarf virus infection rates decreased with elevated P supply rate, while the
172 addition of N significantly increased its' infection rate (Lacroix *et al* 2014; Smith 2014). This suggests that,
173 at the very least, N:P shapes how each parasite species differentially impacts their resources, setting the
174 stage for coinfection.

175 Analogous rules likely apply to hosts with two types of immune response (2P2I, the immune ratio
176 model; Fig. 2D). If parasites act as substitutable resources for two generalist immune responses, coinfection
177 arises if each parasite also has larger impact on the immune response to which its' fitness is most sensitive
178 (Appendix Section 2; derived for case with parasite self-limitation). Modification of this 2P2I framework
179 captures well-studied within-host interactions. First, the host can mount an independent, specialist immune
180 response to each parasite (with no links between $P_i - I_j$, Fenton & Perkins 2010). Therefore, the separate
181 dynamics of each immune-parasite pair determines coinfection. Similar results emerge for parasites
182 separated spatially (e.g., in different host tissues: Cervi *et al* 2004; Karvonen *et al* 2006). Second, two

183 parasites can each be attacked by specialist immune responses that inhibit each other. For instance, in mice,
184 competing parasites interact *via* T-helper cells, where Th1 attacks intra-cellular malaria, Th2 attacks
185 intestinal nematodes, but Th1 and Th2 inhibit each other (Griffiths *et al* 2015). Such interference creates
186 negative feedback that can further enable coinfection (*e.g.*, links between I_1 and I_2 [grey shading]; Fenton
187 & Perkins 2010).

188

189 *Two parasite – immune cell – energy (2PIE)*

190 Parasites can also engage in simultaneous exploitative and immune-mediated apparent competition
191 (Cressler *et al* 2014; Ramesh & Hall 2023). Consider common variations of two competing parasites (P_j)
192 that steal energy (E) from hosts and immune cells (I) that kill them (2PIE; Fig. 2E-F; Table S1). In one,
193 only parasites induce production of immune cells (2PIE_i, induced immunity). In the other, energy is
194 continuously allocated to maintain baseline immune function, even without parasites (2PIE_c, constitutive
195 immunity). This structure resembles a food web in which two prey species share a resource while attacked
196 by a generalist predator (Holt *et al* 1994; Leibold 1996). This keystone predation (diamond) model
197 anticipates the tradeoffs and niche dimensions that would govern exploitative and apparent competition
198 parasites (Ramesh & Hall 2023). When combined, these forms of competition enable coinfection, priority
199 effects, or competitive exclusion (see below Fig. 3; Ramesh & Hall 2023). Constitutive immunity (Fig. 2F)
200 reduces opportunities (parameter space) for coinfection, lowering parasite burden while maintaining higher
201 energy for other metabolic work (see below; Fig. 9).

202 The remainder of this review will focus on joint immune and energy (resource) competition in the 2PIE
203 model. Most organisms have some type of (costly) immune defences to fight parasites that steal host energy
204 (*reviewed in* Lochmiller & Deerenberg 2000; Zuk & Stoehr 2002). Furthermore, principles that govern
205 strength of intra- v inter-specific competition in 2PIE models should apply to others. With the 2PIE model,
206 then, we ask three questions: (a) What within-host feedback drives divergent outcomes of infection? (b)
207 How does this framework offer new ways to resolve results in previous coinfection experiments (Fig. 1A-
208 C)? (c) How can this framework guide future theory and experiments?

209

210

211 Section III: A mechanistic framework linking feedbacks, trait ratios, and infection outcomes

212 In this section, we construct a framework for within-host competition of parasites that connects
213 trade-offs, nullclines (niches), feedbacks, and traits. As we will learn, the 2PIE model follows the familiar
214 tale of intra- vs inter-specific competition governing coexistence vs priority effects (given a feasible interior
215 equilibrium; Fig. 1D). Although specifics between 2PIEi and the others (Fig. 2A-F) surely differ, this
216 approach lays a general script to generate mechanistic *a priori* predictions and glean better understanding
217 of coinfection dynamics from within-host niche models. Many of the mathematical details are found
218 elsewhere (Appendix Section 1).

219

220 **The Model (see also S1, Table S1):**

221 *Growth rate of immune cells I* (Eq. 2A): In 2PIEi, immune cells (I) increase after attack on parasite
222 j (P_j) at rate f_{IP_j} , inducing consumption of e_{IP_j} of energy, E , with conversion efficiency e_l of energy into
223 an immune cell after debiting loss rate m_l . In 2PIEc, I also increases with allocation of E at baseline rate
224 a_b .

225 *Growth rate of parasite P_j* (Eq. 2B): The two parasites consume host energy with feeding rate
226 f_{P_j} and energy per parasite conversion, $e_{P_j E}^{-1}$. The parasites are lost due to attack by immune cells (f_{IP_j})
227 and die at (shared) background rate m_p .

228 *Growth rate of energy, E* (Eq. 2C): The host consumes a resource S via a Monod function with
229 maximal assimilation rate f_E and half-saturation constant h . (This function merely pays homage to non-
230 linear feeding behaviour of hosts following Cressler *et al* 2014). That resource, converted to energy within
231 the host (E), is lost at fixed rate r for use by hosts (for metabolic needs). Its net production, then, is $f(S) - r$
232 E . Additionally, host energy is consumed via induction from immune attack on parasites (proportional to
233 the triple product $P_j E I$), and from consumption (theft) by parasites themselves. Hence, parasite j
234 ‘consumes’ energy both indirect and directly described, a sum grouped below as $f_j(I)$. In 2PIEc, energy is
235 also lost via allocation to baseline immune function at rate a_b . The 2PIEi,c models are thus:

$$\frac{dI}{dt} = \frac{a_b E + \sum e_{IP_j} f_{IP_j} P_j E I}{e_l} - m_l I, \quad \text{Eq. 2A}$$

$$\frac{dP_j}{dt} = \left(\frac{f_{P_j E}}{e_{P_j E}} - f_{IP_j} I - m_P \right) P_j, \quad \text{Eq. 2B}$$

$$\frac{dE}{dt} = \frac{f_{ES}}{h+S} - rE - (\sum e_{IP_j} f_{IP_j} I + \sum f_{P_j}) P_j E - a_b E. \quad \text{Eq. 2C}$$

236

237 **Outcomes of competition**

238 Depending on their traits, competing parasites can successfully coinfect, singly infect (via
 239 competitive exclusion or priority effects), or produce no infection in a host. Such outcomes can be captured
 240 along gradients of, say, supply of resources to hosts, S , and feeding rate of parasites on energy within hosts,
 241 f_{P_1} (Fig. 3A, Table S1). The lines within the 2D bifurcation diagram represent qualitative shifts of within-
 242 host composition determined by minimal requirements. We highlight two such shifts or ‘transcriticals’ (T_1
 243 and T_2) governing coinfection, but we build to it. Very low S prevents persistence of either parasite, resulting
 244 in no infection (a nutritional clearance; Fig. 3A, yellow). Increasing S , now supports only single infection
 245 by parasite 1 (P_1) because it excludes the other via resource competition (P_2 , at $E-P_1$ [lighter] or $E-P_1-I$
 246 [darker] ‘boundary equilibria’). Now, intermediate S , such that $T_2 < S < T_1$, allows parasite 2 (P_2) to invade
 247 that P_1 boundary and P_1 invasion into the P_2 ’s boundary equilibrium ($E-P_2-I$). Hence, that region represents
 248 mutual invasibility and coinfection (Fig. 3A, orange), situated between regions of competitive exclusion
 249 (‘single infection’). At higher S , P_1 is excluded allowing P_2 to win ($E-P_2-I$; Fig. 3A, dark purple). Notice,
 250 increasing both f_{P_1} and S flips the geometry of those transcriticals. Now, higher S , such that $T_1 < S < T_2$,
 251 does not allow P_1 invasion into the P_2 ’s boundary equilibrium and vice-versa. Hence, this region represents
 252 mutual uninvasibility and priority effects aka founder control (Fig. 3A, grey; see Appendix S1 for details).
 253 The offsets show sample dynamics when hosts are exposed to concurrent infection, started at one or two
 254 initial densities, in each of these regions (Fig. 3B – F). In the no infection region, insufficient energy caused
 255 failed infection, even at high initial densities of parasites (Fig. 3D). In the single infection regions, the
 256 winner always excludes the other, even with initially low densities (Fig. 3A, E). In the coinfection region,
 257 all trajectories head toward a stable (interior) equilibrium (Fig. 3C). With priority effects, the parasite
 258 starting more densely wins and excludes the other (i.e., top: P_1 wins; bottom: P_2 wins; Fig. 3F).

259

260 ***Mechanism of competition: A within-host “assembly rules” and nullcline approach***

261 These predictions hinge on intra- vs inter-specific competition. Intraspecific competition, mediated
262 indirectly via host energy and immune cells, produces negative feedback loops while interspecific
263 competition yields positive ones (Fig. 1D). When strength of intra- exceeds inter-specific competition, net
264 negative feedback on the feasible interior equilibrium can enable coinfection (coexistence). Conversely,
265 greater inter- than intra-specific competition generates net positive feedback that can produce priority
266 effects. This section actualizes these concepts for 2PIEi using niches and nullclines.

267 ***Assembly rules:*** Broadly, coinfection requires a competition-resistance trade-off: the species that
268 competes superiorly for energy (without immune cell) must remain more vulnerable to immune attack. It
269 also requires intermediate resource supply, S , as consumed by hosts, $f(S)$, falling in between two thresholds
270 (described below: $T_2 < f(S) < T_1$). The assembly of a within-host ‘community’ of parasites can be understood
271 via hosts exposed to (i) single species (Fig. 4A, 5A dotted and dashed lines) and (ii) both species (Fig. 4B,
272 5B solid lines). The single species ‘boundary’ equilibria provide insights into their minimum resource
273 requirements of parasites for energy (E_j^* , akin to R^* sensu Tilman 1982) and of immune cells for the product
274 of energy and parasites (EP_j^*). They also highlight maximal immune cell densities supported by each
275 parasite (I_j^* , akin to P^* sensu Holt 1977). These quantities provide a start for assembly of coinfection.

276 First, the route to single infection follows resource- and immune-based assembly rules along a
277 nutrient supply gradient, S (Figs. 4B, 5B). Very low nutrient supply (S) meets neither parasite’s minimum
278 energy requirements ($E^* < E_j^*$). Hence, very low S prevents infection (i.e., clearance via starvation; yellow).
279 However, with high enough S , E^* increases, eventually meeting that minimum (E_j^*). Then, P_j can invade
280 and increase with S (pinning E at E_j^* ; E - P_j regions in lighter). Eventually, P_j ’s density crosses a minimal
281 threshold (EP_j^*) that induces immune activation (darker colors). With higher S still, immune attack reduces
282 density of P_j freeing up more energy (where energy with immune cells is denoted by $E_{j,i}^*$). While both
283 parasite species follow similar assembly rules, they differ in a key trade-off: P_1 is the superior competitor
284 without immune cells ($E_1^* < E_2^*$) but is more vulnerable to immune attack ($f_{IP_1} > f_{IP_2}$). That competition-
285 resistance trade-off provides a first prerequisite for coinfection.

286 Comparison of those key energy and immune quantities yields more conditions for coinfection (Fig.
287 4B). Along the nutrient gradient, S , the more vulnerable parasite, P_1 invades (E - P_1). It outcompetes

288 (excludes) the more resistant parasite, P_2 , via resource competition (since $E_1^* < E_2^*$). At some S following
289 immune activation (EP_1^*), P_1 becomes the superior apparent competitor ($I_1^* > I_2^*$) but inferior energy
290 competitor ($E_{2,I}^* < E_{1,I}^*$) – a shift in competitive dominance. Then, with further S still, the E - I niche
291 environment set by P_1 enables P_2 to invade (at T_2 : orange).

292 In a window of coinfection, the within-host niche environment remains constant while parasite
293 densities shift (Fig. 4B). Here, energy and immune cells stay at E_{int}^* and I_{int}^* , respectively. However, with
294 higher S , the structure of this community shifts, with P_2 increasing while P_1 declines. With this shift, the
295 energy and parasite density needed to keep the immune system activated, $E_{int}^*(P_1^* + P_2^*)$, increases until P_2
296 could support immune activation alone (at EP_2^* ; Fig. 4D). Broadly, in this region, the more vulnerable P_1
297 remains the superior apparent competitor (Fig. 4D, $I_1^* > I_2^*$) but weaker competitor for energy (Fig. 4C, E_2^*
298 $< E_{1,I}^*$ shifts to $E_{2,I}^* < E_{1,I}^*$). Conversely, the more resistant P_2 is the superior energy competitor but weaker
299 apparent competitor. This biology means that the more vulnerable parasite species also produces more
300 immune cells, the niche factor to which it is most sensitive (see below). That combination imposes a brake
301 on its own growth rate (negative feedback), thus promoting coinfection. With S past this threshold (T_1), P_2
302 excludes P_1 (via resource competition: $E_{2,I}^* < E_{1,I}^*$) but more immune cells lower P_2 's density (purple, Figs.
303 5B-E).

304 Priority effects can arise with different trait combinations for the two parasites (here: at higher f_{P_1} ;
305 Fig. 5B). Along a gradient of nutrient supply to hosts, S , the region of priority effects is approached similarly
306 to the coinfection case: first the more vulnerable parasite invades (when its E_1^* is met), then the immune
307 system is activated (when its EP_1^* is reached). However, P_1 always remains the superior energy competitor,
308 unlike the flip seen before the coinfection window for coinfection (Fig. 5C). Past T_1 , more resistant P_2
309 cannot invade until T_2 is crossed; with higher S , more resistant P_2 excludes P_1 via apparent competition
310 (since $I_2^* > I_1^*$; Fig. 5D). Biologically, this means that the more resistant species produces more immune
311 cells, the niche factor to which their competitors are most sensitive (see below), creating positive feedback
312 and thus priority effects. With decreasing S , P_1 could not invade until T_1 was crossed. Hence, the interior
313 equilibrium in the priority effects window is unstable (a saddle), separating two stable states, dominance
314 by P_1 (at its E - P_1 - I boundary equilibrium) or by P_2 (at E - P_2 - I).

315 ***A nullcline (niche) interpretation:*** Nullclines help to characterize the niche environment that

316 enables it coinfection. At a given nutrient supply S , nullclines denote conditions in which a parasite (P_j) or
317 niche component (energy, immune cells) neither grows nor declines. Combinations of energy (E) and
318 immune (I) cells that fall to the right of a parasite's nullcline (higher energy, lower immune cells) sit within
319 its fundamental niche (Fig. 6A; P_1 , blue shading; P_2 , purple). Then, the impact of each parasite on their
320 within-host niche determines I and E nullclines. The nullcline for E is the combination of P_1 and P_2 that
321 'consumes' all production of energy at the interior (E_{int}^*). Below this line, energy grows ($dE/dt > 0$, yellow
322 in Fig. 6B). The P_j -axis intercepts (\tilde{P}_j) note the density of each parasite, when alone, that consumes all net
323 energy production. The nullcline for I is the combination of P_1 and P_2 that meets the minimal EP^* needed
324 to maintain its activation. All points above the line increase production of immune cells ($dI/dt > 0$; green
325 in Fig. 6B). At each intercept (\hat{P}_j), the parasite alone supports immune activation (at EP_j^*) given E_{int}^* .

326 *Coinfection* (Fig. 6C - E; black, closed circle): Co-infection requires that parasite nullclines cross,
327 niche nullclines cross, and nutrient supply is intermediate. The nullclines of the parasites cross in E - I space
328 because of their competition-resistance trade-off (Appendix section S1). The shallower slope of less
329 resistant P_1 's nullcline means it is more sensitive to I while more resistant P_2 is more sensitive to E . When
330 they coinfect, both parasites set their relevant single-species (boundary) equilibria within the fundamental
331 niche of the other. Hence, each single-parasite environment can be invaded by the other (Fig. 6C; P_1
332 equilibrium [blue dot] falls within P_2 's niche [purple shaded] and vice-versa). Now P_1 is the superior
333 apparent competitor ($I_1^* > I_2^*$) while P_2 is the superior energy competitor (i.e., has lower E^* : $E_{1,I}^* > E_{2,I}^*$
334 [as shown] or E_2^* ; Fig. 4C). Meanwhile, the I nullcline is steeper in P_1 - P_2 space (Fig. 6E). Hence P_1 has
335 larger impact on immune cells while P_2 has larger impact on energy. Therefore, each parasite exerts largest
336 impact on the niche factor to which it is most sensitive. Based on the nullcline intercepts, coinfection
337 requires that the interior niche would support surplus P_1 ($\hat{P}_1 < \tilde{P}_1$) but deficient P_2 (so $\hat{P}_2 > \tilde{P}_2$) than needed
338 to meet immune system's EP^* requirement (Fig. 6E; when $f(S) = T_2$, $\hat{P}_1 = \tilde{P}_1$; at T_1 , $\hat{P}_2 = \tilde{P}_2$). The coinfection
339 equilibrium, then, combines densities of the superior apparent (P_1) and energy competitor (P_2) that
340 consumes all net energy production while meeting minimal requirements of immune cells – eliminating
341 those surpluses and deficits.

342 *Priority effects* (Fig. 6F-H; white, open circle): During priority effects, those three elements change.

343 First, while parasite nullclines still cross (due to the competition-resistance trade-off), now both parasites
344 (P_j) alone create uninhabitable immune (I) – energy (E) niche environments (Fig. 6F; P_1 blue dot outside P_2
345 purple shaded niche and vice-versa). Furthermore, in this region P_1 is always the superior energy
346 competitor, without ($E_1^* < E_2^*$) and with immune cells ($E_{1,I}^* < E_{2,I}^*$), while P_2 becomes the superior
347 apparent competitor ($I_2^* > I_1^*$; Fig. 6F). Second, the E nullcline is now steeper than the I nullcline (Fig. 6J).
348 Hence, impacts flip: less resistant P_1 has larger impact on E while more resistant P_2 has larger impact on I .
349 Therefore, each parasite has a larger impact on the niche factor to which its competitor is most sensitive.
350 Thus, the system would provide excess of the more resistant parasite ($\hat{P}_2 < \tilde{P}_2$) and a deficiency of the
351 vulnerable one ($\hat{P}_1 > \tilde{P}_1$) enabling priority effects.

352

353 ***Factors enabling coinfection: Feedback loops and trade-offs of traits***

354 Outcomes of coinfection v priority effects depend on feedback and traits that govern them. At the
355 most fundamental scale, co-infection must be ‘feasible’ (set by an environment supporting both species) at
356 an equilibrium having net negative feedback. Such net negative feedback emerges when intraspecific
357 competition exceeds interspecific competition. That competition depends on loops connecting parasites to
358 their niche (Fig. 7A, S1). Loops are chains of interactions linking increased density of a species to growth
359 rates of others, eventually returning to that species (Puccia & Levins 1991). For instance, interspecific
360 competition can be traced starting with an increase in P_1 . (i) An increase in P_1 ’s density can ‘fuel immune
361 cells’ that suppress its competitor, freeing up energy resources, thereby increasing its own growth rate via
362 higher ‘births’. (ii) P_1 can also ‘starve immune cells’ by reducing P_2 ’s density via consumption of E .
363 Through both chains of interactions, P_1 indirectly benefits from an increase in its own density via gains in
364 energy, hence birth rate, or lower death rate, respectively. Those two positive (destabilizing) loops then
365 push against two negative loops, (iii and iv) “ P_i is attacked, P_j eats”. These latter loops add the stabilizing,
366 consumer-resource-like, intraspecific competitive interactions within which each parasite is enmeshed. For
367 instance, (iii) a small increase in P_1 increases immune attack, thereby reducing P_1 (P_1 - I loop) while P_2 is
368 slowed by resource consumption (P_2 - E loop). Then, (iv) those roles reverse, *i.e.*, resources brake P_1 while
369 the immune system slows parasite P_2 . Summed, those two loops (iii and iv) jointly determine the amount

370 of intraspecific competition (negative feedback). Then, the 2PIE model follows the recognizable script of
371 intra- vs inter-specific competition governing coexistence vs priority effects. If the strength of intraspecific
372 competition loops (iii + iv: negative) exceeds that of interspecific loops (i + ii: positive), net negative
373 feedback leads to coinfection. If, instead, interspecific exceed intraspecific loop strength, net positive
374 feedback generates priority effects.

375 With some rearrangement, these intra- and inter-specific loops governing feedback can more
376 intimately connect to the niche environment and assembly rules revealed above (Fig. 7B, S1). The first
377 involves the difference in ratios of sensitivity of each parasite to immune cells, I , vs. energy, E (denoted by
378 α_j ; following Pásztor et al 2016). The second involves the ratio of impacts of each parasite on I vs. E (ϵ_j).
379 Both ratios can be written as proportional to ratios of traits or traits and minimal requirements (Fig. 7D and
380 E , respectively; see details in Appendix Section S1). Coinfection requires that each parasite has a larger
381 impact on the niche factor to which it is most sensitive. If the more vulnerable P_1 is most sensitive to and
382 has highest impact on I , then $\alpha_1 > \alpha_2$ and $\epsilon_1 < \epsilon_2$. Such symmetry in ratios generates net negative feedback.
383 For priority effects, the competition-resistance trade-off still yields $\alpha_1 > \alpha_2$. However, because P_1 has highest
384 impact on E (to which P_2 is most sensitive), the impact ratios flip, $\epsilon_1 < \epsilon_2$. This asymmetry in sensitivity vs.
385 impact ratios produces net positive feedback.

386

387 **Section IV: A focus on the traits and quantities to measure in the future**

388 Presently, most within-host competition experiments observe patterns of coinfection, then infer
389 mechanisms. The next phase of experimentation should shift toward feedback, minimal requirements, and
390 traits of mechanistic niche models (like 2PIEi). Above, we learned that coinfection requires that each
391 parasite has greater impact on the niche factor to which it is most sensitive (generating net negative
392 feedback); with priority effects, each parasite has greatest impact on the niche factor to which its competitor
393 is most sensitive (yielding net positive feedback). Future research on coinfection dynamics could aim to
394 quantify the traits and minima's underlying these sensitivity and impact frameworks.

395 (1) *Quantifying traits*: The (a)symmetry of the *sensitivity-impacts* ratios governing coinfection and
396 priority effects can be better understood by delineating the combination of traits (Fig. 7D, Appendix Section

397 S1). For instance, the *sensitivity* ratios are governed by killing rate of immune cells on parasites (f_{IP_j}),
398 feeding rate of parasites (f_{P_j}), and the cost of producing a new parasite (e_{P_jE}). On the other hand, the *impact*
399 ratios depend on how attacked parasites induce energy allocation to immune cells ($e_{IP_j}f_{IP_j}$) and the per
400 capita ‘consumption’ of energy by parasite j directly and indirectly ($f_{P_j}(I)$).

401 (3) *Quantifying key traits and minimal requirements*: Experimental tests of *sensitivity-impact* ratios
402 could also centre on measurement of key quantities such as the minimal requirement of each parasite (E^*)
403 for energy and of the immune system for activation (EP^* ; Fig. 7E, Table 1C). For instance, the difference
404 in sensitivity ratios boils down to killing rate of immune cells on parasites, f_{P_j} , and each parasite’s minimal
405 energy requirement without immune cells, E_j^* . Similarly, the difference in impact ratios depend on per capita
406 ‘consumption’ of energy by parasites, $f_{P_j}(I)$, and the immune cells’ minimal energy-parasite requirement
407 EP_j^* (Appendix S1). These traits and quantities could be estimated via experiments (in principle).

408 Despite this call for a focus on traits and minimal requirements, we acknowledge inherent challenges
409 in measuring them. To move forward, experimentalists can leverage interdisciplinary methodologies. For
410 instance, measurement of state variables like parasite (P_j^*), energy (E_j^*), or immune densities (I_j^*) over time
411 can allow estimation of parameters of the model. Alternatively, traits could be measured with radioisotope
412 labelling of resources to track parasite feeding rate (Gomez-Amaro *et al* 2015), live imaging to track
413 immune killing rate (Galli *et al* 2021), ICP-MS to measure energetic content of infected host (Cassat *et al*
414 2018), etc. As a pay-off, the combination of trait measurements and models generates *a priori* predictions
415 of infection outcomes and the feedback mechanisms that govern them (notably demonstrated in Budischak
416 *et al* 2015; Griffiths *et al* 2015). Ultimately, such approaches may catalyse a new wave of theory-grounded,
417 niche-mechanistic combinations of modelling and experimentation.

418

419 **Section V: Explanations for divergent infection outcomes using 2PIE**

420 The model of exploitative and apparent competition between parasites, 2PIE_{i,c}, makes predictions
421 (Fig. 8A, 9) that can help to contextualize and interpret previous experiments (Fig. 8B-F). In this next
422 section, we envision how 2PIE_i could produce these various outcomes, backing-out mechanism *post hoc*.
423 Thus, 2PIE_i offers a way to potentially resolve otherwise seemingly inconsistent experimental outcomes.

424 Then, it can guide creation of new coinfection models tested in future experiments. Ideally, such efforts
425 would start with parameterized predictions that test divergence of infection outcomes *a priori*.

426

427 ***Coinfected or not? What within-host factors facilitate or inhibit coinfection? (Fig. 8B, C)***

428 *Priority effects*

429 *Theory:* Stronger inter- than intra-specific competition ensures priority effects (via net positive
430 feedback) where the parasite with sufficiently high initial dose wins (Fig. 8A, B; Table 1B).

431 *Empirical evidence:* In a rare, unequivocal demonstration of priority effects, the order of arrival of
432 bacterial (*B. burgdorferi*) strains determined which won and excluded the other within a host mouse (Fig.
433 8B). Immune response likely did not explain the priority effects (Devevey *et al* 2015), so future work can
434 pinpoint mechanisms (e.g., resource competition, interference, etc.) facilitating them (Fig. 2B; Table 1B).

435 *Guiding future experiments:* Varying initial parasite dose (dose-dependent assays) provide on
436 possible way to delineate coinfection vs priority effects. When parasites coinfect, dose does not change
437 outcome, despite varying initial P_2 and constant initial P_1 . With priority effects, sufficiently high initial
438 density determines winner (Table 1B). Such an experiment would reveal whether competitive exclusion, or
439 priority effects led to single infection. Even better, measurement of key quantities involved in *sensitivity-*
440 *impact* ratios can delineate mechanism (e.g., superior resource v resistant competitor as in Fig. 5).

441

442 *Competitive exclusion*

443 *Theory:* Differences in parasite traits can separate exclusion from coinfection. For example, for a
444 given nutrient supply to hosts, a parasite with higher feeding rate (all else equal), can exclude its competitor
445 resulting in single infection (Fig. 8A, C). In contrast, one with lower feeding rate may successfully coinfect.

446 *Empirical evidence:* Mice infected with malarial strain P_1 or P_3 (blue) were allowed to compete
447 pairwise against a common malarial strain P_2 (purple; Fig. 8C; De Roode *et al* 2005). In the $P_3 - P_2$ pairing,
448 regardless of order or arrival or delay between infections, P_3 competitively excluded P_2 (Fig. 8C).

449 *Guiding future experiments:* Higher competitive ability of P_3 may reflect higher feeding rate on
450 host energy. In contrast, if strain P_1 had lower feeding rate (hence less competitive), it could stably coinfect
451 with P_2 (Fig. 8C). Such hypotheses about resource acquisition traits could be tested in the future (Table 1B).

452

453 ***Coinfection hierarchy and community structure (Fig. 8D-F)***

454 *Theory:* When parasites coinfect, nutrient supply to hosts (S) can mediate densities of the within-
455 host energy and immunity, and hence relative and absolute densities of parasites (Fig. 8D). Thus, nutrient
456 supply can shift this ‘community structure’ of parasites within hosts. For instance, increasing nutrient
457 supply favours the more resistant P_2 over the less resistant P_1 .

458 *Empirical evidence:* This prediction could explain shifts in community structure of parasites in two
459 different systems (Fig. 8E). The first arose with mice infected by two species of gastrointestinal worms
460 (case I; Budischak *et al* 2015); the second used mosquito larvae infected by a microsporidian and protozoan
461 parasite (case II; Fellous & Koella 2009). Both demonstrate how changing nutrient supply (S) favours one
462 species (purple; positive slope) over the other (blue; negative slope; Fig. 8D). In both cases, relative
463 abundance of coinfecting species can shift (or not) depending on S , too. However, future trait measurements
464 would need to establish that higher S favoured the more resistant parasite as 2PIE predicts (Table 1C).

465 *Guiding future experiments:* Much may be learned about coinfection and nutrient supply with focus on
466 individual hosts (*reviewed in* Ezenwa 2021). Hosts can exhibit high intra- and inter-individual variation in
467 infection outcomes (Merill & Cáceres 2018). To illustrate, parasite densities in the mosquito case ranged
468 among all individuals from coinfection to single infection via exclusion / priority effects to no infection
469 (see reference to shaded regions in Fig. 8D v 8F; replotting of Fellous & Koella 2009). Such variation
470 among hosts could arise from individual differences in resource acquisition. If so, individuals nominally
471 fed the same amount (in a treatment) may fall functionally along different supply points (like in Fig. 8D).
472 Individuals consuming less resources would favour the less resistant parasite (P_1) while those eating much
473 more would favour the more resistant one (P_2) - yielding exclusion in both cases (Fig. 8D, F). The remaining
474 hosts became coinfecting, with parasites reaching different densities among hosts. Future, experimental tests
475 can test for the full range of possible infection outcomes (and hence ‘assembly rules’ leading to coinfection
476 outcomes) at the individual scale, say, along broader nutrient gradients (Table 1C).

477 Furthermore, niche-based insights can guide more predictive experiments at the within-host scale which
478 can then be scaled to the population linking within- to between-host dynamics. For instance, fluctuation in
479 nutrient supply to host could shift competitive outcomes within hosts that then alters multi-parasite

480 outbreaks at the population scale (Hite & Cressler 2018; Ezenwa & Jolles 2011) or ecosystem processes
481 (Kendig *et al* 2020).

482

483 ***Coinfection burden (Fig. 9)***

484 Finally, some hosts present higher coinfection burden (total density) than others, hinting at intrinsic
485 host resistance via immune clearance. How does variation in immune response govern coinfection burden?

486 *Theory:* In comparison to the model with only immune induction (2PIEi), baseline energy
487 allocation to immunity squeezes parameter space for coinfection and reduces parasite burden (2PIEc,
488 constitutive immunity; Fig. 9A-B). Despite the higher allocation (via a_b), reduced burden allows the
489 infected host to maintain more energy for other metabolic work (Fig. 9A-B). At lower nutrient supply (S),
490 ‘no infection’ by parasite shifts from nutritional clearance (E , yellow; Fig. 9A) to combination of immune
491 and nutritional form of clearance ($E-I$, green; Fig. 9B). The 2PIEc model also predicts that increasing
492 baseline allocation favours the more resistant P_2 over P_1 , eventually excluding it (Fig. 9E).

493 *Empirical evidence:* Consistent with these predictions, plant hosts treated with immune-signalling
494 hormone experienced a lower prevalence of a less aggressive parasite, increased burden of infection by a
495 more aggressive parasite, and experienced fewer co-infections (Halliday *et al* 2018). Thus, hosts with higher
496 allocation to immunity can resist infection more than those with lower allocation, leading to variation
497 among hosts in infection burden (all else equal).

498 *Guiding future experiments:* First, one could test such predictions using strains with immune
499 suppression of specific genes or metabolites involved in constitutive immunity (like in Chen *et al* 2005).
500 That could shift competition from a 2PIEc framework (with $a_b > 0$) to a more 2PIEi like one (with $a_b = 0$ at
501 the extreme). Another test could involve measuring competitive outcomes in host genotypes differing
502 allocation to baseline immunity (Fuess *et al* 2021; Table 1D).

503

504 **Section VI: Conclusion**

505 Why do divergent infection dynamics arise within a host? Competing parasites within a host can
506 coinfect (coexist), singly infect (through exclusion, or priority effects), or become cleared (no infection;
507 Fig. 1, 3). Those differing outcomes significantly affect health of individual hosts and even alter population-

508 level disease outbreaks (Mideo *et al* 2008). Such divergent infection outcomes ought to stem from niche
509 interactions, *i.e.*, with the resources that parasites steal from hosts and the immune cells that kill them
510 (Cressler *et al* 2014, Graham 2008). Yet, despite two decades of empirical focus on infection dynamics,
511 many of these studies present a collection of disparate results without a synthetic glue. Clearly then, we
512 need a comprehensive framework that explains why parasites coinfect and why they might not.

513 Here we build a within-host framework of parasite competition based on ecological theory (Fig. 2).
514 Using a two parasite – immune cells – energy model (2PIE), we illustrate general principles governing
515 parasite competition via joint exploitative and immune-mediated apparent competition (Ramesh & Hall
516 2023). Those forms of competition underlie a within-host framework that connects infection outcomes to
517 competitive abilities, nullclines (niches), feedbacks, and traits (Figs. 3 – 7; see details in Appendix Section
518 S1). Notably, we delineate how the interplay of three quantities – minimum resource requirements of (1)
519 parasites for energy (E_j^* , akin to R^*), and of (2) the product of energy and parasites (EP_j^*) for immune cells,
520 and (3) maximal immune cells supported by each parasite (I_j^*) – provide a start for assembly of coinfection.
521 We show that coinfection requires that each parasite exerts greater impact on its more sensitive niche factor;
522 that arrangement introduces net stabilizing, negative feedback. With priority effects, each parasite more
523 strongly impacts the factor to which its competitor is most sensitive, leading to net destabilizing, positive
524 feedback (Fig. 3, 4).

525 That framework also provides mechanistic insights into and explanations for some experimental
526 results (Fig. 8-9). First, it explains two ways to hinder coinfection: priority effects can favour early invaders,
527 while competitive exclusion always inhibits one parasite (arising via *e.g.*, fast feeders at low nutrient supply;
528 Fig. 5, 8B-C). Second, increasing nutrient supply in the coinfection region can favour the more resistant
529 over the less resistant parasite, shifting community structure along nutrient gradients (Fig. 8D). Finally,
530 greater investment in constitutive immunity squeezes opportunity (parameter space) for coinfection and
531 reduces parasite burden, freeing up energy for metabolic needs (Fig. 9). Together, the 2PIE models provide
532 interpretation for otherwise puzzling outcomes from various experiments. Although specifics will vary,
533 these principles should apply other niche models involving, say, two energy or immune sources (Fig. 2,
534 2P2E, 2P2I; see Appendix Section S2). This synthesis of experiments with models underscores need for
535 parametrized trait-based experiments that better predict within-host infection outcomes (Table 1).

536 Unpacking such within-host mechanisms can improve our understanding of individual health. For
537 instance, deworming trials of hosts coinfecting with malaria and gastrointestinal worms show that increased
538 availability of RBCs allow malaria to proliferate within the host, ultimately making them sicker (Budischak
539 *et al* 2018). Disentangling the mechanisms can then allow for correct course of treatment plan to improve
540 individual health (*e.g.*, malarial drugs or vaccines followed by deworming). Together, our work provides a
541 synthesis of within-host niche-based frameworks, laying a theoretical groundwork for a mechanistic
542 understanding of competition outcomes. We then used model predictions to contextualize key findings from
543 the past two decades of experimentation. With this synthesis, we aim to catalyse a new wave of theory-
544 grounded, niche-mechanistic combinations of modelling and experimentation. Ultimately, such a new wave
545 could help to mitigate the severity and comorbidities of coinfections but also advance the development of
546 preventive drug therapeutics and vaccines, ultimately enhancing individual health.

547

548 **Acknowledgements:**

549 AR was supported by the IU Center for the Integrative Study of Animal Behavior, NSF DEB (1655656),
550 and a MSU Presidential Postdoctoral Fellowship. We thank J Lau and the Klausmeier-Litchman lab for
551 helpful comments on the manuscript; D Brisson, J de Roode, S Budischak, S Fellous for generously sharing
552 their data. AR credits J Coltrane and A Ali Khan for artistic inspiration.

553 **FIGURE CAPTIONS**

554 **Figure 1:** *Unpacking causes and consequences of coinfection:* (A-C) Examples from experiments
555 probing why coinfection arises and the diverse range of its' consequences, including: (A) *Coinfected or*
556 *not?* What within-host factors facilitate coinfection and what prevents it? Sequential exposure to parasite
557 species can lead to coinfection irrespective of timing (Case I); in other scenarios, early-infecting parasites
558 prevailed (impeding coinfection; Case II). (B) *Coinfection community structure:* When they coinfect, why
559 do some parasites become more abundant than others? When can nutrient supply or resources increase a
560 parasite's relative abundance (Case I) and both relative and absolute abundance (Case II)? (C) *Coinfection*
561 *burden:* Finally, some hosts or host genotypes present higher (co)infection burden than others hinting at
562 differences in immunological resistance. (D) Parasite competition hinges on two main interactions: how (a)
563 species compete with themselves or intra-specific competition (negative intraspecific direct effect, red
564 curve), and how (b) species compete interspecifically (negative interspecific direct effect, red arrows).
565 Generally, coinfection (or within-host coexistence) occurs when intra- exceeds inter-specific competition,
566 and vice-versa for priority effects, at a feasible 'interior' equilibrium (Table S2). Here, those outcomes are
567 illustrated with direct effects (in the Lotka-Volterra model). Subsequently, those competitive effects work
568 indirectly through niche factors (like energy or immune cells).

569 **Figure 2:** *Models of within-host competition of parasites, with potential infection outcomes.* Top
570 *row, single host energy or immune cells model:* Two parasites can compete indirectly for (A) host energy
571 (exploitative: 2PE) or (B) via immune cells (apparent competition: 2PI). Parasites can also engage directly
572 in interference competition (denoted by $P_1 - P_2$ interactions: grey shading). *Middle row, two energy or*
573 *immune models:* Two parasites can compete for (C) two sources of energy or other resources within hosts
574 (2P2E; i.e., like a resource ratio model) or for (D) two different forms of immune cells or classes (2P2I;
575 'immune ratio'; mutual inhibition between $I_1 - I_2$ is possible [grey shading]). *Bottom row, energy and*
576 *immune models:* Competing parasites can be attacked by shared immune cells and compete for host energy
577 with (E) induced immunity (2PIEi), and (F) with constitutive immunity (2PIEc). Immune cells require host
578 energy for proliferation resulting in additional $E-I$ loops beyond those above (B, D). Red (black) arrows:
579 negative (positive) interspecific direct effects, evaluated at positive densities (a feasible interior
580 equilibrium); red curved arrow: self-limitation (negative intraspecific effect).

581 **Figure 3:** *Outcomes of within-host competition in the 2PIEi model* (A) Outcomes of competition
582 are characterized here in a 2D-bifurcation diagram over gradients of nutrient supply point (S) and feeding
583 rate of a parasite, P_1 (f_{P_1}). The (a)symmetry in inter- and intra-specific competition involved governs single
584 infection (via competitive exclusion: P_1 [blue] or P_2 [purple] only), coinfection (orange), priority effects
585 (gray), or no infection (yellow). (B – F) Sample dynamics for one or two starting densities of P_1 and P_2 .

586 **Figure 4:** *Elements of coinfection (coexistence) in the 2PIEi model.* (A-B) Equilibrial densities
587 along a gradient of nutrient supply (S) of (A) one single parasite, P_1 (blue region, tiny dash, left panel) or
588 the other, P_2 (purple, large dash, right) or (B) by both parasites (coinfection in orange) for a fixed feeding
589 rate of P_1 ($f_{P_1} = 7.2$). (C-D) A closer comparison of energy (E) and immune (I) quantities of each parasite
590 provides insight into outcomes of joint resource (energy) and apparent competition. (C) *Energy*
591 *competition:* Without immune attack, P_1 is the superior energy competitor ($E_1^* < E_2^*$) allowing P_1 to win
592 (*sensu* the R^* rule). Mortality from immune activation weaken P_1 's competitive ability, allowing P_2 to
593 become the superior energy competitor ($E_{1,I}^* > E_{2,I}^*$). (D) *Immune-mediated apparent competition:* Immune
594 cells proliferate when their minimum energy-parasite requirement is met (EP_1^* : gray dotted; EP_2^* : dashed).
595 The winner of apparent competition (higher I_j^*) supports more immune cells (here: less resistant P_1). Red
596 box: Conditions promoting coinfection.

597 **Figure 5:** *Priority effects (founder control) in the 2PIEi model using assembly rules.* (A-B)
598 Equilibrial densities along a gradient of nutrient supply (S) of (A) one parasite, P_1 (blue region, tiny dash,
599 left panel) or the other P_2 (purple, large dash, right) or (B) leading to priority effects (grey) for a fixed
600 feeding rate of P_1 ($f_{P_1} = 10.63$). (C-D) Comparison of energy (E) and immune (I) quantities with each
601 parasite singly provides insight into competitive outcomes. (C) *Energy competition:* Here, P_1 always
602 remains the superior energy competitor with ($E_1^* < E_2^*$) or without ($E_{1,I}^* < E_{2,I}^*$) immune cells. (D) *Immune-*
603 *mediated apparent competition:* Immune cells invade when the minimum energy-parasite requirement of
604 the immune cells is met (EP_1^* : gray dotted; EP_2^* : dashed). In the region of priority effects, more resistant
605 P_2 wins via apparent competition (since $I_2^* > I_1^*$). Grey box: Conditions promoting priority effects.

606 **Figure 6:** *Interpretation of coinfection (coexistence) and priority effects (alternate stable states) in*
607 *the 2PIEi model using nullclines.* (A) *Sensitivity to their niche:* Densities of energy (E) and immune cells

608 (I) at which parasites 1 (P_1) and 2 (P_2) show zero growth ($dP_j/dt = 0$). Combinations below these nullclines
609 (higher energy, less immune attack) fall in the fundamental niche of each parasite. (B) *Impacts on their*
610 *niche*: densities of parasite 1 (P_1) and 2 (P_2) below the energy nullcline ($dE/dt = 0$, yellow) or above the
611 immune ($dI/dt = 0$, green) nullcline lead to increases in both. At a given S , the outcomes of within-host
612 competition can also be visualized at the intersection of (C,F) parasite or (E,H) energy-immune cell
613 nullclines involving the (D, G) equilibrium denoting coinfection (black, closed circle: C,D,E) or priority
614 effects (white, open circle: F,G,H). (See text and Appendix S1, Tables S1,2 for more details).

615 **Figure 7:** *A mechanistic framework for within-host parasite competition, linking feedback, trait*
616 *ratios and key traits in the 2PIEi model. (A) Feedback:* Coinfection v priority effects is governed by the
617 sum of level four feedback loops (F_4); from *L-R*, two destabilizing, positive (+), interspecific competition
618 loops and two stabilizing, negative (-), intraspecific competition ones. P_i benefits from an increase in its
619 density (positive feedback, interspecific) as it (i) directly “fuels” or (ii) indirectly “starves” immune cells
620 but is restrained (negative feedback, intraspecific) by (iii) and (iv) “ P_i is attacked, P_j eats” loops (the product
621 of binary $I-P_i$ and P_j-E consumer-resource-like loops). (B) *Differences in ratios of key traits:* With some
622 rearrangement, these feedback loops correspond to ratios of key quantities made of key traits. These ratios
623 encapsulate differences in how competing parasites are (B) *sensitive to* ($\alpha_1 - \alpha_2$) and have (C) *impacts on*
624 ($\varepsilon_1 - \varepsilon_2$) immune cells and energy. Those differences in ratios can be written proportional to and measured
625 either as a combination of (D) traits or as (E) traits and minimal requirements. For instance, (E) α_j is
626 proportional to the product of killing rate of immune cell on parasite j (f_{IP_j}) and the minimal energy
627 requirement of parasite j (E_j^*), and ε_j is proportional to the per capita ‘consumption’ of energy by parasite
628 j , $f_{IP_j}(I)$, times minimal energy and parasite needed for immune activation (EP_j^*).

629 **Figure 8:** *Coinfected or not?* Assuming a competition-resistance trade-off between competitors, (A)
630 the 2D bifurcation plot of resource supply to host resources (S) and feeding rate of parasite P_1 on host energy
631 (f_{P_1}) captures divergent infection outcomes in 2PIEi (as in Fig. 3): single infection either via priority effects
632 (grey), or competitive exclusion (blue: P_1 wins; purple: P_2 wins), coinfection (orange), or no infection
633 (yellow). (B) *Priority effects* in mice parasitized by strains of a bacterium (*B. burgdorferi*), where the first
634 invader excludes the later. (C) *Competitive exclusion:* A malarial strain (P_2 ; purple) is excluded by one (P_3)

635 or *coinfects* (coexists) with another strain (P_1 ; blue). (D-F) *Coinfection community structure*: Coinfecting
636 parasites can shift relative and absolute abundance within hosts with increasing resource supply (S). (D)
637 In 2PIE_i, increasing nutrient supply favours more resistant P_2 over the superior P_1 . (E) Empirically, shifts
638 in community structure arise in mice coinfecting by two species of gastrointestinal worms (case I) and a
639 mosquito larvae infected by a microsporidian (case II). (F) Re-examination of all outcomes of competition
640 from Case II suggests that variation in infection outcomes could arise when individuals assimilate different
641 amounts of food. Small deviations among individuals could drive large variation in infection outcomes.

642 **Figure 9: Coinfection burden:** The burden of parasites that infect a host can depend on baseline
643 energy allocation to immunity (a_b). (A) vs. (B): Higher a_b squeezes parameter space for coinfection (2PIE_i,
644 induced v 2PIE_c, constitutive immunity, respectively). (C-D) It also reduces density of competing parasites.
645 Reduced burden allows the host to maintain slightly more energy for other metabolic work, potentially
646 improving host health. (E) Increasing a_b favours the superior energy competitor (more resistant P_2) over
647 the superior apparent competitor (P_1), eventually excluding it. By implication, differences in a_b can lead to
648 varying (co)infection burden among hosts.

649 **Table 1. A guide to future coinfection experiments:** The outcomes of within-host competition can
650 be tested by (A) measuring species' invasion growth rates via phenomenological models (e.g., Lotka-
651 Volterra), or (B-D) via parameterizing a model mechanistic model like those outlined in Fig. 2 – 7.
652 'Questions' outline fundamental queries surrounding causes and consequences of divergent infection
653 outcomes. 'Mechanisms' summarize the theory, and 'Relationships' shows equations or correlations that
654 can connect theory to experiments. 'Empirical Tests' provides examples of how those relationships can be
655 tested across a range of systems. Figure created using [BioRender.com](#).

656 **REFERENCES**

657

658 Amarasekare, P. (2002). Interference competition and species coexistence. *Proceedings of the Royal*
659 *Society of London. Series B: Biological Sciences*, 269(1509), 2541-2550.

660

661 Budischak, S. A., Sakamoto, K., Megow, L. C., Cummings, K. R., Urban Jr, J. F., & Ezenwa, V. O. (2015).
662 Resource limitation alters the consequences of co-infection for both hosts and parasites. *International*
663 *Journal for Parasitology*, 45(7), 455-463.

664

665 Budischak, S. A., Wiria, A. E., Hamid, F., Wammes, L. J., Kaiser, M. M., van Lieshout, L., ... & Graham,
666 A. L. (2018). Competing for blood: the ecology of parasite resource competition in human malaria–
667 helminth co-infections. *Ecology letters*, 21(4), 536-545.

668

669 Cassat, J. E., Moore, J. L., Wilson, K. J., Stark, Z., Prentice, B. M., Van de Plas, R., ... & Skaar, E. P.
670 (2018). Integrated molecular imaging reveals tissue heterogeneity driving host-pathogen
671 interactions. *Science translational medicine*, 10(432), eaan6361.

672

673 Cervi, L., MacDonald, A. S., Kane, C., Dzierszinski, F., & Pearce, E. J. (2004). Cutting edge: dendritic
674 cells copulsed with microbial and helminth antigens undergo modified maturation, segregate the antigens
675 to distinct intracellular compartments, and concurrently induce microbe-specific Th1 and helminth-specific
676 Th2 responses. *The Journal of Immunology*, 172(4), 2016-2020.

677

678 Chen, C. C., Louie, S., McCormick, B., Walker, W. A., & Shi, H. N. (2005). Concurrent infection with an
679 intestinal helminth parasite impairs host resistance to enteric *Citrobacter rodentium* and enhances
680 *Citrobacter*-induced colitis in mice. *Infection and immunity*, 73(9), 5468-5481.

681

682 Clay, P. A., Cortez, M. H., Duffy, M. A., & Rudolf, V. H. (2019). Priority effects within coinfecting hosts
683 can drive unexpected population-scale patterns of parasite prevalence. *Oikos*, 128(4), 571-583.

684

685 Cressler, C. E., Nelson, W. A., Day, T., & McCauley, E. (2014). Disentangling the interaction among host
686 resources, the immune system and pathogens. *Ecology letters*, *17*(3), 284-293.

687

688 De Roode, J. C., Helinski, M. E., Anwar, M. A., & Read, A. F. (2005). Dynamics of multiple infection and
689 within-host competition in genetically diverse malaria infections. *The American Naturalist*, *166*(5), 531-
690 542.

691

692 Devevey, G., Dang, T., Graves, C. J., Murray, S., & Brisson, D. (2015). First arrived takes all: inhibitory
693 priority effects dominate competition between co-infecting *Borrelia burgdorferi* strains. *BMC*
694 *microbiology*, *15*(1), 61.

695

696 Ezeamama, A. E., Friedman, J. F., Olveda, R. M., Acosta, L. P., Kurtis, J. D., Mor, V., & McGarvey, S. T.
697 (2005). Functional significance of low-intensity polyparasite helminth infections in anemia. *The Journal of*
698 *infectious diseases*, *192*(12), 2160-2170.

699

700 Ezenwa, V. O. (2021). Co-infection and nutrition: integrating ecological and epidemiological perspectives.
701 In *Nutrition and Infectious Diseases* (pp. 411-428). Humana, Cham.

702

703 Ezenwa, V. O., Etienne, R. S., Luikart, G., Beja-Pereira, A., & Jolles, A. E. (2010). Hidden consequences
704 of living in a wormy world: nematode-induced immune suppression facilitates tuberculosis invasion in
705 African buffalo. *The American Naturalist*, *176*(5), 613-624.

706

707 Ezenwa, V. O., & Jolles, A. E. (2011). From host immunity to pathogen invasion: the effects of helminth
708 coinfection on the dynamics of microparasites. *Integrative and comparative biology*, *51*(4), 540-551.

709

710 Fellous, S., & Koella, J. C. (2009). Infectious dose affects the outcome of the within-host competition
711 between parasites. *The American Naturalist*, *173*(6), E177-E184.

- 712
- 713 Fenton, A., & Perkins, S. E. (2010). Applying predator-prey theory to modelling immune-mediated, within-
714 host interspecific parasite interactions. *Parasitology*, *137*(6), 1027-1038.
- 715
- 716 Freckleton, R. P., & Watkinson, A. R. (2000). Designs for greenhouse studies of interactions between
717 plants: an analytical perspective. *Journal of Ecology*, *88*(3), 386-391.
- 718
- 719 Fuess, L. E., Weber, J. N., den Haan, S., Steinel, N. C., Shim, K. C., & Bolnick, D. I. (2021). Between-
720 population differences in constitutive and infection-induced gene expression in threespine
721 stickleback. *Molecular Ecology*, *30*(24), 6791-6805.
- 722
- 723 Galli, F., Varani, M., Lauri, C., Silveri, G. G., Onofrio, L., & Signore, A. (2021). Immune cell labelling and
724 tracking: implications for adoptive cell transfer therapies. *EJNMMI radiopharmacy and chemistry*, *6*, 1-19.
- 725
- 726 Graham, A. L. (2008). Ecological rules governing helminth–microparasite coinfection. *Proceedings of the*
727 *National Academy of Sciences*, *105*(2), 566-570.
- 728
- 729 Griffiths, E. C., Pedersen, A. B., Fenton, A., & Petchey, O. L. (2011). The nature and consequences of
730 coinfection in humans. *Journal of Infection*, *63*(3), 200-206.
- 731
- 732 Griffiths, E. C., Fairlie-Clarke, K., Allen, J. E., Metcalf, C. J. E., & Graham, A. L. (2015). Bottom-up
733 regulation of malaria population dynamics in mice co-infected with lung-migratory nematodes. *Ecology*
734 *letters*, *18*(12), 1387-1396.
- 735
- 736 Grainger, T. N., Levine, J. M., & Gilbert, B. (2019). The invasion criterion: a common currency for
737 ecological research. *Trends in ecology & evolution*, *34*(10), 925-935.
- 738
- 739 Gruner, D. S., Kolekar, A., McLaughlin, J. P., & Strong, D. R. (2009). Host resistance reverses the outcome

- 740 of competition between microparasites. *Ecology*, 90(7), 1721-1728.
- 741
- 742 Guzmán-Franco, A. W., Clark, S. J., Alderson, P. G., & Pell, J. K. (2009). Competition and co-existence of
743 *Zoophthora radicans* and *Pandora blunckii*, two co-occurring fungal pathogens of the diamondback moth,
744 *Plutella xylostella*. *Mycological research*, 113(11), 1312-1321.
- 745
- 746 Halliday, F. W., Umbanhowar, J., & Mitchell, C. E. (2018). A host immune hormone modifies parasite
747 species interactions and epidemics: insights from a field manipulation. *Proceedings of the Royal Society*
748 *B*, 285(1890), 20182075.
- 749
- 750 Halliday, F. W., Penczykowski, R. M., Barrès, B., Eck, J. L., Numminen, E., & Laine, A. L. (2020).
751 Facilitative priority effects drive parasite assembly under coinfection. *Nature Ecology & Evolution*, 4(11),
752 1510-1521.
- 753
- 754 Hart, S. P., Freckleton, R. P., & Levine, J. M. (2018). How to quantify competitive ability. *Journal of*
755 *Ecology*, 106(5), 1902-1909.
- 756
- 757 Hite, J. L., & Cressler, C. E. (2018). Resource-driven changes to host population stability alter the evolution
758 of virulence and transmission. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological*
759 *Sciences*, 373(1745), 20170087.
- 760
- 761 Holt, R. D., Grover, J., & Tilman, D. (1994). Simple rules for interspecific dominance in systems with
762 exploitative and apparent competition. *The American Naturalist*, 144(5), 741-771.
- 763
- 764 Holt, R. D. (1977). Predation, apparent competition, and the structure of prey communities. *Theoretical*
765 *population biology*, 12(2), 197-229.
- 766
- 767 Karvonen, A., Jokela, J., & Laine, A. L. (2019). Importance of sequence and timing in parasite

- 768 coinfections. *Trends in parasitology*, 35(2), 109-118.
- 769
- 770 Karvonen, A., Savolainen, M., Seppälä, O., & Valtonen, E. T. (2006). Dynamics of *Diplostomum*
- 771 *spathaceum* infection in snail hosts at a fish farm. *Parasitology Research*, 99(4), 341-345.
- 772
- 773 Kendig, A. E., Borer, E. T., Boak, E. N., Picard, T. C., & Seabloom, E. W. (2020). Host nutrition mediates
- 774 interactions between plant viruses, altering transmission and predicted disease spread. *Ecology*, 101(11),
- 775 e03155.
- 776
- 777 Lacroix, C., Seabloom, E. W., & Borer, E. T. (2014). Environmental nutrient supply alters prevalence and
- 778 weakens competitive interactions among coinfecting viruses. *New Phytologist*, 204(2), 424-433.
- 779
- 780 Merrill, T. E. S., & Cáceres, C. E. (2018). Within-host complexity of a plankton-parasite
- 781 interaction. *Ecology*, 99(12), 2864-2867.
- 782
- 783 Leibold, M. A. (1996). A graphical model of keystone predators in food webs: trophic regulation of
- 784 abundance, incidence, and diversity patterns in communities. *The American Naturalist*, 147(5), 784-812.
- 785
- 786 Lively, C. M., de Roode, J. C., Duffy, M. A., Graham, A. L., & Koskella, B. (2014). Interesting open
- 787 questions in disease ecology and evolution. *The American Naturalist*, 184(S1), S1-S8.
- 788
- 789 Lochmiller, R. L., & Deerenberg, C. (2000). Trade-offs in evolutionary immunology: just what is the cost
- 790 of immunity?. *Oikos*, 88(1), 87-98.
- 791
- 792 Lotka, A. J. (1925). *Elements of physical biology*. Williams & Wilkins.
- 793
- 794 Mideo, N., Alizon, S., & Day, T. (2008). Linking within-and between-host dynamics in the evolutionary
- 795 epidemiology of infectious diseases. *Trends in ecology & evolution*, 23(9), 511-517.

796

797 Moret, Y., & Schmid-Hempel, P. (2000). Survival for immunity: the price of immune system activation for
798 bumblebee workers. *Science*, 290(5494), 1166-1168.

799

800 Pásztor, L., Botta-Dukát, Z., Magyar, G., Czárán, T., & Meszéna, G. (2016). *Theory-based ecology: a*
801 *Darwinian approach*. Oxford University Press.

802

803 Puccia, C. J., & Levins, R. (1991). Qualitative modeling in ecology: loop analysis, signed digraphs, and
804 time averaging. In *Qualitative simulation modeling and analysis* (pp. 119-143). New York, NY: Springer
805 New York.

806

807 Råberg, L., De Roode, J. C., Bell, A. S., Stamou, P., Gray, D., & Read, A. F. (2006). The role of immune-
808 mediated apparent competition in genetically diverse malaria infections. *The American Naturalist*, 168(1),
809 41-53.

810

811 Ramesh, A., & Hall, S. R. (2023). Niche theory for within-host parasite dynamics: Analogies to food web
812 modules via feedback loops. *Ecology Letters*, 26(3), 351-368.

813

814 Restif, O., & Graham, A. L. (2015). Within-host dynamics of infection: from ecological insights to
815 evolutionary predictions. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological*
816 *Sciences*, 370(1675), 20140304.

817


818

819 Smith, V. H. (2014). Nutrient supply differentially alters the dynamics of co-infecting phytoviruses. *New*
820 *Phytologist*, 204(2), 265-267.

821


822 Susi, H., Barres, B., Vale, P. F., & Laine, A. L. (2015). Co-infection alters population dynamics of
823 infectious disease. *Nat Commun* 6: 5975.

- 824
- 825 Tilman, D. (1982). *Resource competition and community structure* (No. 17). Princeton university press.
- 826
- 827 Tombak, K. J., Budischak, S. A., Hauck, S., Martinez, L. A., & Rubenstein, D. I. (2020). The non-invasive
828 measurement of faecal immunoglobulin in African equids. *International Journal for Parasitology:
829 Parasites and Wildlife*, 12, 105-112.
- 830
- 831 Vogels, C. B., Rückert, C., Cavany, S. M., Perkins, T. A., Ebel, G. D., & Grubaugh, N. D. (2019). Arbovirus
832 coinfection and co-transmission: A neglected public health concern?. *PLoS biology*, 17(1), e3000130.
- 833
- 834 Volterra, V. (1926). Fluctuations in the abundance of a species considered
835 mathematically. *Nature*, 118(2972), 558-560.
- 836
- 837 Zuk, M., & Stoehr, A. M. (2002). Immune defense and host life history. *The American Naturalist*, 160(S4),
838 S9-S22.

A. COINFECTED OR NOT?


What within-host factors favour or undermine coinfection?
e.g., Timing of infection results in coinfection, single infection (via priority effects/ exclusion), or clearance

Clay 2019; Devevey 2015

B. COMMUNITY STRUCTURE


During coinfection, why may one parasite become more abundant?
e.g., Nutrient supply or resources can shift this 'community structure' of parasites within hosts.

Budischak 2015; Fellous & Koelle 2009

C. COINFECTION BURDEN

Why do some hosts present higher burden of coinfecting parasites?
e.g., Variation in immune response leads to varied infection burden in hosts

Fuoss 2021


D.**GENERAL THEORY OF COINFECTION**

Within-host models of parasite competition

2 Parasite – host
energy - 2PE

Exploitative competition


A.



2 Parasite – host
immune cells - 2PI

Apparent competition

B.




Parasite competition along a single niche dimension, i.e., (A) energy-mediated exploitative competition (2PE), or (B) immune-mediated apparent competition (2PI), ensures exclusion when parasites grow exponentially. Adding direct interference competition (grey box) enables coinfection and priority effects.

2 Parasite –
2 host energy

2P2E Resource Ratio


C.



2 Parasite –
2 immune cells

2P2I Immune Ratio

D.




(C) Exploitation of two energy resources (2P2E) in resource ratio competition, or (D) apparent competition for two types of immune cells, i.e., 'immune ratio' (2P2I), enables coinfection and priority effects. Production of immune cells can interfere with each other (grey box).

2 Parasite – immune cells – host energy

2PIEi

Induced immunity


E.



2PIEc

Constitutive immunity

F.




Exploitative and immune-mediated apparent competition enables coinfection and priority effects (2PIE).


(E) Compared to hosts with solely induced immunity (2PIEi), (F) constitutive immunity (via fixed energy allocation; 2PIEc) reduces opportunities for coinfection and parasite burden (see text).




Outcomes of within-host parasite competition




A. Host infected by single parasite or



B. Host infected by both parasite species



C. Host energy (E)



Superior energy competitor, P_1 with no immune cell (lowest E_1^*) becomes...

Condition / criterion


Coinfection occurs between Superior resource competitor Superior apparent competitor At lower S , P_1 wins via At higher S , P_2 wins via Switch in competitive rankings? Stronger form of competition

Coinfection region


$T_2 < S < T_1$
 P_2
($E_2^* < E_{int}^* ; E_2^* < E_{int}^*$)
 P_1
($I_1^* > I_1^*$)
apparent competition (higher I^*)
resource competition (lower E^*)
yes
intra- > inter-specific competition


Coinfection requires that each parasite has a larger impact on the niche factor to which it is most sensitive

D. Immune cells (I)




...superior apparent competitor (highest I_1^*) when its EP_1^* is met


A. Host infected by single parasite 



B. Host infected by both parasite species 



C. Host energy density (E)



P_1 remains the superior energy competitor without or with immune cells ...

Condition / criterion


- Priority effects occur between
- Superior resource competitor
- Superior apparent competitor
- At lower S , P_1 wins via
- At higher S , P_2 wins via
- Switch is competitive rankings?
- Stronger form of competition

Priority effects region

- $T_1 < S < T_2$
- P_1
- ($E_{1j}^* < E_{2j}^*$)
- P_2
- ($I_1^* > I_2^*$)
- resource competition (lower E)
- apparent competition (higher I^*)
- no
- intra- > intra-specific

Priority effect requires each parasite has greatest impact on the niche to which its competitor is most sensitive









D. Immune cells density (I)




...but becomes inferior apparent competitor with immune cell (lower I)

A. Sensitivity of parasites to host niche


B. Impacts of parasites on host niche



FEEDBACK



DIFFERENCES IN KEY RATIOS



KEY TRAITS

D. Differences in key ratios written as proportional to traits only

$$\left(\frac{e_{P_1 E} f_{IP_1}}{f_{P_1}} - \frac{e_{P_2 E} f_{IP_2}}{f_{P_2}} \right) \times \left(\frac{e_{IP_1} f_{IP_1}}{f_{P_1} (I_{int}^*)} - \frac{e_{IP_2} f_{IP_2}}{f_{P_2} (I_{int}^*)} \right)$$

Killing rate, immune cell on parasite
 Cost of producing parasite I
 Parasite feeding rate
 Induced energy allocation per parasite killed by the immune response
 Immune cells supported
 Killing rate, immune cell on parasite
 per capita 'consumption' of energy by parasite
 $f_{P_j} (I_{int}^*) = f_{P_j} - e_{IP_j} f_{IP_j} I_{int}^*$

E. Differences in key ratios written as proportional to traits and minimal requirements

$$\left(f_{IP_1} E_1^* - f_{IP_2} E_2^* \right) \times \left(f_{P_1} (I) EP_{1,I}^* - f_{P_2} (I) EP_{2,I}^* \right)$$

E_j^* minimal requirement without immunity

$$E_j^* = \frac{e_{P_j I} m_{IP}}{f_{P_j}}$$

Parasite background mortality rate


$EP_{L,I}^*$ minimal EP requirement for the immune system

$$EP_{L,I}^* = \frac{e_I m_I}{e_{IP_j} f_{IP_j}}$$

Immune cells background mortality rate

Priority effects in sequential infection experiments

B.




Empirical pattern:

First arriving strain of bacteria (*B. burgdorferi*) wins competition in mice, excluding the late arriver.

Consistent explanation: 2PIE predicts that parasite with highest initial density can win in priority effects region (adapted from Devevey et al 2015).

A.



C. Single infection



Empirical pattern:

In competition, one genetically distinct malarial strain (P_2) becomes excluded (by P_3) or coinfects (with P_1).



Consistent explanation: Exclusion of P_2 is consistent with winner (P_3) having higher feeding rate.

Coexistence is consistent with P_2 having lower feeding rate (adapted from de Roode et al 2005).

Coinfection



Coinfection along resource supply



Empirical pattern: (E) Nutrient supply (S) can shift 'community structure' of parasites within hosts

Consistent explanation: (D) 2PIE predicts shifts in relative and absolute abundance towards more resistant parasite (P_2) with higher S in successful coinfections. (F) Replot of Case II for all hosts exposed to both parasites, captures divergent outcomes: no infection or clearance, ' P_1 single infection' likely at low supply (18%), ' P_2 single infection' likely at high supply (4%), coinfection where parasite densities of species are negatively correlated across nutrient supply as predicted by (D) model. (Replotting of Case I: Budischak et al 2015, Case II: Fellous & Koella 2009)





Table 1

Question

Mechanism

Relationship

Empirical Tests

A. When can competing parasites coexist?

In general, successful coinfection occurs when intra is greater than interspecific competition captured by simple phenomenological models like Lotka-Volterra competition

$$\frac{dP_i}{dt} = r_i(1 - a_{ii}P_i - a_{ij}P_j)$$



A response surface design can evaluate growth rates estimated by intra- and inter-specific competition coefficients

- Using a response surface design, infect a host with an individual parasite grown
 - alone; with a range of
 - conspecific competitor densities, and
 - interspecific competitor densities
- Measure per capita rate of parasite increase (e.g., macroparasites that multiply within hosts)
- Calculate intrinsic population growth rate (r_i) and the intraspecific (a_{ii}) and interspecific (a_{ij}) coefficients
- Quantify growth rates and validate results with models fit to time series data within-hosts (e.g., LV, Beverton-Holt model); see: Gruner 2009, Grainger 2019



B. What hinders coinfection?

↳ Priority effects

↳ Competitive exclusion

If the less resistant parasite always competes for energy (without or without immune cells) while the resistant parasite is best apparent competitor (highest r_i), then they can exhibit **priority effects**



When parasites **coinfect**, dose does not change final outcome, despite varying initial P_1 and constant initial P_2 . With **priority effects**, sufficiently high initial density determines winner.

- ↳ **Testing priority effects:** 1) Set up a dose-dependent infection assay where dose of one parasite is varied keeping the other constant with single infection controls. 2) Measure parasite densities over time and/or immune cells and nutritional status to delineate mechanism (e.g., superior resource v resistant competitor as in Fig. 4).

- ↳ **Testing competitive exclusion:** 1) The above experiment can also yield exclusion. 2) Alternately, exclusion can be traced by varying quantifiable traits that govern competitive ability, e.g., foraging rates of parasites. 3) Measure pairwise competition of two or more parasite strains with different feeding rates over time (Fig 7C).

C. How does nutrient enrichment mediate community structure?

Nutrient supply to hosts mediates densities of within-host energy and immunity, and hence relative and absolute densities of parasites. Increasing nutrient supply favours the resistant but superior energy competitor (P_2) over the less resistant but superior apparent competitor (P_1).

Outcomes of within-host competition



Nutrient supply can shift 'community structure' of parasites within hosts from **no infection** → P_1 wins → **coinfection** → P_2 wins

- Raise hosts that are i) singly infected, and ii) coinfectd along a nutrient supplement gradient (e.g., food enriched with nitrogen, iron, etc.).
- Measure probability of infection outcomes (Fig. 8C), and/or parasite densities, immune cells and nutritional status over time (Budechak 2015).
- With single infection data measure minimum resource requirements of parasites and immune cells that establish the energy-immune trade-off (Fig. 4D-E) between competing parasites (R^* rule).
- Alternately, field observations could correlate parasite densities to host resource or immune measurements to infer mechanism; see: Tombak 2021, Ezenwa 2010



D. How does constitutive immunity hinder co-infection?

Larger baseline allocation of energy to immunity (a_i) → higher immune response. Higher immune response reduces parasite burden ($P_1 + P_2$) that allows the host to maintain slightly higher energy (E) for other metabolic work.



Greater immune cell density (due to a_i) → ↓ opportunity for coinfection → ↓ and excludes resistant P_2 freeing up energy for metabolic needs. Investment in immunity without compensatory intake leads to host death.

Effect of constitutive immunity on burden: Expose hosts with differences in constitutive immunity, i.e., differences in immune resistance, to multiple parasite strains. Hosts should have a higher probability of coinfections v single infections with no / low constitutive immunity.

Cost of immune maintenance: Expose hosts to inactivated parasites or stimulate immune system (e.g., LPS beads) under starvation. Lack of compensatory nutritional intake can affect host survival, condition and reproduction. Differences between control and infected can estimate cost of immune maintenance; see: Moret & Schmid-Hempel 2000

