Susceptibility across host species is independent of dietary protein to

carbohydrate ratios

Twitter summary: No role of host diet in susceptibility to a novel viral pathogen

across host species

Impact Statement: A successful host shift of a parasite from one susceptible

species to a novel host can be influenced by many ecological factors. Changes in

host diet can alter the immune response and outcomes of host–parasite

interactions and could potentially alter the outcome of a virus host shift. To

investigate, we infected 27 species of Drosophilidae with an RNA virus (DCV)

across three food types with differing protein to carbohydrate ratios. We then

looked at pathogen loads and survival of infected hosts compared to uninfected

controls. Changes in the ratio of protein to carbohydrate did not alter

susceptibility to DCV across host species.

Abstract

The likelihood of a successful host shift of a parasite to a novel host

species can be influenced by environmental factors that can act on both the host

and parasite. Changes in nutritional resource availability have been shown to

alter pathogen susceptibility and the outcome of infection in a range of systems.

Here we examined how dietary protein to carbohydrate altered susceptibility in

a large cross infection experiment. We infected 27 species of Drosophilidae with

an RNA virus on three food types of differing protein to carbohydrate ratios. We

then measured how viral load and mortality across species was affected by

changes in diet. We found that changes in the protein:carbohydrate in the diet

did not alter the outcomes of infection, with strong positive inter-species

correlations in both viral load and mortality across diets, suggesting no species

by diet interaction. Mortality and viral load were strongly positively correlated,

and this association was consistent across diets. This suggests changes in diet

may give consistent outcomes across host species, and may not be universally

important in determining host susceptibility to pathogens.

Introduction

A key driver of pathogen host shifts – where a pathogen jumps from one host

species to another – is environmental change (Hoberg & Brooks, 2015; Carlson *et

al.*, 2020). For a host shift to successfully occur a novel host must first be exposed

to a parasite, which must then be able to replicate and successfully infect the

host, before sufficient onward transmission (Woolhouse *et al.*, 2005). Ecological

factors can therefore influence the likelihood of host shifts by altering species

distributions and abundances making encounters more likely, or by acting as

stressors that alter physiological factors including immunity or virulence. The

main ecological factor studied has been temperature, which can have

asymmetrical impacts on hosts and parasites and potentially alter the likelihood

of host shifts (Brooks & Hoberg, 2007; Hoberg & Brooks, 2015; Kirk *et al.*, 2018;

Roberts *et al.*, 2018). The role of other ecological traits such as resource

availability, humidity, population density and geographical range, or within host

ecological traits such as metabolic rate, have been less well studied in explaining

the outcomes of host shifts, despite an increasing understanding of the role such

factors play in effecting the outcomes of host parasite interactions (Blanford &

Thomas, 1999; Harvell *et al.,* 2002; Ponton *et al.,* 2013; Hayman *et al.,* 2016;

Cumnock *et al.,* 2018).

Nutrition can shape the outcome of host-parasite interactions through its ability

to moderate both parasite virulence and host resistance (Ponton *et al.,* 2011,

2013; Pike *et al.,* 2019). The nutritional resources of a host can impact its ability

to resist infection as immune responses are thought to be costly to both maintain

and activate (Kraaijeveld & Godfray, 1997; Lochmiller & Deerenberg, 2000;

McKean *et al.,* 2008; Cotter *et al.,* 2011; Kutzer & Armitage, 2016; Knutie *et al.,*

2017). Nutrition is known to have long term consequences, with developmental

nutritional status being shown to have latent or even trans-generational effects

on immune responses (in *Drosophila*: Fellous & Lazzaro, 2010; Savola *et al.,*

2020b and reviewed in Grueber *et al.,* 2018). Hosts can also show behavioural

modifications in feeding upon infection; parasite-induced anorexia is thought to

be an adaptive host response (Ayres & Schneider, 2009; Rao *et al.,* 2017). In

some cases hosts actively increase the consumption of certain nutrients in their

diet for example, the African armyworm – *S. exempta* upon infection with a

baculovirus displays macronutrient self-medication (Povey *et al.,* 2009).

Nutrition may constrain the amount of investment that a host can allocate to an

energetically demanding immune response (Kraaijeveld & Godfray, 1997;

Lochmiller & Deerenberg, 2000; Cotter *et al.,* 2011; Knutie *et al.,* 2017), and

coping with costs associated with a parasite burden if infection does become

established (Sheldon & Verhulst, 1996). A suboptimal nutritional status may lead

a host to be unable to suppress or tolerate a parasite challenge they may

otherwise have been able to resist; or have reduced fitness from a trade off in

resources with life history traits (Kraaijeveld & Godfray, 1997; Lochmiller &

Deerenberg, 2000; Cotter *et al.*, 2011; Knutie *et al.*, 2017).

From a parasite perspective infecting a host of suboptimal nutritional status may

mean they encounter a weaker immune response and therefore infection and

establishment is easier (Siva-Jothy & Thompson, 2002). However, once

established the parasite may encounter its own resource limitations due to

competition with an already depleted host, causing suboptimal growth and

potentially affecting onward transmission. Therefore, predicting the outcome of

the interaction between nutrition, host immunity and subsequent resistance is

complex as the effects on the two parties may be divergent (Bedhomme *et al.*,

2004).

Multiple life history traits are moderated by resource availability, with condition

dependency across reproductive traits, aging and lifespan (Lee *et al.*, 2008;

Maklakov *et al.*, 2009; Camus *et al.*, 2017; Henry & Colinet, 2018; Henry *et al.*,

2020). Laboratory experiments on dietary restriction, where individuals

experienced a reduction in nutrition without inducing malnutrition

(differentiated from Calorie Restriction) have been found to extend life span in a

range of organisms (Weindruch & Walford, 1982; Klass, 1983; Anderson *et al.*,

2003; Nakagawa *et al.*, 2012). The effects of dietary restriction appear to be

explained by resource-mediated trade-offs between longevity and reproductive

effort (but see review by (Moatt *et al.*, 2020)). Geometric frameworks – the use of

artificial diets with known compositions of specific nutrients that develop an

understanding of dimensional nutrient space – have been used to examine the

consequences of different ratios of macronutrients across a range of

organisms(Simpson & Raubenheimer, 1995, 2011; Raubenheimer & Simpson,

1999). In *Drosophila* it was found different life-history traits were optimized at

different protein-carbohydrate intakes (Lee *et al.*, 2008; Skorupa *et al.*, 2008;

Fanson *et al.*, 2009; Jensen *et al.*, 2015). Across multiple species, low protein to

carbohydrate ratios reduce reproductive rates but maximise lifespan (Nakagawa

et al., 2012; Le Couteur *et al.*, 2016). However, individuals with diets higher in

protein and lower in carbohydrates have greater reproductive rates but shorter

life spans. When given a choice of diet, individuals have been shown to optimise

reproduction over lifespan (Bunning *et al.*, 2016). Host dietary frameworks have

been used to examine effects on bacterial pathogens (Povey *et al.*, 2009; Cotter *et*

al., 2019; Savola *et al.*, 2020b; Wilson *et al.*, 2020), viral pathogens (Lee *et al.*,

2006; Povey *et al.*, 2014), and individual aspects of immunity and gene

expression (Cotter *et al.*, 2011, 2019; Keaton Wilson *et al.*, 2019). In particular,

studies of viral infection in insects have found that high dietary protein leads to

increased resistance (Lee *et al.*, 2006) indicating there may be higher protein

costs of resistance.

To investigate the effect that host diet has on the likelihood of a pathogen host

shift into different host species we infected 27 species of Drosophilidae with

Drosophila C Virus (DCV) fed on three diets with varying ratios of protein to

carbohydrates but comparable calorie content. We then measured the change in

viral load and host mortality across these different diets. DCV is a positive sense

RNA virus in the family *Dicistroviridae*. DCV was isolated from *D. melanogaster*

although has also been detected in the closely related *D. simulans* (Christian,

1987), and in the wild it is thought to be transmitted faecal-orally (Jousset *et al.*,

1972). Infection of DCV by inoculation is highly pathogenic in adult flies causing

increased mortality rates, metabolic and behavioural changes and nutritional

stress in the midgut, causing similar pathologies to those seen in starvation

(Christian, 1987; Arnold *et al.*, 2013; Chtarbanova *et al.*, 2014; Vale & Jardine,

2017). DCV shows specific tissue tropism in *D. melanogaster*, with infection of

the heart tissue, fat body, visceral muscle cells around the midgut and food

storage organ (crop) causing reduced defecation, food blockage and

dehydration/starvation (Ferreira *et al.*, 2014). Infection progresses in a similar

manner following both oral or septic inoculation, with the same tissues

ultimately becoming infected (Cherry & Perrimon, 2004; Arnold *et al.*, 2013;

Chtarbanova *et al.*, 2014; Ferreira *et al.*, 2014). If hosts are in a nutritional

environment that allows for investment in immune function or damage repair,

they may be more able to resist, or tolerate a novel infection (Ponton *et al.*, 2011,

2013; Pike *et al.*, 2019). This could then lead to different outcomes following a

host shift, either the host could manage to suppress the parasite or avoid

infection entirely, or could become infected and minimise parasite damage

(Lazzaro & Little, 2009; Howick & Lazzaro, 2014). Alternatively hosts may be

fully susceptible to infection, and enriched resources may act to enhance

pathogen virulence by enabling within host pathogen growth (Hall *et al.*, 2009;

Pike *et al.*, 2019). Previous work has demonstrated that following inoculation

into a novel host species, the host phylogeny is an important determinant of

susceptibility to DCV (Longdon *et al.*, 2011, 2015). The host phylogeny explains a

large proportion of the variation in DCV virulence (mortality) and viral load

(75% and 67% respectively) with high virulence being associated with high viral

loads (Longdon *et al.*, 2015). One of the fundamental steps needed for a

successful host shift is the ability of a pathogen to infect a novel host. Here we

ask if the nutritional environment alters the susceptibility to DCV following a

shift into a range of novel host species, and whether such patterns are consistent

across species.

Methods

Diet preparation

Three different cornmeal diets were used (*Supplementary of species used and*

food type). The standard cornmeal diet used in our lab comprised a 1:10 protein

to carbohydrate ratio and became our "Medium" - protein: carbohydrate ratio

diet treatment. We also developed two further diets that were approximately

isocaloric, a low protein: carbohydrate food (1: 20 protein to carbohydrate) and

a high protein: carbohydrate food (1: 5 protein carbohydrate); see

supplementary for full table of food recipes nutrient breakdown. These were

based around previous findings that suggested that in *D. melanogaster* lifespan

was maximized on a protein: carbohydrate ratio of around 1:16, and fitness -

measured as lifetime egg production at a ratio of 1:4 (Lee *et al.*, 2008). All diets

were manipulated by altering the dextrose and yeast amounts whilst

maintaining as close as possible the same calorie content at 142 Calories g/100

ml. Yeast was manipulated as it provides the majority of the protein as well as

other non-caloric nutritional requirements (Piper, 2017). Values were confirmed

using the Drosophila Dietary Composition Calculator (Lesperance & Broderick,

2020).

Figure 1. Schematic of the experimental set up: males from 27 species of

Drosophilidae were housed on three foods with different protein: carbohydrate

ratios before being inoculated with DCV or a control for a survival assay. Flies

were also inoculated with DCV and sampled immediately (day 0) or 2 days post

infection to measure the change in RNA viral load. For each treatment

(control/virus or day 0/day 2) there were three replicates, where each replicate

was a vial of flies (number of flies per vial described below)

Viral Infections

Twenty-seven different species of Drosophilidae were maintained in multi

generation populations, in Drosophila stock bottles (Fisherbrand) on 50 ml of

their respective food medium at 22°C and 70% relative humidity with a 12-hour

light-dark cycle (See *Supplementary for species and food*). Each day, two vials of

0-1 day old male flies were randomly assigned to one of three potential food

types; low, medium or high, protein: carbohydrate ratio. The mating status of

flies was not controlled as some species may reach sexual maturity before

collection. We used male flies only for this study to remove any potential effect of

sex. Flies were kept on their respective food treatments for 5 days, and tipped

onto fresh vials of food every day (Broderick & Lemaitre, 2012; Blum *et al.*,

2013). After 5 days of acclimatisation on their food treatment flies were

experimentally infected with DCV. These collections and inoculations were

carried out over three replicate blocks, with each block being completed over

consecutive days (Figure 1). The order that the species were infected was

randomized each day, as was food treatment for each species.

We used Drosophila C virus (DCV) strain B6A (Longdon *et al.*, 2018), which is

derived from an isolate collected from *D. melanogaster* in Charolles, France

(Jousset *et al.*, 1972). The virus was prepared as described previously (Longdon

et al., 2013). Briefly, DCV was grown in Schneider's Drosophila line 2 cells and

the Tissue Culture Infective Dose 50 (TCID50) per ml was calculated using the

Reed-Muench end-point method. Flies were anesthetized on CO_2 and inoculated

using a 0.0125 mm diameter stainless steel needle that was bent to a right angle

~0.25mm from the end (Fine Science Tools, CA, USA). The bent tip of the needle

was dipped into the DCV solution (TCID50 = 6.32×10^9) and pricked into the

pleural suture on the thorax of the flies (Longdon *et al.*, 2015). We selected this

route of infection as oral inoculation has been shown to lead to stochastic

infection outcomes in *D. melanogaster*, with injection producing a more

reproducible infection, that has been found to follow a similar course to an oral

infection, with the same tissues ultimately becoming infected by both methods

(Cherry & Perrimon, 2004; Chtarbanova *et al.*, 2014; Ferreira *et al.*, 2014;

Merkling & van Rij, 2015). One vial of inoculated flies was immediately snap

frozen in liquid nitrogen to provide a time point zero samples to be used as a

reference sample to control for relative viral dose. The second vial of flies were

infected and then placed back into a new vial of their respective food treatment.

After 2 days (+/- 1 hour) flies were snap frozen in liquid nitrogen. This time

point was chosen based on previous studies that show a clear increase in viral

growth but little mortality at 2 days post infection (Longdon *et al.*, 2015; Roberts

et al., 2018). Each experimental block contained a day 0 and day 2 replicate for

each species, at each diet (27 species × 3 diet treatments × 3 experimental

blocks). In total, we quantified viral load in 7580 flies in 474 biological replicates

(biological replicate = change in viral load from day 0 to day 2 post-infection),

with a mean of 16 flies per replicate (range across species = 8-28).

Survival

In order to measure the effect of diet on virulence we also carried out a survival

assay where mortality was recorded following infection. The same infection

protocol was carried out as above; one vial of flies was infected with DCV whilst

the other was injected using a clean virus free needle dipped in *Drosophila*

Ringer's solution (Sullivan *et al.*, 2000) (Figure 1). Flies were maintained in vials

as described above and tipped onto their respective fresh food every 2 days. The

number of dead flies was counted every day for 21 days. The survival assay was

carried out across three blocks with infections carried out over consecutive days,

to obtain a control and infected vial per species each day. Treatment (virus or

control) and the order in which fly species were inoculated were randomized

between blocks. Diet was randomized across days, so for a given food type a

control and viral infected vial was completed each day, and this was repeated

over consequent days until there was a control and infected for each species on

each food type (27 species × 2 treatments (control or challenged) × 3 diet

treatments × 3 experimental blocks). In total, we measured mortality in 9222

flies with a mean of 20 flies per replicate (range across species: 6–30 flies).

Measuring the change in viral load

The change in RNA viral load from day 0 to day 2-post infection was measured

using quantitative Reverse Transcription PCR (qRT-PCR). Frozen flies were

homogenised in Trizol reagent (Invitrogen) using a bead homogeniser for 30

seconds (Bead Ruptor 24; Omni international) and stored at -80℃ for later

extraction. Total RNA was extracted from the Trizol homogenised flies in a

chloroform isopropanol extraction, reverse-transcribed with Promega GoScript

reverse transcriptase and random hexamer primers. Viral RNA load was

expressed relative to the endogenous control housekeeping gene *RpL32*. Primers

were designed to match the homologous sequence in each species and crossed

an intron-exon boundary so will only amplify mRNA. The primers in *D.*

melanogaster were *RpL32* qRT-PCR F (5'-TGCTAAGCTGTCGCACAAATGG -3') and

RpL32 qRT-PCR R (5'- TGCGCTTGTTCGATCCGTAAC -3') (see supplementary

table and Longdon *et al.*, 2011). DCV primers were 599F (5'-GACACTGCCTTT

GATTAG-3') and 733R (5'CCCTCTGGGAACTAAATG-3') as previously described

(Longdon *et al.*, 2015). Two qRT-PCR reactions (technical replicates) were

carried out per sample with both the viral and endogenous control primers, with

replicates distributed across plates in a randomised block design. qRT-PCR was

performed on an Applied Biosystems StepOnePlus system using Sensifast Hi-Rox

Sybr kit (Bioline) with the following PCR cycle: 95°C for 2 min followed by 40

cycles of: 95°C for 5 sec followed by 60°C for 30 sec. Each qRT-PCR plate

contained four standard samples. A linear model was used to correct the cycle

threshold (Ct) values for differences between qRT-PCR plates. Samples where

the technical replicates had Ct values more than 2 cycles apart after plate

correction were repeated. To estimate the change in viral load, we first

calculated ΔCt as the difference between the cycle thresholds of the DCV qRT-

PCR and the RpL32 endogenous control. For each species the viral load of day 2

flies relative to day 0 flies was calculated as $2^{-\Delta\Delta Ct}$; where ΔΔCt = ΔCt day0 – ΔCt

day2. The ΔCt day 0 and ΔCt day 2 is a pair of ΔCt values from a day 0 biological

replicate and a day 2 replicate.

Diet	Ratio Protein: Carb	Cornmeal (g)	Dextrose (g)	Yeast (g)	Agar (g)	Nipagin (ml)	dH20 (L)	Calories per 100ml
High	1:5	176	131.2	84	22	29	1	142.60
Medium	1:10	176	176	38	22	29	1	142.30
Low	1:20	176	203	10	22	29	1	142.02

Table 1: Ingredients for the experimental diet treatments. Amounts given

are enough to produce ~100 vials of food, with calculated calories per 100ml.

Effect of Body Size

To account for any potential differences in body size between species, we

measured wing length as a proxy for body size (Huey *et al.*, 2006). During the

collections for the viral load assay males of each species were collected and

immediately stored in ethanol. Subsequently, wings were removed and

photographed under a dissecting microscope. Using ImageJ software (version

1.48) the length of the IV longitudinal vein from the tip of the proximal segment

to where the distal segment joins vein V was recorded, and the mean taken for

each species, overall there was a mean of 28 wings measured per species (range

20–35).

Host phylogeny

The host phylogeny was inferred as described previously (Longdon *et al.*, 2015)

using seven genes (mitochondrial; *COI, COII*, ribosomal; *28S* and nuclear; A*dh,*

SOD, Amyrel, RpL32). Publicly available sequences were downloaded from

Genbank or were Sanger sequenced. In total we had *RpL32* sequences for all 27

species, *28S* from 24 species, *Adh* from 24 species, *Amyrel* from 15 species, *COI*

from 27 species, *COII* from 27 species and *SOD* from 12 species. For each gene

the sequences were aligned in Geneious (version 9.1.8) (Kearse *et al.*, 2012)

using the global alignment setting, with free end gaps and a cost matrix of 70%

similarity. The phylogeny was inferred using BEAST (v1.10.4) (Drummond *et al.*,

2012), with genes partitioned into three groups; mitochondria, ribosomal and

nuclear, with their own molecular clock models. A random starting tree was

used, with a relaxed uncorrelated lognormal molecular clock. Each of the

partitions used a HKY substitution model with a gamma distribution of rate

variation with 4 categories and estimated base frequencies. Additionally, the

mitochondrial and nuclear data sets were partitioned into codon positions 1+2

and 3, with unlinked substitution rates and base frequencies across codon

positions. The tree-shape prior was set to a birth-death process. The BEAST

analysis was run twice to ensure convergence for 1000 million MCMC

generations sampled every 10000 steps. On completion the MCMC process was

examined using the program Tracer (version 1.7.1) (Rambaut *et al.*, 2014) to

ensure convergence and adequate sampling, and the constructed tree was then

visualised using FigTree (v1.4.4) (Rambaut, 2006).

Statistical analysis

We used phylogenetic mixed models to look at the effects of host relatedness on

mortality and viral load across the three diet treatments. We fitted all models

using a Bayesian approach in the R package MCMCglmm version 2.29 (Hadfield,

2010) in RStudio (R version 3.5.1) (R Development Core Team, 2005). We used a

multivariate model with mortality of the controls, mortality of the virus infected

flies and viral load at each of the diets as the response variables. Mortality was

calculated as the mean portion of flies alive each day for each vial. The model

took the following form:

$y_{hit} = \beta_{1:t} + wingsize\beta_{2:t} + u_{p:ht} + e_{hit}$

Where y is the change in viral load of the ith biological replicate of host species h,

for trait t. β are the fixed effects, with β_1 being the intercepts for each trait and β_2

being the effect of wing size. U_p are the random phylogenetic species effects and e

the model residuals. The models were also run with a species-specific

component independent of phylogeny ($u_{s:ht}$) that allow us to estimate the

proportion of variation that is not explained by the host phylogeny (v_s) (Longdon

et al., 2011). The main model was run without this term as it struggled to

separate the phylogenetic and non-phylogenetic terms. Our main model

therefore assumes a Brownian motion model of evolution (Felsenstein, 1973).

The random effects and the residuals are assumed to be multivariate normal

with a zero mean and a covariance structure $\mathbf{V_p} \otimes \mathbf{A}$ for the phylogenetic affects

and $\mathbf{V_e} \otimes \mathbf{I}$ for the residuals ($\otimes$ here is the Kronecker product). $\mathbf{A}$ is the

phylogenetic relatedness matrix, $\mathbf{I}$ is an identity matrix and the $\mathbf{V}$ are 9×9

(co)variance matrices describing the (co)variances between viral load, mortality

in virus infected, and mortality in controls each at the 3 different diet levels. The

phylogenetic covariance matrix, $\mathbf{V_p}$ – describes the inter-specific variances in

each trait and the inter-specific covariances between them. The residual

covariance matrix, $\mathbf{V_e}$ describes the within-species variance that includes both

any actual within-species effects and also any measurement or experimental

error. The off-diagonal elements in $\mathbf{V_e}$ (the covariances) are unable to be

estimated because no vial has multiple measurements – so were set to zero. The

MCMC chain was run for 1300 million iterations with a burn-in of 30 million

iterations and a thinning interval of 1 million. Results were tested for sensitivity

to the use of different priors by being run with different prior structures (see

supplementary R code), which gave qualitatively similar results. We also ran

models with the data subset into viral load and mortality that gave similar

results. All confidence intervals (CI's) reported are 95% highest posterior

density intervals. In order to test for the interaction between diet and species we

calculated correlations between traits from the variance covariance matrix from

the diet:species random effect ($u_{p:\mathrm{h}t}$). If the correlations between traits are close

to one and there is no change in the means or the variance, it would suggest that

there is no species-by-diet interaction. We confirmed our experimental design

and sample sizes had sufficient power to detect effects by down sampling a

similar dataset (Roberts *et al.*, 2018).

Results

In order to investigate the effect that host diet may have on the likelihood of

virus host shifts we quantified DCV viral load in 27 species of Drosophilidae that

had been housed on three different diets (Fig.2). Viral loads differed between

species, with a billion times more virus in the most susceptible compared to the

least susceptible species, consistent with previous studies (Longdon *et al.*, 2015;

Roberts *et al.*, 2018). Viral loads were highly repeatable, with the inter-specific

phylogenetic component (v_p), explaining a high proportion of the variation in

viral load across diets with little within species or measurement error (v_e)

(Repeatability = v_p /(v_p + v_e); Low = 0.92 (95% CI: 0.86, 0.96); Medium = 0.90

(95% CI: 0.84,0.96); High = 0.83 (95% CI: 0.75, 0.92).

375
376
Figure 2. (A). Phylogeny of the 27 Drosophilidae host species. Scale bar is
the number of substitutions per site. **(B) Change in RNA viral load (log₂) for**
the host species infected with DCV across the three different diets of
differing protein: carbohydrate ratios. Individual points are plotted with a
small x-axis jitter and represent the change in viral load between day 0 and day
2-post infection. Panels are ordered as on the tips of the phylogeny in (A).
383

We also partitioned the inter-specific variance into that which can be explained

by a Brownian motion model of evolution on the host phylogeny (v_p), and a

species-specific component independent of the phylogeny (v_s). The proportion of

the between species variance that can be explained by the phylogeny can then be

calculated, using $v_p/(v_p + v_s)$ (Freckleton *et al.*, 2002), and can be equated to the

phylogenetic heritability or Pagel's lambda (Pagel, 1999; Housworth *et al.*, 2004).

We found that the host phylogeny explained a modest amount of the inter-

specific variation in viral loads across diets, however these estimates had broad

confidence intervals (Low = 0.20 (95% CI: 3.5 x10^{-6}, 0.63); Medium = 0.34 (95%

CI: 2.0 x 10^{-6}, 0.80); High = 0.51 (95% CI: 3.2 x 10^{-6}, 0.88), due to the model

struggling to separate out the phylogenetic and non-phylogenetic components.

In order to examine if the susceptibility of species responded in the same or

different ways to the changes in diet we examined viral load across the different

protein: carbohydrate ratios. We found strong positive inter-specific correlations

between viral loads across diet treatments suggesting the species are responding

in similar ways to the changes in ratios (Table 2). There was a decline in the

between species variance in the high diet compared to low and medium – but

this was not significantly different– (v_p: Low =77.13 (95% CI: 35.09, 125.50);

Medium =82.33 (95% CI: 37.55, 135.26); High =45.59 (95% CI: 19.61, 76.39) and

mean viral loads were similar across the diets (Low = 11.4 (95% CI: 5.3, 17.7);

Medium = 10.6 (95% CI: 3.6, 16.6); High = 10.6 (95% CI: 3.6, 16.7). Residual

variance did not differ significantly between treatments (Low = 6.45 (95% CI:

4.87, 8.04); Medium = 8.23 (95% CI: 6.45, 10.35); High = 8.32 (95% CI: 6.54,

10.6).

		Interspecific Correlation	95% CIs
Viral load	Low - Medium	0.93	0.85, 0.98
	Medium - High	0.83	0.66, 0.96
	Low - High	0.80	0.63, 0.96
Survival in virus challenged	Low - Medium	0.93	0.81, 0.99
	Medium - High	0.88	0.71, 0.99
	Low - High	0.90	0.73, 0.99

Table 2. Inter-specific correlations between viral load and mortality

measures across the different diet treatments.

As similar pathogen loads can cause different levels of harm to their hosts (Roy &

Kirchner, 2000; Boots, 2008; Råberg *et al.*, 2009) we examined if virus induced

mortality differed across diets over a 20 day period after viral challenge (Fig. 3).

We found differences in the virulence (mortality) caused by DCV between host

species, with some species seeing no apparent change in mortality over the

experimental period compared to sham infected controls, (e.g. *S. pattersoni* and

D. saltans), whilst other species show higher susceptibility with up to 50% of

flies dead by day 10 post infection (e.g. *D. simulans* and *D. melanogaster*). As with

the viral load data we calculated the repeatability of survival in these virus

infected flies which was high in all cases (Repeatability; Low = 0.90 (95% CI:

0.78, 0.98); Medium = 0.87 (95% CI: 0.71,0.97); High = 0.98 (95% CI: 0.85, 1.00).

We also calculated the proportion of between species variance that can be

explained by the phylogeny for the virus infected flies (Phylogenetic effect: Low

= 0.16 (95% CI: 2.58 x10^{-6}, 0.62); Medium = 0.18 (95% CI: 5.75 x 10^{-7}, 0.78); High

= 0.32 (95% CI: 7.75 x 10^{-8}, 0.87), which – like the viral load data – had broad

confidence intervals due to the model struggling to separate the phylogenetic

and non-phylogenetic components.

We found strong positive inter-specific correlations between the survival of

virus challenged flies across the diets, suggesting the species are responding in

similar ways to the dietary changes (Table 2). Among species variance in

mortality of virus infected flies was consistent across diets (Low = 0. 18 (95% CI:

0.07, 0.31); Medium = 0.16 (95% CI: 0.04, 0.30); High = 0.12 (95% CI: 0.04, 0.23)

as was the mean mortality (Low = 0.64 (95% CI: 0.47, 0.82); Medium = 0.58

(95% CI: 0.38, 0.75); High = 0.65 (95% CI: 0.47, 0.82). The residual variance was

also consistent across the diets (Low = 0.02 (95% CI: 0.01, 0.03); Medium = 0.02

(95% CI: 0.01, 0.04); High = 0.02 (95% CI: 0.01, 0.03).

Figure 3. Mortality in 27 species of Drosophilidae housed on three different diets of varying protein: carbohydrate ratios. High- red circles, Medium - blue crosses and Low- green triangles and either control stabbed (dashed line) or virally challenged with DCV (solid lines). Panels are labelled in line with the tips in Figure 2A.

We found that there were strong positive correlations between mortality and RNA viral load (interspecific correlations between viral load and survival of virus infected flies: Low = 0.89 (95% CI: 0.78, 0.98); Medium = 0.85 (95% CI: 0.67, 0.97); High = 0.67 (95% CI: 0.35, 0.90). To confirm that these differences are due to mortality caused by the virus rather than intrinsic differences in the

survivorship of the different species, we also inoculated flies with a control

solution. There was far less mortality in the controls than the virus infected flies

(Fig. 3). There was inter-specific variation in control mortality (Low = 0.18 (95%

CI: 0.01, 0.59); Medium = 0.43 (95% CI: 0.01,0.76); High = 0.55 (95% CI: -0.72,

1.00) but this was not significantly correlated with survival of the virus infected

flies (survival of control versus virus infected on: Low = -0.11 (95% CI: -0.92,

0.75); Medium = 0.34 (95% CI: -0.48 0.97); High = 0.12 (95% CI: -0.82, 0.89). We

found no effect of wing length as a proxy for body size, (mean: -0.05, 95% CI: -

0.13, 0.05).

Discussion

We found dietary treatments of differing protein to carbohydrate ratios did not

alter the outcome of infection in 27 species of Drosophilidae infected with DCV.

We found strong positive inter-specific correlations across diets in both viral

load and mortality, suggesting that the species are in general responding in

similar ways to nutritional changes. Despite there being among species variation

in susceptibility, changes in diet did not affect viral loads, nor did they alter the

likelihood of surviving an infection. We found strong positive correlations

between mortality and viral load on each of the diets, suggesting the amount of

harm caused to a host is a result of virus accumulation within the infected host.

Both mounting and maintaining an immune response requires energy and

nutrients. During an acute immune challenge the provisioning of nutrients may

become more demanding for a host, with pathogen induced malabsorption

through damage to or obstruction of digestive tissues (Lochmiller & Deerenberg,

2000). DCV is known to cause severe pathology of the tissues of the digestive

tract with subsequent accumulation of food in the crop (food storage organ) and

obstruction in the intestine (Chtarbanova *et al.*, 2014). These physical symptoms

alter an infected hosts energy stores with infected flies showing significantly

reduced glycogen and triglyceride levels three to four days post infection

(Chtarbanova *et al.*, 2014). DCV infected flies also increase in body mass, with a

reduced food intake and reduced metabolism, suggesting that they experience

increased water retention (Thomas-Orillard, 1984; Arnold *et al.*, 2013;

Chtarbanova *et al.*, 2014). We therefore hypothesised that changing the ratio of

protein to carbohydrate in the diet may alter outcome of infection, and as species

may all have their own "optimal diet", that species may respond in different ways

to such changes. However, this does not appear to be the case.

Geometric frameworks for nutrition were developed in response to the fact that

what is "optimal" will depend on a balance of particular nutrients in the

organism and trait being investigated (Simpson & Raubenheimer, 1995; Archer

et al., 2009; Cotter *et al.*, 2019). For example mice infected with *Salmonella* were

found to survive better on diets containing a higher ratio of protein to

carbohydrate (Peck *et al.*, 1992). As were army worm caterpillars infected with

bacteria, with survival increasing with dietary protein, suggesting high protein

requirements are associated with bacterial resistance (Povey *et al.*, 2009). A

recent study used 10 different protein: carbohydrate diets and challenged flies

with *Pseudomonas entomophila* bacteria (Savola *et al.*, 2020a). Survival on low

protein diets was found to be lower in infected flies and suggested protein was

important for survival during infection. This study also monitored lifespan and

reproduction in flies, and found that regardless of injury and infection, dietary

restriction extended lifespan and reduced reproductive output (Savola *et al.*,

2020a). One potential mechanism of the interaction of diet and infection has

been suggested in research using a model host-pathogen system *in vivo* and *in*

vitro (Wilson *et al.*, 2020)*.* Caterpillars of *S. littoralis* challenged with the bacteria

X. nematophila in vivo and on high dietary protein had slower bacterial growth

with higher survival*.* When this was combined with *in vitro* experiments the

results suggested this was driven by the osmolality of the hosts' blood

(hemolymph) being altered by an increase in solutes in the high protein diets

slowing the bacterial growth (Wilson *et al.*, 2020).

Further research on the mechanistic basis of dietary effects on resistance is

needed for other pathogen taxa, including viruses. Immunity to DCV inoculation

in *D. melanogaster* has been reported to involve the JAK/STAT and Imd

pathways, and potentially phagocytosis (Van Rij *et al.*, 2006; Zhu *et al.*, 2013;

Lamiable *et al.*, 2016). Additionally, the RNAi pathway is a key antiviral defence

mechanism in *Drosophila* and DCV appears to have evolved to suppress this

response (Van Rij *et al.*, 2006). Although we find no interaction between dietary

protein:carbohydrate and susceptibility, the multifaceted immune response to

DCV may be energetically costly and other nutrients may interact with the ability

of a host to allocate resources between an immune response, damage repair and

the maintenance of homeostasis (Lochmiller & Deerenberg, 2000; Zuk & Stoehr,

2002; Schmid-Hempel, 2005; Sadd & Siva-Jothy, 2006). For example, lipid and

fats have been associated with *D. melanogaster* response to DCV viral infection;

peroxisomes were found to be required for host defense to infection, through

their primary function in lipid metabolism (Aubert *et al.*, 1995). The lipid level

across our diets was held constant, but this may be a potential area for further

study. There has been an increased use of a chemically defined (holidic) diet in

order to manipulate individual nutrients present in fly diets (Lee *et al.*, 2006).

Exome matched diets have been shown to alleviate trade-offs in fecundity and

longevity (Piper *et al.*, 2017). A possible extension of this would be to look at the

effect of matching diets to transcriptional changes during infection, and seeing if

this alleviates (or exacerbates) pathology.

Changes in diet have been shown to alter pathogen susceptibility in a number of

systems. We hypothesised that changes in diet could alter the potential outcomes

of virus host shifts. However, we found that overall changes in the ratio of

protein to carbohydrate did not alter susceptibility to DCV across host species in

this instance. This suggests dietary protein to carbohydrate ratios are not

universally important in determining susceptibility to pathogens. It is unclear if

the lack of studies showing no effect of diet reflect publication biases or whether

our model system is unusual. However, it highlights the need to examine the

importance of diet in explaining susceptibility to pathogens across a broad range

of host and pathogen taxa.

References
Anderson, R.M., Latorre-Esteves, M., Neves, A.R., Lavu, S., Medvedik, O., Taylor, C.,
et al. 2003. Yeast Life-Span Extension by Calorie Restriction Is Independent
of NAD Fluctuation. *Science (80-.).* **302**: 2124–2126.
Archer, C.R., Royle, N., South, S., Selman, C. & Hunt, J. 2009. Nutritional geometry
provides food for thought. *Journals Gerontol. - Ser. A Biol. Sci. Med. Sci.* **64**:
956–959.
Arnold, P.A., Johnson, K.N. & White, C.R. 2013. Physiological and metabolic
consequences of viral infection in Drosophila melanogaster. *J. Exp. Biol.* **216**:
3350–3357.
Aubert, A., Goodall, G. & Dantzer, R. 1995. Compared effects of cold ambient
temperature and cytokines on macronutrient intake in rats. *Physiol. Behav.*
57: 869–873. Elsevier.
Ayres, J.S. & Schneider, D.S. 2009. The Role of Anorexia in Resistance and
Tolerance to Infections in Drosophila. *PLoS Biol.* **7**: e1000150.
Bedhomme, S., Agnew, P., Sidobre, C. & Michalakis, Y. 2004. Virulence reaction
norms across a food gradient. *Proc. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci.* **271**: 739–44.
Blanford, S. & Thomas, M.B. 1999. Host thermal biology: the key to
understanding host-pathogen interactions and microbial pest control? *Agric.*
For. Entomol. **1**: 195–202.
Blum, J.E., Fischer, C.N., Miles, J. & Handelsman, J. 2013. Frequent replenishment
sustains the beneficial microbiome of Drosophila melanogaster. *MBio* **4**: 1–8.
Boots, M. 2008. Fight or learn to live with the consequences? *Trends Ecol. Evol.*
23: 248–250.
Broderick, N.A. & Lemaitre, B. 2012. Gut-associated microbes of Drosophila
melanogaster. *Gut Microbes* **3**: 307–321.
Brooks, D.R. & Hoberg, E.P. 2007. How will global climate change affect parasite-
host assemblages? *Trends Parasitol.* **23**: 571–574.
Bunning, H., Bassett, L., Clowser, C., Rapkin, J., Jensen, K., House, C.M., *et al.* 2016.
Dietary choice for a balanced nutrient intake increases the mean and
reduces the variance in the reproductive performance of male and female
cockroaches. *Ecol. Evol.* **6**: 4711–4730.
Camus, M.F.F., Fowler, K., Piper, M.W.D. & Reuter, M. 2017. Sex and genotype
effects on nutrient-dependent fitness landscapes in Drosophila
melanogaster. *Proc. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci.* **284**: 20172237.
Carlson, C.J., Albery, G.F., Merow, C., Trisos, C.H., Zipfel, C.M., Eskew, E.A., *et al.*
2020. Climate change will drive novel cross-species viral transmission.
bioRxiv 2020.01.24.918755.
Cherry, S. & Perrimon, N. 2004. Entry is a rate-limiting step for viral infection in a
Drosophila melanogaster model of pathogenesis. *Nat. Immunol.* **5**: 81–87.
Christian, P.D. 1987. Studies on Drosophila C and A viruses in Australian
populations of Drosophila melanogaster. Australian National University.
Chtarbanova, S., Lamiable, O., Lee, K.-Z., Galiana, D., Troxler, L., Meignin, C., *et al.*
2014. Drosophila C virus systemic infection leads to intestinal obstruction. *J.*
Virol. **88**: 14057–69.
Cotter, S.C., Reavey, C.E., Tummala, Y., Randall, J.L., Holdbrook, R., Ponton, F., *et al.*
2019. Diet modulates the relationship between immune gene expression
and functional immune responses. *Insect Biochem. Mol. Biol.* **109**: 128–141.
Cotter, S.C., Simpson, S.J., Raubenheimer, D. & Wilson, K. 2011. Macronutrient

balance mediates trade-offs between immune function and life history
traits. *Funct. Ecol.* **25**: 186–198.
Cumnock, K., Gupta, A.S., Lissner, M., Chevee, V., Davis, N.M. & Schneider, D.S.
2018. Host Energy Source Is Important for Disease Tolerance to Malaria.
Curr. Biol. **28**: 1635-1642.e3.
Drummond, A., Suchard, M., Xi, E.D. & Rambaut, A. 2012. Bayesian phylogenetics
with BEAUti and the BEAST 1.7. Molecular Biology And Evolution 29.
Fanson, B.G., Weldon, C.W., Pérez-Staples, D., Simpson, S.J. & Taylor, P.W. 2009.
Nutrients, not caloric restriction, extend lifespan in Queensland fruit flies
(Bactrocera tryoni). *Aging Cell* **8**: 514–523. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.
Fellous, S. & Lazzaro, B.P. 2010. Larval food quality affects adult (but not larval)
immune gene expression independent of effects on general condition. *Mol.*
Ecol. **19**: 1462–1468.
Felsenstein, J. 1973. Maximum-likelihood estimation of evolutionary trees from
continuous characters. *Am. J. Hum. Genet.* **25**: 471–492.
Ferreira, Á.G., Naylor, H., Esteves, S.S., Pais, I.S., Martins, N.E. & Teixeira, L. 2014.
The Toll-Dorsal Pathway Is Required for Resistance to Viral Oral Infection in
Drosophila. *PLoS Pathog.* **10**.
Freckleton, R.P., Harvey, P.H. & Pagel, M. 2002. Phylogenetic analysis and
comparative data: a test and review of evidence. *Am. Nat.* **160**: 712–26.
Grueber, C.E., Gray, L.J., Morris, K.M., Simpson, S.J. & Senior, A.M. 2018.
Intergenerational effects of nutrition on immunity: a systematic review and
meta-analysis. *Biol. Rev. Camb. Philos. Soc.* **93**: 1108–1124.
Hadfield, J.D. 2010. MCMC methods for multi-respoinse generalized linear mixed
models: The MCMCglmm R package. *J. Stat. Softw.* **33**: 1–22.
Hall, S.R., Knight, C.J., Becker, C.R., Duffy, M.A., Tessier, A.J. & Cáceres, C.E. 2009.
Quality matters: Resource quality for hosts and the timing of epidemics.
Ecol. Lett. **12**: 118–128.
Harvell, C.D., Mitchell, C.E., Ward, J.R., Altizer, S., Dobson, A.P., Ostfeld, R.S., *et al.*
2002. Climate warming and disease risks for terrestrial and marine biota.
Science **296**: 2158–62.
Hayman, D.T.S., Pulliam, J.R.C., Marshall, J.C., Cryan, P.M. & Webb, C.T. 2016.
Environment, host, and fungal traits predict continental-scale white-nose
syndrome in bats. *Sci. Adv.* **2**: e1500831.
Henry, Y. & Colinet, H. 2018. Microbiota disruption leads to reduced cold
tolerance in Drosophila flies. *Sci. Nat.* **105**: 59. The Science of Nature.
Henry, Y., Overgaard, J. & Colinet, H. 2020. Dietary nutrient balance shapes
phenotypic traits of Drosophila melanogaster in interaction with gut
microbiota. *Comp. Biochem. Physiol. Part A Mol. Integr. Physiol.* **241**: 110626.
Hoberg, E.P. & Brooks, D.R. 2015. Evolution in action: climate change,
biodiversity dynamics and emerging infectious disease. *Philos. Trans. R. Soc.*
Lond. B. Biol. Sci. **370**: 20130553–20130553. The Royal Society.
Housworth, E.A., Martins, E.P. & Lynch, M. 2004. The phylogenetic mixed model.
Am. Nat. **163**: 84–96.
Howick, V.M. & Lazzaro, B.P. 2014. Genotype and diet shape resistance and
tolerance across distinct phases of bacterial infection. *BMC Evol. Biol.* **14**.
Huey, R.B., Moreteau, B., Moreteau, J.-C., Gibert, P., Gilchrist, G.W., Ives, A.R., *et al.*
2006. Sexual size dimorphism in a Drosophila clade, the D. obscura group.
Zoology **109**: 318–330.

Jensen, K., McClure, C., Priest, N.K. & Hunt, J. 2015. Sex-specific effects of protein
and carbohydrate intake on reproduction but not lifespan in *Drosophila*
melanogaster. *Aging Cell* **14**: 605–615.
Jousset, F.X., Plus, N., Croizier, G. & Thomas, M. 1972. [Existence in Drosophila of
2 groups of picornavirus with different biological and serological
properties]. *C. R. Acad. Sci. Hebd. Seances Acad. Sci. D.* **275**: 3043–6.
Kearse, M., Moir, R., Wilson, A., Stones-Havas, S., Cheung, M., Sturrock, S., *et al.*
2012. Geneious Basic: an integrated and extendable desktop software
platform for the organization and analysis of sequence data. *Bioinformatics*
28: 1647–1649.
Keaton Wilson, J., Ruiz, L. & Davidowitz, G. 2019. Dietary Protein and
Carbohydrates Affect Immune Function and Performance in a Specialist
Herbivore Insect (Manduca sexta). *Physiol. Biochem. Zool.* **92**: 58–70.
Kirk, D., Jones, N., Peacock, S., Phillips, J., Molnár, P.K., Krkošek, M., *et al.* 2018.
Empirical evidence that metabolic theory describes the temperature
dependency of within-host parasite dynamics. *PLOS Biol.* **16**: e2004608.
Klass, M.R. 1983. A method for the isolation of longevity mutants in the
nematode Caenorhabditis elegans and initial results. *Mech. Ageing Dev.* **22**:
279–286.
Knutie, S.A., Wilkinson, C.L., Wu, Q.C., Ortega, C.N. & Rohr, J.R. 2017. Host
resistance and tolerance of parasitic gut worms depend on resource
availability. *Oecologia* **183**: 1031–1040.
Kraaijeveld, A.R. & Godfray, H.C. 1997. Trade-off between parasitoid resistance
and larval competitive ability in Drosophila melanogaster. *Nature* **389**: 278–
80.
Kutzer, M.A.M. & Armitage, S.A.O. 2016. The effect of diet and time after bacterial
infection on fecundity, resistance, and tolerance in *Drosophila melanogaster*.
Ecol. Evol. **6**: 4229–4242..
Lamiable, O., Arnold, J., de Faria, I.J. da S., Olmo, R.P., Bergami, F., Meignin, C., *et al.*
2016. Analysis of the Contribution of Hemocytes and Autophagy to
Drosophila Antiviral Immunity. *J. Virol.* **90**: 5415–5426.
Lazzaro, B.P. & Little, T.J. 2009. Immunity in a variable world. *Philos. Trans. R.*
Soc. Lond. B. Biol. Sci. **364**: 15–26.
Le Couteur, D.G., Solon-Biet, S., Cogger, V.C., Mitchell, S.J., Senior, A., De Cabo, R., *et*
al. 2016. The impact of low-protein high-carbohydrate diets on aging and
lifespan. *Cell. Mol. Life Sci.* **73**: 1237–1252.
Lee, K.., Cory, J.., Wilson, K., Raubenheimer, D. & Simpson, S.. 2006. Flexible diet
choice offsets protein costs of pathogen resistance in a caterpillar. *Proc. R.*
Soc. B Biol. Sci. **273**: 823–829.
Lee, K.P., Simpson, S.J. & Wilson, K. 2008. Dietary protein-quality influences
melanization and immune function in an insect. *Funct. Ecol.* **22**: 1052–1061.
Lesperance, D.N.A. & Broderick, N.A. 2020. Meta-analysis of Diets Used in
Drosophila Microbiome Research and Introduction of the Drosophila
Dietary Composition Calculator (DDCC). *G3 Genes, Genomes, Genet.*
g3.401235.2020.
Lochmiller, R.L. & Deerenberg, C. 2000. Trade-offs in evolutionary immunology:
Just what is the cost of immunity? *Oikos* **88**: 87–98.
Longdon, B., Cao, C., Martinez, J. & Jiggins, F.M. 2013. Previous Exposure to an
RNA Virus Does Not Protect against Subsequent Infection in Drosophila

melanogaster. *PLoS One* **8**: e73833.
Longdon, B., Day, J.P., Alves, J.M., Smith, S.C.L., Houslay, T.M., McGonigle, J.E., *et al.*
2018. Host shifts result in parallel genetic changes when viruses evolve in
closely related species. *PLoS Pathog.* **14**: e1006951.
Longdon, B., Hadfield, J.D., Day, J.P., Smith, S.C.L., McGonigle, J.E., Cogni, R., *et al.*
2015. The Causes and Consequences of Changes in Virulence following
Pathogen Host Shifts. *PLOS Pathog.* **11**: e1004728.
Longdon, B., Hadfield, J.D., Webster, C.L., Obbard, D.J. & Jiggins, F.M. 2011. Host
phylogeny determines viral persistence and replication in novel hosts. *PLoS*
Pathog. **7**: e1002260.
Maklakov, A.A., Hall, M.D., Simpson, S.J., Dessmann, J., Clissold, F.J., Zajitschek, F.,
et al. 2009. Sex differences in nutrient-dependent reproductive ageing.
Aging Cell **8**: 324–330.
McKean, K.A., Yourth, C.P., Lazzaro, B.P. & Clark, A.G. 2008. The evolutionary
Merkling, S.H. & van Rij, R.P. 2015. Analysis of resistance and tolerance to virus
infection in Drosophila. *Nat. Protoc.* **10**: 1084–97.
Moatt, J.P., Savola, E., Regan, J.C., Nussey, D.H. & Walling, C.A. 2020. Lifespan
Extension Via Dietary Restriction: Time to Reconsider the Evolutionary
Mechanisms? *BioEssays* 1900241.
Nakagawa, S., Lagisz, M., Hector, K.L. & Spencer, H.G. 2012. Comparative and
meta-analytic insights into life extension via dietary restriction. *Aging Cell*
11: 401–409.
Pagel, M. 1999. Inferring the historical patterns of biological evolution. *Nature*
401: 877–884.
Peck, M.D., Babcock, G.F. & Alexander, J.W. 1992. The role of protein and calorie
restriction in outcome from Salmonella infection in mice. *J. Parenter. Enter.*
Nutr. **16**: 561–565.
Pike, V.L., Lythgoe, K.A. & King, K.C. 2019. On the diverse and opposing effects of
nutrition on pathogen virulence. *Proc. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci.* **286**: 20191220.
Piper, M.D. 2017. Using artificial diets to understand the nutritional physiology of
Drosophila melanogaster. *Curr. Opin. Insect Sci.* **23**: 104–111.
Piper, M.D.W., Soultoukis, G.A., Blanc, E., Mesaros, A., Herbert, S.L., Juricic, P., *et al.*
2017. Matching Dietary Amino Acid Balance to the In Silico-Translated
Exome Optimizes Growth and Reproduction without Cost to Lifespan. *Cell*
Metab. **25**: 610–621.
Ponton, F., Wilson, K., Cotter, S.C., Raubenheimer, D. & Simpson, S.J. 2011.
Nutritional immunology: A multi-dimensional approach. *PLoS Pathog.* **7**:
e1002223.
Ponton, F., Wilson, K., Holmes, A.J., Cotter, S.C., Raubenheimer, D. & Simpson, S.J.
2013. Integrating nutrition and immunology: a new frontier. *J. Insect Physiol.*
59: 130–7.
Povey, S., Cotter, S.C., Simpson, S.J., Lee, K.P. & Wilson, K. 2009. Can the protein
costs of bacterial resistance be offset by altered feeding behaviour? *J. Anim.*
Ecol. **78**: 437–446.
Povey, S., Cotter, S.C., Simpson, S.J. & Wilson, K. 2014. Dynamics of macronutrient
self-medication and illness-induced anorexia in virally infected insects. *J.*
Anim. Ecol. **83**: 245–255.
R Development Core Team. 2005. *R: A Language and Environment for Statistical*
Computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria.

Råberg, L., Graham, A.L. & Read, A.F. 2009. Decomposing health: tolerance and
resistance to parasites in animals. *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci.* **364**: 37–
49.
Rambaut, A. 2006. FigTree v1.4.4. Available:
http://tree.bio.ed.ac.uk/software/figtree/.
Rambaut, A., Suchard, M., Xie, D. & Drummond, A. 2014. Tracer v1.6.
https://github.com/beast-dev/tracer/releases/tag/v1.7.1
Rao, S., Schieber, A.M.P., O'Connor, C.P., Leblanc, M., Michel, D. & Ayres, J.S. 2017.
Pathogen-Mediated Inhibition of Anorexia Promotes Host Survival and
Transmission. *Cell* **168**: 503-516.e12.
Raubenheimer, D. & Simpson, S.J. 1999. Integrating nutrition: A geometrical
approach. In: *Entomologia Experimentalis et Applicata*, pp. 67–82. Wiley.
Roberts, K.E., Hadfield, J.D., Sharma, M.D. & Longdon, B. 2018. Changes in
temperature alter the potential outcomes of virus host shifts. *PLOS Pathog.*
14: e1007185.
Roy, B.A. & Kirchner, J.W. 2000. Evolutionary Dynamics of Pathogen Resistance
and Tolerance. *Evolution (N. Y).* **54**: 51–63.
Sadd, B.M. & Siva-Jothy, M.T. 2006. Self-harm caused by an insect's innate
immunity. *Proc. Biol. Sci.* **273**: 2571–4.
Savola, E., Montgomery, C., Waldron, F.M., Monteith, K., Vale, P. & Walling, C.A.
2020a. Testing evolutionary explanations for the lifespan benefit of dietary
restriction in Drosophila melanogaster. *bioRxiv*, doi:
https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.18.159731.
Savola, E., Vale, P. & Walling, C.A. 2020b. Larval diet affects adult reproduction
but not survival regardless of injury and infection stress in Drosophila
melanogaster. *bioRxiv* 1–29. https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.16.342618
Schmid-Hempel, P. 2005. Evolutionary ecology of insect immune defenses. *Annu.*
Rev. Entomol. **50**: 529–51.
Sheldon, B.C. & Verhulst, S. 1996. Ecological immunology: costly parasite
defences and trade offs in evolutionary ecology. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* **11**: 317–
321.
Simpson, S.J. & Raubenheimer, D. 1995. The geometric analysis of feeding and
nutrition: a user's guide. Pergamon.
Simpson, S.J. & Raubenheimer, D. 2011. The nature of nutrition: A unifying
framework. *Aust. J. Zool.* **59**: 350–368.
Siva-Jothy, M.T. & Thompson, J.J.W. 2002. Short-term nutrient deprivaion affects
immune function. *Physiol. Entomol.* **27**: 206–212.
Skorupa, D.A., Dervisefendic, A., Zwiener, J. & Pletcher, S.D. 2008. Dietary
composition specifies consumption, obesity, and lifespan in *Drosophila*
melanogaster. *Aging Cell* **7**: 478–490.
Sullivan, W., Ashburner, M. & Hawley, R.S. 2000. Drosophila protocols. *Drosoph.*
Protoc. Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory Press.
Thomas-Orillard, M. 1984. Modifications of Mean Ovariole Number, Fresh Weight
of Adult Females and Developmental Time in DROSOPHILA
MELANOGASTER Induced by Drosophila C Virus. *Genetics* **107**: 635–63544.
Vale, P.F. & Jardine, M.D. 2017. Infection avoidance behavior: Viral exposure
reduces the motivation to forage in female Drosophila melanogaster. *Fly*
(Austin). **11**: 3–9.
Van Rij, R.P., Saleh, M.C., Berry, B., Foo, C., Houk, A., Antoniewski, C., *et al.* 2006.

The RNA silencing endonuclease Argonaute 2 mediates specific antiviral
immunity in Drosophila melanogaster. *Genes Dev.* **20**: 2985–2995
Weindruch, R. & Walford, R.L. 1982. Dietary restriction in mice beginning at 1
year of age: Effect on life-span and spontaneous cancer incidence. *Science
(80-.).* **215**: 1415–1418.
Wilson, K., Holdbrook, R., Reavey, C.E., Randall, J.L., Tummala, Y., Ponton, F., *et al.*
2020. Osmolality as a Novel Mechanism Explaining Diet Effects on the
Outcome of Infection with a Blood Parasite. *Curr. Biol.* **30**: 2459–2467.
Woolhouse, M.E.J., Haydon, D.T. & Antia, R. 2005. Emerging pathogens: the
epidemiology and evolution of species jumps. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* **20**: 238–
244.
Zhu, F., Ding, H. & Zhu, B. 2013. Transcriptional profiling of Drosophila S2 cells in
early response to Drosophila C virus. *Virol. J.* **10**: 210.
Zuk, M. & Stoehr, A.M. 2002. Immune Defense and Host Life History. *Am. Nat.*
160: S9–S22.
807