Parasite virulence in coinfected hosts: the importance of infection order

Aloïs Dusuel[1*], Luc Bourbon[2*], Emma Groetz[1], Nicolas Pernet[3], Mickaël Rialland[1], Benjamin Roche[4,5],
Bruno Faivre[2], Gabriele Sorci[2#]

1. CTM - Center for Translational and Molecular Medicine, INSERM UMR 1231, Université de
Bourgogne, 21000 Dijon, France ; LabEx LipSTIC, 21000 Dijon, France

2. Biogéosciences, CNRS UMR 6282, Université de Bourgogne, 6 Boulevard Gabriel, 21000 Dijon,
France

3. Plateforme ImaFlow, Université de Bourgogne, Inserm, Institut Agro Dijon, CGFL, CHU Dijon
Bourgogne, US58 BioSanD, F-21000 Dijon, France

4. MIVEGEC, IRD, CNRS, Université de Montpellier, 34090 Montpellier, France

5. International Joint Laboratory ELDORADO, IRD/UNAM, Mérida, Yucatán, México

#corresponding author: gabriele.sorci@u-bourgogne.fr

*equal contribution

Abstract

When hosts are simultaneously infected by different pathogens, the severity of the disease might be exacerbated compared to hosts harboring single infections. The reasons underlying these changes in parasite virulence are manifold. Here, we investigated the importance for the infection outcome of order and timing of infection. We used a model of rodent coinfection between two parasites that do not compete for common resources, an intestinal nematode (*Heligmosomoides polygyrus*) and an apicomplexan protozoan (*Plasmodium yoelii*). During single infections, *H. polygyrus* induced only mild disease symptoms. *Plasmodium* produced a substantial reduction in the number of red blood cells but all mice recovered from the infection. A different picture emerged in coinfected hosts. *Heligmosomoides* maintained a profile of mostly asymptomatic infection whatever the order of the infection (first or second). On the contrary, *P. yoelii* incurred substantially higher costs in hosts that had been previously infected with *H. polygyrus* (independently of the timing of infection). We then investigated the possible reasons underlying the increase of *Plasmodium* virulence in coinfected hosts. We found that coinfected hosts were less able to control *Plasmodium* multiplication and to recover from infection-induced anemia. Coinfected hosts had similar levels of erythropoietin and similar renewal of lost red blood cells, resulting in decreased tolerance to *Plasmodium* infection. Experimental administration of erythropoietin in coinfected hosts, partially decreased the severity of disease symptoms and improved tolerance. The detoxification of free heme released during the lysis of red blood cells, and the expression of Th1 and anti-inflammatory cytokine genes were also similar between coinfected and single infected hosts. However, coinfected mice had higher proportions of regulatory T cells expressing the CTLA-4 immune checkpoint, suggesting an enhanced immunosuppressive activity of Tregs. *Plasmodium* infection also induced the exhaustion of CD8$^+$ T cells, as coinfected mice had higher proportions of both PD-1$^+$ and LAG-3$^+$ CD8$^+$ T cells, and an increase in the CD4$^+$/CD8$^+$ ratio. Overall, these results stress the importance of the order of infection as a major determinant of disease severity in coinfected hosts. We discuss the possible epidemiological and evolutionary consequences of these results.

Keywords: coinfection, helminths, *Plasmodium*, nematodes, virulence

Introduction

Coinfection is a widespread phenomenon in plants, wildlife, livestock and humans (Viney and Graham 2013), and describes the occurrence of different parasites/pathogens (hereafter we will use the term parasite as a general term) at the same time in the same individual host. Coinfection has the potential to change the two principal drivers of the infection dynamics, the within host multiplication and the between host transmission (Wait et al. 2021; Imrie et al. 2023), and therefore parasite fitness (Clay and Rudolf 2019) and virulence (i.e., infection-induced damage) (Alizon et al. 2013). During single infections, parasites might have a better access to host resources, while during coinfection, access to resources might be limited if competing parasites share the same infection site or consume the same host resources (Graham 2008; Griffiths et al. 2015). This might affect the within host multiplication rate (for parasites that do multiply within the host) and the transmission rate if coinfection reduces the number of propagules produced per unit of time. This bottom-up regulation of coinfecting parasites might also change the cost paid by the host (e.g., Szabo et al. 2024) if, for instance, the overall host resource consumption exceeds the consumption during single infections. In this case, parasite fitness can also be jeopardized if coinfection compromises the survival of the host. The regulation of the coinfection dynamics might also involve top-down mechanisms, where parasites strive to exploit the host in the face of the immune defenses deployed by the host (Graham 2008). Under this scenario, depending on the nature of the coinfecting parasites, coinfection can have protective [when, for instance, coinfecting parasites elicit similar immune effectors (Filbey et al. 2019)] or antagonistic effects on the host ability to clear the infection (Shen et al. 2019). Specifically, top-down regulation of coinfecting parasites might be compromised when different immune effectors are involved in the process of parasite clearance. Broadly speaking, this is usually the case when hosts are simultaneously infected with microparasites that elicit a Th1 immune response (e.g., viruses and protozoa) and macroparasites that induce a Th2 response (e.g., helminths) (Supali et al. 2010; Ezenwa and Jolles 2011; Ma et al. 2020).

Coinfection between micro and macroparasites is a public health issue in several countries of

the intertropical areas, given the high prevalence of helminthiases in humans and the overlap with the

endemicity of major infectious diseases, such as malaria or AIDS (Webb et al. 2012; Afolabi et al. 2021).

Coinfection between gastrointestinal helminths and malaria has attracted attention in the last decades

not only to understand if and how helminths might aggravate the severity of malaria symptoms

(Degarege et al. 2016; Kwan et al. 2018), but also to forecast the public health effect of deworming

campaigns on malaria incidence and severity (Fenton 2013; Budischak et al. 2018), or to assess the

potential effect of helminth infection on the efficacy of malaria vaccines (Su et al. 2006; Noland et al.

2010; Coelho et al. 2019). However, despite considerable effort, epidemiological studies overall report

an inconsistent pattern where coinfection can both result in protection or increased severity of malaria

symptoms (Nacher 2011; Salazar-Castañón et al. 2014; Degarege and Erko 2016). This inconsistency

can be explained by several factors related, for instance, to the species of coinfecting helminths

(Adegnika and Kremsner 2012; Hürlimann et al. 2019). Work conducted using animal models has also

reported inconsistent results, depending on mouse strains and parasite species (Segura et al. 2009;

Knowles 2011; Kolbaum et al. 2012). Here, we suggest that a previously underestimated factor shaping

the outcome of the coinfection might also be the order and timing of the infection with the two

parasites (Salazar-Castañón et al. 2018; Karvonen et al. 2019; Billet et al. 2020). In most epidemiological

studies, the order of infection is not taken into account because this information is typically not

available and might contribute to inflate the heterogeneity of the reported results.

The rationale underlying the hypothesis that order of infection is an important driver of the

coinfection dynamics rests on the observation that, when coinfecting parasites are regulated through

top-down effects, the polarization of the host immune response following the first infection (Hartgers

and Yazdanbakhsh 2006; Kotepui et al. 2023) offers a favorable ground for the subsequent infection

with the second parasite (Su et al. 2005; Craig and Scott 2017). We explored this question using a

model of coinfection with the gastrointestinal nematode *Heligmosomoides polygyrus* (hereafter Hp)

and *Plasmodium yoelii* (hereafter Py) in mice. Hp is a model species in immunoparasitology (Reynolds

et al. 2012). This nematode is a natural parasite of rodents (Gregory et al. 1992) which elicits a

canonical Th2 immune response, orchestrated by Th2 cytokines, such as IL-4, IL-5 and IL-13 (Reynolds

et al. 2012). Mice are infected when ingesting infective larvae (L3), and adult worms live in the lumen

of the small intestine where they feed on the host's intestinal tissue (Bansemir and Sukhdeo 1994). Py

is also a model species for the study of the pathogenesis of malaria and the associated immune

response (Olatunde et al. 2022). The strain 17XNL of Py produces self-resolving infections, and

although the parasitemia can reach high level, all mice recover from the infection in about four weeks.

The cycle in the vertebrate host includes an early hepatic-stage that is followed by the asexual

replication within the red blood cells (RBCs) (blood-stage); the lysis of RBCs induces anemia, the typical

symptom of malaria infection. Infection with Py stimulates the production of pro-inflammatory

cytokines, such as the interferon-gamma (IFN-γ), and therefore polarizes the immune response

towards Th1 effectors (Olatunde et al. 2022).

Therefore, given that Hp and Py do not share the same ecological niche and do not share

common resources for their replication (RBCs for Py), or survival/reproduction (intestinal lumen for

Hp), any interference between the two parasites is unlikely to be driven by bottom-up regulation

mechanisms. On the contrary, given that the two parasites elicit different immune effectors, and that

Th1 and Th2 cytokines have reciprocal inhibitory effects (Paludan 1998), top-down mechanisms are

likely candidates to drive the outcome of the coinfection in this system.

We conducted a series of experiments with the aim of exploring to what extent the order and

timing of the infection with the two parasites drives the infection dynamics and the severity of the

disease. We also explored the possible mechanisms underlying the increased disease severity in

coinfected hosts. Based on the rationale reported above, we predicted that if the polarization of the

immune response towards Th1 (in the case of Py infection) or Th2 (in the case of Hp infection) makes

the host more vulnerable to the infection with the other parasite, coinfection should aggravate the

symptoms of the disease, compared to single infections.

Materials and Methods

Ethical statement

Experiments were approved by the Comité d'éthique Grand Campus Dijon of the University of Burgundy and were authorized by the French Ministry of Higher Education and Research under the numbers 33492 and 47573.

Experimental animals and infections

C57BL/6JRj female mice (7-10 weeks old) were purchased from Janvier Labs (Le Genest-Saint-Isle, France), housed in cages containing 5 individuals under pathogen-free conditions, and maintained under a constant temperature of 24°C and a photoperiod of 12h:12h light:dark with *ad libitum* access to water and standard chow diet (A03-10, Safe, Augny, France). All mice were acclimatized to the housing conditions during, at least, 7 days prior to the start of the experiments, were monitored twice a day to check health status, and euthanized by cervical dislocation under anesthesia with isoflurane either if they reached previously defined end points (and considered as mortality events in the survival analysis) or at specific days post-infection (p.i.) for terminal collection of blood and organs (and considered as censored events in the survival analysis).

Mice were infected with *Plasmodium yoelii* 17XNL by intra-peritoneal (i.p.) injection with 5×10^5 infected red blood cells (iRBC) suspended in 0.1 ml of PBS and/or *Heligmosomoides polygyrus bakeri* by oral gavage with L3 larvae (350 larvae suspended in 0.2 ml of drinking water).

Experimental groups

Mice were randomly assigned to 8 experimental groups (15 to 20 mice per group) as described in figure 1. A control group (group 1) of mice was sham infected (i.p. injection of 0.1 ml of PBS and oral gavage with a 0.2 ml of drinking water). Two groups (groups 2 and 3) received single infections, either with Hp or Py. Five additional groups were coinfected with the two parasites according to specific orders and timings of infection. In one group, mice were simultaneously infected with the two parasites (group 4); in two groups, mice were infected first with Hp and subsequently infected with Py

either at day 7 post Hp infection, or at day 28 post Hp infection (groups 5 and 6); in two groups, mice

were first infected with Py and subsequently infected with Hp either at day 14 post Py infection, or at

day 28 post Py infection (groups 7 and 8). The timings of infection in the coinfection groups correspond

to specific stages in the life cycles of the two parasites. Day 7 and 28 post Hp infection correspond to

the stage that just precedes the emergence of the adult worms in the intestinal lumen and when the

infection has reached a chronic stage, respectively. Day 14 and day 28 post Py infection approximately

correspond to the parasitemia peak and the end of the acute phase infection, respectively. The whole

experiment was repeated twice, although not all traits were measured in all mice of the two replicates.

163
Figure 1. Schematic view of the experimental setup and groups. Non-infected (group 1) and single (Hp,
Py) infected mice (groups 2 and 3) were monitored during 35 days post-infection. One group of
coinfected mice (group 4) was simultaneously (the same day) infected with Py and Hp. The other
coinfection groups were either infected first with Hp (at day -7 or day -28) and then with Py (groups 5
and 6), or infected first with Py (at day -14 or day -28) and then with Hp (groups 7 and 8). Groups 4, 5
and 6 were monitored during 21 days post Py infection.

170
171 *Erythropoietin administration*

172
173   Mice (n = 20) were infected with Hp and at day 28 p.i. they were infected with Py. Mice were

174 then split randomly into two groups, one received an i.p. injection of 1 µg of recombinant mouse

175 erythropoietin (rEPO) (959-ME, Bio-Techne, Minneapolis, Minnesota, USA) in 200 µl of PBS at days 0,

176 2 and 4 post Py infection; the other group was injected with 200 µl of PBS only, for control.

Monitoring of health status, hematological and plasma parameters, and Py parasitemia

Mice were regularly weighed (at least three times a week) and body mass was used as an integrative marker of host health. Hematological parameters were assessed by collecting 10 µl of blood from the tail tip in 0.5 ml tubes with 1 µl of heparin (Héparine Choay® 25 000 UI/5ml, Sanofi-Aventis, Gentilly, France). These samples were immediately read with a SCIL Vet abc Plus+ hematology analyzer (Horiba Medical, Montpellier, France) to assess RBC concentration and mean globular volume. For mice with Py infection, a drop of blood was smeared on a slide and fixed with methanol. Slides were subsequently stained with a Giemsa RS solution (Carlo Erba Reagents, Val de Reuil, France) (10% v/v in phosphate buffer) for 15 minutes and rinsed with water. Infected RBCs were counted using an optical microscope under magnification x1000, and parasitemia expressed as the proportion of iRBCs.

At day 3, 14, 21 and 35 p.i. (post second infection for the coinfection groups), five mice per group were euthanized by cervical dislocation under isoflurane anesthesia, for terminal collection of total peripheral blood and organs. Given the severity of the disease symptoms, the simultaneous infection group and the two coinfection groups first infected with Hp (groups 4, 5, 6) were only monitored up to day 21 post Py infection. Plasma was separated from total blood by centrifugation (7 min 3000 rpm 4°C), aliquoted and stored at -80°C.

Plasma levels of aspartate aminotransferase (AST) and heme oxygenase-1 (HO-1) were assessed with ab263882 and ab229431 commercial ELISA kits from Abcam (Cambridge, UK), respectively. Plasma levels of mouse erythropoietin (EPO) were assessed with EM28RB commercial ELISA kit from Invitrogen™ (Carlsbad, California, USA). Plates were read with a SpectraMax iD3 multi-mode microplate reader (Molecular Devices, San Jose, California, USA).

Organ collection

Spleen was removed and weighed. About one third of the spleen was cut and immediately frozen in liquid nitrogen for RT-qPCR, and the remaining was kept on ice in PBS before the flow cytometry staining procedure. A liver slice (left lobe) was also immediately frozen in liquid nitrogen for RT-qPCR.

206 *RNA extraction and qPCR for Hmox-1, IFN-γ, IL-10 and TGF-β1 gene expression*
207
Tissues were homogenized in TRIzol™ Reagent (Invitrogen™, Carlsbad, California, USA) under

strong agitation using 0.5 mm glass beads and a Precellys® 24 Touch homogenizer (Bertin

Technologies, Montigny-le-Bretonneux, France). RNA extraction was performed following the

manufacturer's instructions. RNA concentration was measured with a NanoPhotometer® N50 (Implen,

Munich, Germany). Reverse transcription was performed with a High-Capacity cDNA Reverse

Transcription Kit (Applied Biosystems™, Foster City, California, USA) from 1.5 µg total RNA.

Quantitative PCR was performed with PowerUp™ SYBR™ Green Master Mix (Applied Biosystems™) on

a QuantStudio™ 3 Real-Time PCR System (Applied Biosystems™). We used two housekeeping genes (β-

actin and GAPDH); β-actin provided more consistent values (less intra-group variability) and therefore

we used it as the reference gene. Primer sequences are reported in the supplementary material (table

S1), and were checked for specificity using the Primer-BLAST tool (NCBI). Melt curve analysis was also

performed in all samples to check for the presence of nonspecific amplification products.

220
221 *Spectral flow cytometry*
222
Spleens were homogenized with a 70 µm cell strainer and washed two times with PBS to obtain

a single-cell suspension. RBCs were removed from suspensions with eBioscience™ RBC Lysis Buffer

(Invitrogen™) (3 min incubation at RT). Cells were counted with viability trypan blue dye and

dispatched in 96-well V bottom plates to obtain 1×10^7 live cells/well. Cells were then stained with

LIVE/DEAD™ Fixable Blue Dead Cell Stain Kit (Invitrogen™) in PBS for 30 min at 4°C, incubated in stain

buffer with BD Fc Block™ (BD Pharmingen™, Franklin Lakes, New Jersey, USA) for 15 min at RT (0.5

µg/well), and stained with surface antibodies in brilliant stain buffer (see table S2 for details on the

markers used) for 30 min at 4°C. Cells were then fixed and permeabilized with eBioscience™ Foxp3 /

Transcription Factor Staining Buffer Set (Invitrogen™) prior intracellular staining in brilliant stain buffer

(table S2) for 30 min at RT. Cells were resuspended in stain buffer, filtered with 100 µm nylon mesh

and analyzed on a 4-lasers (UV/V/B/R) Aurora™ (Cytek® Biosciences, Fremont, California, USA) spectral

flow cytometer in the ImaFlow Facility, part of the US58 BioSanD. Events were gated and analyzed with

SpectroFlo® v3.0.0 software (Cytek® Biosciences) (see figures S1 and S2 for the gating strategy).

236
237   *Statistical analyses*
238
We used general and generalized linear mixed models (GLMM) to analyze data where each

individual mouse was repeatedly sampled, using either a normal distribution or a beta distribution (i.e.,

for proportions) of errors. Mouse ID was included in these models as a random intercept. Variables do

not necessarily vary linearly with time over the course of the infection. We therefore included squared

(and cubic) time p.i. to capture these nonlinear relationships. However, polynomial regression might

provide a poor fit to the data. Therefore, we also ran general additive models (GAM) where the degrees

of freedom of the smoothing function were chosen based on the generalized cross-validation (GCV)

optimization criterion. Some variables had an asymmetrical distribution and were log-transformed to

reduce skewness and meet the model assumptions.

Differences in survival between groups were analyzed using the Kaplan Meier estimator and

significance assessed using a Log-Rank test. For coinfected mice, any mortality that had occurred

before the infection with the second parasite was considered as caused by single infections (and

therefore included as single infected individuals in the model); any effect of coinfection on survival

was, thus, assessed only after the infection with the second parasite. To increase the statistical power,

the survival analysis also included additional mice that were followed for a longer period of time (up

to day 99 p.i.) for other purposes (i.e., to assess the long-term effect of coinfection on the infection

dynamics). Therefore, the survival analysis included up to four replicated datasets.

For variables that were measured only once per individual mouse, we ran general or

generalized linear models (GLM), depending on the distribution of errors (normal or beta distribution).

Post-hoc comparisons between groups were done using LS-means with Bonferroni correction of p

values. Differences in sample size across groups reflect missing values, either due to the reaching of

the end point or to technical issues during the processing of the sample.

To simplify the interpretation of the results, we ran different sets of models, comparing

different groups. First, we compared non-infected mice versus single infections (groups 1, 2 and 3).

These models provided us with the baseline information on the intrinsic effect of each parasite when

infecting the host alone. Then, we compared single infection versus coinfection groups. This was done

separately for Py and Hp by including in the model the corresponding coinfection groups where Py and

Hp infected mice that had been previously infected with the other parasite (i.e., groups 3, 4, 5, 6 in one

model, and groups 2, 7, 8 in another model). The simultaneous infection group (group 4) was always

included in the Py model. Given that the timing of the infection did appear to have minor effects on

the response variables, we also ran models where the different coinfection groups were clustered

together (groups 4, 5 and 6; groups 7 and 8) and we compared non-infected, single infected and

coinfected hosts in the same model. Finally, we ran a model that was restricted to the coinfection

groups (excluding the simultaneous infection group) where we could assess the effect of the order of

the infection [either Hp first (groups 5 and 6), or Py first (groups 7 and 8)]. All the statistical analyses

and figures were done using SAS Studio.

275
276   **Results**

277
278   ***Severity of the disease in single and coinfected hosts***

279
280   *Body mass*

281
We analyzed body mass as percent variation relative to the body mass at the day of the sham-

infection for the control group (group 1) and the day of the infection for single and simultaneous

infection groups (groups 2, 3 and 4) or the day of the second infection for the coinfection groups

(groups 5, 6, 7 and 8). We first compared changes in body mass over time between non-infected and

single (Hp, Py) infected mice (groups 1, 2, 3). The model showed that body mass increased linearly over

time, at a similar rate for non-infected and single infected mice (table 1, fig. 2a).

Table 1. General linear mixed model investigating the changes in body mass (percent variation with respect to day 0) in non-infected and single (Hp and Py) infected mice. We report the parameter estimates with the 95% CI, degrees of freedom (df), F and p values. Mouse ID was included as a random effect to take into account the non-independence of observations for the same individual over time. N = 120 individuals and 774 observations.

Fixed effects		Estimate	95% CI	df	F	p
Treatment				2,648	0.24	0.7828
	Non-infected	0				
	Hp	-0.47	-3.13/2.20			
	Py	-0.95	-3.60/1.71			
Time		0.54	0.35/0.74	1,648	83.44	<0.0001
Squared time		-0.004	-0.01/0.001	1,648	2.80	0.095
Time*Treatment				2,648	0.12	0.8827
	Non-infected	0				
	Hp	0.007	-0.27/0.29			
	Py	-0.06	-0.33/0.22			
Squared Time*Treatment				2,648	0.88	0.4141
	Non-infected	0				
	Hp	0.0003	-0.01/0.01			
	Py	0.005	-0.003/0.01			
Random effect		Estimate	SE	z	P	
ID		16.49	2.49	6.62	<0.0001	

We then compared changes in body mass in mice that were infected with Py alone and mice that were simultaneously infected or were first infected with Hp and then with Py (groups 4, 5, 6). Although mice in the coinfection groups lost body mass from day 14 post Py infection onwards (table S3, fig. S3a), the squared time by treatment interaction was not statistically significant (table S3). Given that there was no apparent difference in the dynamics of body mass change between the coinfection groups, we ran an additional model where we compared the changes in body mass between non-infected, single Py infected and coinfected groups together (groups 4, 5 and 6). This model showed a strong effect of coinfection on changes in body mass (table 2, fig. 2b), with coinfected mice losing body mass over the course of the infection.

314 Table 2. General linear mixed model investigating the changes in body mass (percent variation with
315 respect to day 0) in non-infected, single Py infected and coinfected (Hp infecting first and simultaneous
316 infection) mice. We report the parameter estimates with the 95% CI, degrees of freedom (df), F and p
317 values. Mouse ID was included as a random effect to take into account the non-independence of
318 observations for the same individual over time. N = 196 individuals and 1009 observations.

Fixed effects		Estimate	95% CI	df	F	P
Infection				2,807	3.0	0.0503
	Non-infected	0				
	Single	-4.50	-8.2/-0.8			
	Coinfection	-1.55	-4.6/1.5			
Time		0.60	0.14/1.06	1,807	76.87	<0.0001
Squared time		-0.01	-0.03/0.01	1,807	56.88	<0.0001
Time*Infection				2,807	3.57	0.0285
	Non-infected	0				
	Single	0.88	0.23/1.53			
	Coinfection	0.47	-0.07/1.01			
Squared Time*Infection				2,807	9.72	<0.0001
	Non-infected	0				
	Single	-0.04	-0.07/-0.01			
	Coinfection	-0.05	-0.07/-0.03			
Random effect		Estimate	SE	Z	p	
ID		16.7	2.1	7.95	<0.0001	

A different picture emerged when comparing changes in body mass in mice that were infected

first with Py and then with Hp. In this case, coinfection (groups 7 and 8) slowed down the rate of body

mass gain, but did not produce a loss in body mass (table S4, fig. S3b). As the timing of infection did

not have any effect on the changes in body mass, we grouped them and ran an overall model

comparing non-infected, single Hp infected and coinfected groups (7 and 8) together. This model

confirmed the slight effect of coinfection on the dynamics of body mass change, with coinfected mice

having a slower rate of increase in body mass, but not losing mass over time (table 3, fig. 2c). Finally,

we ran a model that was only restricted to the four coinfection groups (groups 5, 6, 7 and 8) where

mice were either infected first with Hp or with Py. This model confirmed to importance of the order of

infection in shaping the dynamics of body mass (table S5, fig. 2d).

Table 3. General linear mixed model investigating the changes in body mass (percent variation with respect to day 0) in non-infected, single Hp infected and coinfected (Py infecting first) mice. We report the parameter estimates with the 95% CI, degreed of freedom (df), F and p values. Mouse ID was included as a random effect to take into account the non-independence of observations for the same individual over time. N = 155 individuals and 869 observations.

Fixed effects		Estimate	95% CI	df	F	p
Infection				2,708	1.06	0.3477
	Non-infected	0				
	Single	-0.52	-2.61/1.57			
	Coinfection	0.8	-1.042.64			
Time		0.54	0.40/0.68	1,708	86.46	<0.0001
Squared time		-0.004	-0.008/-0.0005	1,708	0.58	0.4468
Time*Infection				2,708	22.19	<0.0001
	Non-infected	0				
	Single	0.007	-0.2/0.21			
	Coinfection	-0.52	-0.70/-0.34			
Squared Time*Infection				2,708	9.50	<0.0001
	Non-infected	0				
	Single	0.0007	-0.005/0.006			
	Coinfection	0.01	0.005/0.015			
Random effect		Estimate	SE	z	P	
ID		11.96	1.62	7.37	<0.0001	

Figure 2. Changes in body mass over the course of the infection. Body mass is expressed as percent variation with respect to body mass at day 0 [for the non-infected, single (Hp, Py) infected, and simultaneous infection groups] or at the day of the second infection for the sequential coinfection groups. a) Changes in body mass for non-infected and single (Hp, Py) infected mice; b) Changes in body mass for non-infected, single Py infected and coinfected (Hp infecting first and simultaneous infection) groups; c) Changes in body mass for non-infected, single Hp infected and coinfected (Py infecting first) groups; d) Changes in body mass for coinfected groups depending on the order of the infection (Hp infecting first or Py infecting first). Dots represent the raw data, the lines represent the fit of a GLMM, and the shaded area around the line the 95% CI.

Therefore, coinfection aggravated one of the most integrative symptoms of disease severity, but the magnitude of the aggravating effect was strongly dependent on the order of the infection.

Splenomegaly

Splenomegaly (i.e., the enlargement of the spleen) is another prominent symptom of the infection with Hp or Py. We measured spleen mass at day 3, 14, 21 and 35 p.i. and confirmed that single infection induced splenomegaly of different magnitude depending on the parasite (table S6, fig. 3a). When comparing groups infected first with Hp and then with Py (plus the simultaneous infection, groups 4, 5, 6), coinfection only had a mild initial effect on splenomegaly at day 3 post Py infection compared to single Py infected hosts (Table S7), but by day 14 p.i. the differences vanished (fig. S4a). This result was corroborated when comparing non-infected, single Py infected and coinfected groups together (Table S8, fig. 3b).

When comparing the effect of coinfection in groups that were first infected by Py (groups 7 and 8), we found only a moderate increase in spleen mass, essentially as a consequence of the residual enlargement due to the previous Py infection, since the difference between single Hp infection and coinfection groups tended to vanish over time (table S9 and table S10, fig. 3c).

The asymmetric effect of infection order on splenomegaly was best captured by the model on the four coinfection groups (groups 5, 6, 7 and 8) where mice were either infected first with Hp or with Py. This model showed that spleen mass increased over the course of the infection only when mice were first infected with Hp and subsequently by Py (table S11, fig. 3d).

Figure 3. Changes in $\log_{10}$ transformed spleen mass (mg) over the course of the infection. a) Changes in spleen mass for non-infected and single (Hp, Py) infected mice; b) Changes in spleen mass for non-infected, single Py infected and coinfected (Hp infecting first and simultaneous infection) groups; c) Changes in spleen mass for non-infected, single Hp infected and coinfected (Py infecting first) groups; d) Changes in spleen mass for coinfected groups depending on the order of the infection (Hp infecting first or Py infecting first). Dots represent the raw data, the boxes represent the interquartile range (IQR), the horizontal lines the median, and whiskers the range of data within 1.5 the IQR.

Therefore, as for body mass, coinfection affected splenomegaly in an asymmetric way, depending on infection order.

Marker of liver damage

We compared a marker of liver damage (aspartate aminotransferase, AST) in plasma at day 21 p.i. in non-infected and single (Hp, Py) infected mice, and found that Py infected mice had moderately higher levels of AST compared to non-infected hosts (GLM, $F_{2,23}$ = 4.45, p = 0.0218, n = 26 individuals; fig. 4a). Coinfection did aggravate liver damage in the groups where Py followed the Hp infection (plus simultaneous infection, groups 4, 5, 6) (GLM, $F_{3,36}$ = 4.28, p = 0.0111, n = 40; fig. S5a), and this effect

was confirmed when analyzing non-infected, single Py infected and coinfected mice together in the

same model (GLM, $F_{2,45}$ = 4.22, p = 0.0209, n = 48; fig. 4b).

We found rather similar effects of coinfection when analyzing the groups where Hp follows Py

(groups 7 and 8), with coinfection groups having higher AST levels compared to non-infected and single

Hp infected groups (GLM, $F_{2,29}$ = 4.96, p = 0.0141, n = 32; fig. 4c, fig. S5b). As a consequence, there was

no effect of infection order in the coinfection groups (groups 5, 6, 7 and 8) on AST level at day 21 p.i.

(GLM, $F_{1,35}$ = 0.28, p = 0.5976, n = 37; fig. 4d).

Figure 4. Effect of infection and coinfection on liver damage. a) Levels of aspartate aminotransferase
(AST, ng/ml) in the plasma at day 21 p.i. in non-infected and single (Hp, Py) infected mice; b) AST level
in plasma of non-infected, single Py infected and coinfected (Hp infecting first and simultaneous
infection) groups at day 21 p.i.; c) AST level in plasma of non-infected, single Hp infected and coinfected
(Py infecting first) groups at day 21 p.i.; d) AST level in plasma of coinfected mice, depending on the
order of the infection (Hp infecting first or Py infecting first) at day 21 post-infection. Dots represent
the raw data, the boxes represent the interquartile range (IQR), the horizontal lines the median, and
whiskers the range of data within 1.5 the IQR.

408
409   *Survival*

410
In agreement with the pattern of change in body mass over the course of the infection, we did

not find any difference in the survival rate between non-infected and single infected mice (Log-Rank

test $\chi^2_2 = 0.92$, p = 0.6315, n = 229; fig. 5a). Timing of infection did not affect host survival in coinfected

groups when Py followed the Hp infection (plus simultaneous infection, groups 4, 5 and 6) (Log-Rank

test $\chi^2_2 = 1.45$, p = 0.4844, n = 148; fig. S6), we therefore compared the coinfection groups together

with the non-infected and single Py infection and found a strong effect of coinfection (Log-Rank test

$\chi^2_2 = 26.02$, p < 0.0001, n = 282; fig. 5b).

There was no host mortality in the coinfection groups where Hp followed Py (groups 7 and 8),

whatever the timing of the infection. Therefore, there was no difference in the mortality rate of non-

infected, single Hp infected and coinfected groups (groups 7 and 8) (Log-Rank test $\chi^2_2 = 2.34$, p =

0.3099, n = 229; fig. 5c). As a consequence, order of infection was a strong predictor of host mortality

in the coinfection groups (groups 5, 6, 7 and 8) (Log-Rank test $\chi^2_1 = 13.47$, p = 0.0002, n = 189; fig. 5d).

Overall, these results show that order of infection has a paramount effect on the severity of

the symptoms and therefore on parasite virulence (infection-induced damage), with Hp infection

producing mild symptoms whatever the order of the infection, and Py becoming substantially more

virulent when infecting hosts already harboring the nematode. However, the timing of infection had

virtually no effect on disease severity.

Figure 5. Effect of infection and coinfection on host survival. a) Survival curves for non-infected and
single (Hp, Py) infected mice; b) Survival curves for non-infected, single Py infected and coinfected (Hp
infecting first and simultaneous infection) mice; c) Survival curves for non-infected, single Hp infected
and coinfected (Py infecting first) mice; d) Survival curves for coinfected mice depending on the order
of infection (Hp infecting first or Py infecting first). Crosses indicate censored observations.

434
435 ***Py parasitemia***

436
If previous infection with Hp makes the ground more favorable for a subsequent Py infection,

we should expect higher parasitemia in coinfected hosts (groups 4, 5, 6) compared to single Py

infection. During single infection, parasitemia reached a peak at around day 16 p.i., and then the

infection resolved by day 30 (fig. 6a; fig. S7). Given that the coinfection groups (groups 4, 5 and 6) were

stopped at day 21 p.i., we could only compare the rising and the early declining stages of the

parasitemia. The model showed that coinfected groups reached higher parasitemia and that, contrary

to the single infection group, the parasitemia of coinfected mice kept increasing up to day 21 p.i. (table

S12 and table 4, fig. S8 and fig. 6b).

Table 4. General linear mixed model investigating the changes in parasitemia (proportion of iRBC) in
single Py infection and coinfected (Hp infecting first and simultaneous infection). We report the
parameter estimates with the 95% CI, degrees of freedom (df), F and p values. Mouse ID was included
as a random effect to take into account the non-independence of observations for the same individual
over time. The distribution of errors was modelled using a beta distribution. N = 151 individuals and
665 observations.

Fixed effects		Estimate	95% CI	df	F	p
Infection				1,510	11.3	0.0008
	Single	0				
	Coinfection	1.95	0.81/3.1			
Time		1.05	0.9/1.2	1,510	428.25	<0.0001
Squared time		-0.03	-0.04/0.02	1,510	230.38	<0.0001
Time*Infection				1,510	12.12	0.0005
	Single	0				
	Coinfection	-0.3	-0.48/-0.13			
Squared Time*Infection				1,510	17.63	<0.0001
	Single	0				
	Coinfection	0.01	0.007/0.019			
Random effect		**Estimate**	**SE**	**z**	**p**	
ID		0.139	0.032	4.32	<0.0001	

454   Therefore, as expected, previous infection with Hp made a more favorable ground for

455   subsequent Py infection that replicated more and for longer time in coinfected mice. Enhanced

456   persistent parasitemia might thus explain the observed increase of Py virulence in coinfected hosts

457   through specific costs incurred during the asexual reproduction of Py.

458
459   Figure 6. Changes in parasitemia over the course of the infection. a) Changes in Py parasitemia
460   (proportion of iRBCs counted using optical microscopy) in single infected mice over time; b) Changes
461   in Py parasitemia (proportion of iRBCs) in single infected and coinfected (Hp infecting first and
462   simultaneous infection) mice. Dots represent the raw data, the lines represent the fit of the GLMM,
463   and the shaded area around the line the 95% CI.

464
465   ***Specific costs of Py infection***

466
The principal cost induced by Py infection is related to the anemia caused by the lysis of RBCs

during the asexual reproduction of the parasite (Olatunde et al. 2022). We therefore assessed the

changes in RBC counts over the course of the infection. First, we compared changes in RBC counts

between non-infected and single (Hp, Py) infections. As expected, Py infection produced a sharp

decline in the number of RBCs, while there was no difference between non-infected and Hp single

infection (table 5, fig. 7a, fig. S9), corroborating the idea that Py and Hp do not compete for common

resources.

Table 5. General linear mixed model investigating the changes in RBC counts ($10^6/\mu l$) in non-infected and single (Hp, Py) infected mice. We report the parameter estimates with the 95% CI, degrees of freedom (df), F and p values. Mouse ID was included as a random effect to take into account the non-independence of observations for the same individual over time. N = 60 individuals and 360 observations.

Fixed effects		Estimate	95% CI	df	F	p
Treatment				2,291	5.27	0.0056
	Non-infected	0				
	Hp	0.709	0.101/1.361			
	Py	0.967	0.36/1.574			
Time		-0.224	-0.35/-0.098	1,291	197.56	<0.0001
Squared time		0.013	0.003/0.023	1,291	86.17	<0.0001
Cubic time		-0.0002	-0.0004/-5^{e-6}	1,291	39.83	<0.0001
Time*Treatment				2,291	36.27	<0.0001
	Non-infected	0				
	Hp	-0.163	-0.344/0.017			
	Py	-0.735	-0.913/-0.557			
Squared time*Treatment				2,291	9.55	<0.0001
	Non-infected	0				
	Hp	0.011	-0.003/0.025			
	Py	0.031	0.017/0.045			
Cubic time*Treatment				2,291	2.22	0.1101
	Non-infected	0				
	Hp	-0.0002	-0.0005/0.00008			
	Py	-0.0003	-0.0006/-0.00001			
Random effect		Estimate	SE	z	P	
ID		0.1415	0.061	2.37	0.0089	

Coinfected groups (groups 4, 5, 6) had a similar drop in the count of RBCs (table S13, fig. S10), and we clustered them and compared the changes in RBC counts between non-infected, single Py infected and coinfected mice (groups 4, 5, 6). The model showed that coinfected mice still had low levels of RBCs at day 21 p.i. compared to single Py infected mice that had already started the recovery phase (table 6, fig. 7b, fig. S10c).

Table 6. General linear mixed model investigating the changes in RBC count (10^6/μl) in non-infected, single Py infected and coinfected (Hp infecting first and simultaneous infection) mice. We report the parameter estimates with the 95% CI, degreed of freedom (df), F and p values. Mouse ID was included as a random effect to take into account the non-independence of observations for the same individual over time. N = 94 individuals and 476 observations.

Fixed effects		Estimate	95% CI	df	F	p
Infection				2,373	1.70	0.1840
	Non-infected	0				
	Single	0.263	-0.40/0.92			
	Coinfected	-0.24	-0.79/0.31			
Time		-0.074	-0.29/0.14	1,373	0.03	0.8556
Squared time		-0.006	-0.032/0.021	1,373	67.42	<0.0001
Cubic time		0.0004	-0.0004/0.001	1,373	108.37	<0.0001
Time*Infection				2,373	0.73	0.4826
	Non-infected	0				
	Single	0.166	-0.14/0.471			
	Coinfected	0.024	-0.23/0.28			
Squared Time*Infection				2,373	11.62	<0.0001
	Non-infected	0				
	Single	-0.09	-0.127/-0.052			
	Coinfected	-0.057	-0.088/-0.026			
Cubic Time*Infection				2,373	17.96	<0.0001
	Non-infected	0				
	Single	0.004	0.002/0.005			
	Coinfected	0.002	0.001/0.003			
Random effect		Estimate	SE	z	P	
ID		0.37	0.084	4.37	<0.0001	

Infection-induced anemia stimulates erythropoiesis with the aim of restoring homeostatic RBC counts. We therefore investigated whether coinfection impaired the host capacity to repair the damage (here the loss of RBCs) caused by the infection. To this purpose, we assessed the production of erythropoietin (EPO) (at day 14 and 21 p.i.) and the mean globular volume (MGV) that reflects the proportion of reticulocytes among the total RBCs.

Mice with single Py infection produced EPO in response to the loss of RBCs compared to non-infected individuals (GLM, $F_{1,34}$ = 113.53, p < 0.0001, n = 38; fig. 7c). However, despite having lower RBC counts, coinfected hosts (groups 4, 5, 6) did not produce more EPO compared to single Py infected mice, neither when including each coinfection group separately in the model (GLM, $F_{3,67}$ = 2.24, p = 0.0917, n = 75; fig. S11), nor when grouping them (post hoc comparison of LS-means between single infection and coinfection with Bonferroni correction, p = 0.3096, n = 94; fig. 7c)

This result was mirrored by the change of MGV over the course of the infection. Py infected

mice had a sharp increase in the MGV between day 11 and 21 p.i., compared to non-infected and Hp

infected mice, indicating a higher proportion of reticulocytes among RBCs (table 7, fig. 7d, fig. S12).

However, changes in MGV were similar between single Py infection and the coinfection groups (groups

4, 5, 6) (table 8, fig. 7e, table S14, fig. S13).

Table 7. General linear mixed model investigating the changes in mean globular volume (fL) in non-
infected and single (Hp, Py) infected mice. We report the parameter estimates with the 95% CI, degrees
of freedom (df), F and p values. Mouse ID was included as a random effect to take into account the
non-independence of observations for the same individual over time. N = 60 individuals and 360
observations.

Fixed effects		Estimate	95% CI	df	F	p
Treatment				2,291	1.90	0.151
	Non-infected	0				
	Hp	0.658	-2.108/3.424			
	Py	-1.975	-4.738/0.789			
Time		0.486	-0.09/1.061	1,291	8.14	0.0046
Squared time		-0.026	-0.071/0.02	1,291	0.94	0.3326
Cubic time		0.0003	-0.0006/0.001	1,291	8.0	0.005
Time*Treatment				2,291	3.20	0.0423
	Non-infected	0				
	Hp	-0.529	-1.354/0.295			
	Py	0.53	-0.284/1.343			
Squared Time*Treatment				2,291	3.37	0.0358
	Non-infected	0				
	Hp	0.032	-0.033/0.097			
	Py	0.084	0.02/0.148			
Cubic Time*Treatment				2,291	10.55	<0.0001
	Non-infected					
	Hp	-0.0005	-0.002/0.0008			
	Py	-0.003	-0.004/-0.002			
Random effect		Estimate	SE	z	P	
ID		2.86	1.18	2.42	0.0078	

Table 8. General linear mixed model investigating the changes in mean globular volume (fL) in non-infected, single Py infected and coinfected (Hp infecting first and simultaneous infection) mice. We report the parameter estimates with the 95% CI, degrees of freedom (df), F and p values. Mouse ID was included as a random effect to take into account the non-independence of observations for the same individual over time. N = 94 individuals and 476 observations.

Fixed effects		Estimate	95% CI	df	F	P
Infection				2,373	1.05	0.3518
	Non-infected	0				
	Single	2.1	-1.05/5.25			
	Coinfection	1.7	-0.91/4.31			
Time		0.6	-0.54/1.75	1,373	45.87	<0.0001
Squared time		-0.04	-0.18/0.1	1,373	111.07	<0.0001
Cubic time		0.0008	-0.004/0.005		109.01	
Time*Infection				2,373	17.09	<0.0001
	Non-infected	0				
	Single	-4.36	-5.98/-2.73			
	Coinfection	-3.56	-4.92/-2.21			
Squared Time*Infection				2,373	30.02	<0.0001
	Non-infected	0				
	Single	0.71	0.51/0.90			
	Coinfection	0.58	0.41/0.74			
Cubic Time*Infection				2,373	27.42	<0.0001
	Non-infected	0				
	Single	-0.02	-0.03/0.016			
	Coinfection	-0.02	-0.02/0.012			
Random effect		Estimate	SE	z	p	
ID		4.28	1.25	3.44	0.0003	

Given that coinfected hosts harbored more parasites than single infected hosts, a similar rate of renewal of lost RBCs should result in a reduction in tolerance in coinfected mice. We defined tolerance as the slope of the regression of RBC counts on parasitemia, the steeper the slope the weaker the tolerance (i.e., the capacity to cope with the damage induced by the infection). As expected, we found that coinfected hosts were less tolerant (i.e., steeper slope) to Py infection compared to single infected mice (table 9; fig. 7f).

Table 9. General linear mixed model investigating the relationship between RBC counts (log $10^6/\mu l$) and parasitemia (log proportion iRBC) in single Py infected and coinfected (Hp infecting first and simultaneous infection) mice. We report the parameter estimates with the 95% CI, degrees of freedom (df), F and p values. Mouse ID was included as a random effect to take into account the non-independence of observations for the same individual over time. N = 48 individuals and 298 observations.

Fixed effects		Estimate	95% CI	df	F	P
Infection				1,248	8.71	0.0035
	Single	0				
	Coinfection	-0.199	-0.331/-0.066			
Parasitemia		-0.300	-0.341/-0.259	1,248	646.17	<0.0001
Infection*Parasitemia				1,248	9.14	0.0028
	Single	0				
	Coinfection	-0.081	-0.134/-0.028			
Random effect		Estimate	SE	z	p	
Mouse ID		0.015	0.006	2.51	0.0061	

Figure 7. Effect of infection and coinfection on RBCs. a) Changes in RBC counts measured by hematology analyzer for non-infected and single (Hp, Py) infected mice; b) Changes in RBCs for non-infected, single Py infected and coinfected (Hp infecting first and simultaneous infection) groups. Dots represent the raw data, the lines represent the fit of the GLMM, and the shaded area around the line the 95% CI. c) Levels of erythropoietin (EPO, log ng/ml) in the plasma assessed by ELISA at day 14 and 21 p.i. in non-infected, single Py infected and coinfected (Hp infecting first and simultaneous infection) mice. Dots represent the raw data, the boxes represent the interquartile range (IQR), the horizontal lines the median, and whiskers the range of data within 1.5 the IQR; d) Changes in mean globular volume (MGV, fL) assessed by hematology analyzer for non-infected and single (Hp, Py) infected mice; e) Changes in MVG for non-infected, single Py infected and coinfected (Hp infecting first and simultaneous infection) groups. Dots represent the raw data, the lines represent the fit of the GLMM, and the shaded area around the line the 95% CI; f) Log-log plot of RBC counts on parasitemia for single Py infected and coinfected (Hp infecting first and simultaneous infection) groups. Dots represent the raw data, the lines represent the fit of the GLMM, and the shaded area around the line the 95% CI.

If coinfected hosts suffer from more severe disease symptoms because they cannot effectively

restore RBCs lost during the infection, we should expect that experimentally inducing erythropoiesis

might, at least partially, dampen the cost of coinfection. To explore this hypothesis, we ran an

experiment where mice were first infected with Hp and after 28 days they were infected with Py. These

coinfected mice were then treated with a rEPO or left as control. We assessed the severity of the

symptoms using an integrative marker of health (body mass), a specific marker of Py infection (changes

in RBCs), and any mortality (reaching of the end points) that might have occurred during the course of

the infection.

As predicted, treating coinfected mice with rEPO reduced the severity of the disease

symptoms, since body mass remained stable over the course of the infection, while mice in the control

group lost body mass from day 14 p.i. onwards (table 10, fig. 8a). rEPO treatment only slightly affected

anemia (GLMM, time p.i.*treatment, $F_{1,129}$ = 4.12, p = 0.0443, n = 20 individuals and 153 observations;

fig. 8b, fig. S14), and although mortality was higher in the control group, the difference was not

statistically significant (Log-rank test, χ^2_1 = 1.059, p = 0.3034, n = 20; fig. 8c), suggesting that other

aspects of the pathophysiology of coinfection might explain the observed increase in Py virulence.

Nevertheless, the rEPO administration improved the tolerance to Py infection, since coinfected mice

treated with rEPO had similar slope relating RBC counts to parasitemia as single Py infected hosts

(GLMM, treatment*parasitemia, $F_{1,111}$ = 0.11, p = 0.7363, n = 25 individuals and 138 observations; fig.

8d). Therefore, coinfection reduced the tolerance to Py infection and administering rEPO partially

restored it.

Table 10. General linear mixed model investigating the changes in body mass (g) in coinfected (Hp-28+Py) mice treated or not treated with rEPO. We report the parameter estimates with the 95% CI, degrees of freedom (df), F and p values. Mouse ID was included as a random effect to take into account the non-independence of observations for the same individual over time. N = 20 individuals and 245 observations.

Fixed effects		Estimate	95% CI	df	F	P
Treatment				1,221	0.27	0.6055
	Control	0				
	rEPO	-0.35	-1.67/0.98			
Time		0.2	0.11/0.29	1,221	31.59	<0.0001
Squared time		-0.012	-0.016/-0.008	1,221	40.36	<0.0001
Time*Treatment				1,221	0.75	0.3878
	Control	0				
	rEPO	-0.05	-0.18/0.069			
Squared Time*Treatment				1,221	6.78	0.0098
	Control	0				
	rEPO	0.007	0.002/0.013			
Random effect		Estimate	SE	z	p	
ID		1.77	0.61	2.91	0.0018	

Figure 8. Effect of rEPO administration on the symptoms of the coinfection. a) Changes in body mass (g) over the course of the infection in mice that were infected with Hp at day -28 and with Py at day 0, and treated with rEPO or left as control; b) Changes in RBC counts assessed by hematology analyzer in coinfected mice treated with EPO or left as control. Dots represent the raw data, the lines represent the fit of the GLMM, and the shaded area around the line the 95% CI; c) Survival of coinfected mice treated with rEPO or left as control; d) Log-log plot of RBC counts on parasitemia for single Py infected mice and coinfected (infected with Hp at day -28 and with Py at day 0) mice treated with rEPO. Dots represent the raw data, the lines represent the fit of the GLMM, and the shaded area around the line the 95% CI.

In addition to inducing anemia, the lysis of RBCs releases free heme groups that have pro-

oxidant and pro-inflammatory properties, and stimulates the production of enzymes whose role is to

scavenge them. We therefore hypothesized that the increased virulence of Py in coinfected hosts

(when Py follows Hp) might stem from an impaired capacity to detoxify free heme groups. To this

purpose, we assessed the expression of the *Hmox1* gene in splenocytes at day 14 p.i. and the amount

of circulating heme oxygenase-1 (HO-1) in plasma at day 14 and 21 post-infection. *Hmox1* was strongly

upregulated in Py infected mice compared to non-infected individuals (GLM, $F_{1,8}$ = 96.92, n = 10; p <

0.0001; fig. 9a, fig. S15a), and it was also upregulated in coinfected groups (groups 4, 5, 6) compared

to single Py infected hosts (post-hoc comparison of LS-means, p = 0.0074, n = 28; fig. 9a, fig. S15a,b).

However, although single Py infected mice also had much higher plasma levels of the enzyme HO-1 at

both day 14 and 21 p.i. compared to non-infected individuals (GLM, $F_{1,24}$ = 82.98, p < 0.0001, n = 28;

fig. 9b), coinfected groups (groups 4, 5, 6) did not differ from single Py infection (when considering the

different coinfection groups separately, GLM, $F_{3,68}$ = 2.49, p = 0.0677, n = 76; fig. S15c; when

considering the coinfection groups together, post-hoc comparison of LS-means, p = 1, n = 86; fig. 9b).

Therefore, although *Hmox1* gene expression was upregulated in the coinfection groups, the level of

the enzyme in the blood did not differ between single infection and coinfection.

Another important function related to the clearance of free hemoglobin is provided by the

scavenger receptor CD163 expressed on red pulp macrophages (RPM, F4/80^{+} CD11b^{-}) (Kristiansen et

al. 2001). We therefore assessed the proportions of RPM that were CD163^{+}, by flow cytometry, and

compared them between non-infected and single Py infected and found that the population of CD163^{+}

RPM drastically dropped during the infection (generalized linear model with a beta distribution of

errors, $F_{1,35}$ = 344.88, p < 0.0001, n = 39; fig. 9c). However, the proportion of RPM that were CD163^{+}

was similarly reduced in coinfected mice (groups 4, 5, 6) compared to single Py infection, at both day

14 and 21 p.i. (LS-means comparison with Bonferroni correction, day 14 p.i., p = 0.1648, day 21 p.i., p

= 0.1959, n = 100; fig. 9c, fig. S15d). The receptor CD163 was also less expressed in F4/80^{+} CD11b^{-} of

Py infected mice, as shown by the drastic drop in mean fluorescence intensity (MFI), with no difference

between single and coinfected mice (LS-means comparison with Bonferroni correction, day 14 p.i., p =

1, day 21 p.i., p = 1, n = 100; fig. 9d). Therefore, the population of CD163^{+} RPM which are a key resident

cell population responsible for clearing free hemoglobin released during the lysis of RBCs similarly

decreased in single and coinfected mice.

639
Figure 9. Effect of infection and coinfection on heme detoxification. a) Fold change of *Hmox1* mRNA in
spleen at day 14 p.i. in single Py infected and coinfected (Hp infecting first and simultaneous infection)
groups; b) Levels of Heme oxygenase-1 in the plasma (log ng/ml) at day 14 and 21 p.i. in non-infected,
single Py infected and coinfected (Hp infecting first and simultaneous infection) groups; c) Proportion
of CD163^{+} within F4/80^{+} CD11b^{-} cells analyzed by flow cytometry at day 14 and 21 p.i. in non-infected,
single Py infected and coinfected (Hp infecting first and simultaneous infection) groups; d) Mean
fluorescence intensity (arbitrary fluorescence units) of CD163 at day 14 and 21 p.i. in non-infected,
single Py infected and coinfected (Hp infecting first and simultaneous infection) groups. Dots represent
the raw data, the boxes represent the interquartile range (IQR), the horizontal lines the median, and
whiskers the range of data within 1.5 the IQR.

650
651   ***Immune predictors of Py virulence***

652
Plasmodium infection elicits proinflammatory effectors that might cause immunopathology if

regulatory mechanisms fail to restore homeostasis. Therefore, we speculated that exacerbated disease

severity in coinfected hosts (when Py follows Hp) might stem from an overreacting, non-regulated,

inflammatory response. To address this question, we first assessed the gene expression of pro- and

anti-inflammatory cytokines in splenocytes at day 3 and 14 post-infection. IFN-γ, IL-10 and TGF-β1

genes were all overexpressed at both 3 and 14 days p.i. in single Py infected hosts compared to non-

infected mice (GLM, IFN-γ, $F_{1,34}$ = 24.44, p < 0.001; IL-10, $F_{1,34}$ = 49.86, p < 0.001; TGF-β, $F_{1,34}$ = 20.62, p

< 0.001, n = 38; fig. 10; fig. S16a,b,c). However, coinfection (groups 4, 5, 6) did not induce a change in

the expression of any of the genes compared to single Py infection (LS-means comparison with

Bonferroni correction, all p's = 1, fig. 10, fig. S16d,e,f).

663
664 Figure 10. Effect of infection and coinfection on cytokine expression. Fold change of a) IFN-γ, b) IL-10,
665 c) TGF-β1 mRNA levels in spleen at day 3 and 14 p.i. in single Py infected and coinfected (Hp infecting
666 first and simultaneous infection) groups. Dots represent the raw data, the boxes represent the
667 interquartile range (IQR), the horizontal lines the median, and whiskers the range of data within 1.5
668 the IQR.
669
Previous work conducted on the same model system has shown that coinfected mice have a

higher activation of regulatory T cells (Treg), possibly accounting for their impaired anti-*Plasmodium*

response (Tetsutani et al. 2009). Therefore, we assessed the proportions of CD4+ T cells that were

FoxP3+ by flow cytometry and compared them, over the course of the infection, between non-infected,

single Py infected and coinfected mice (groups 4, 5, 6); we found no differences between single Py

infection and coinfection groups (LS-means comparison with Bonferroni correction, p = 1; n = 100; fig.

11a, table S15; fig. S17a). The expression of the immune check point CTLA-4 on Treg has been shown

to impede immunity to the acute infection with Py (Kurup et al. 2017), by enhancing their

immunosuppressive activity. We thus assessed the proportions of CD4+ T cells that were FoxP3+ and

CTLA-4+ by flow cytometry and compared them between non-infected, single Py infected and

coinfected mice (groups 4, 5, 6); we found that coinfected mice had a higher proportion of CTLA-4^{+}

Treg compared to non-infected and single Py infection at day 14 p.i. (table 11; fig. 11b; table S16; fig.

S17b). Therefore, although coinfection did not produce an expansion of the Treg population compared

to single Py infected hosts, the immunosuppressive power of Treg was upregulated in coinfected hosts.

Table 11. Generalized linear model with a beta distribution of errors investigating the changes in the
proportion of CTLA-4^{+} within FoxP3^{+} CD4^{+} T cells in non-infected, single Py infected and coinfected (Hp
infecting first and simultaneous infection) mice at day 14 and 21 post-infection. We report the degrees
of freedom (df), and the F and p values. N = 96 individuals.

Source of variation	df	F	P
Infection	2,90	19.01	<0.0001
Time	1,90	0.79	0.3755
Time*Infection	2,90	13.89	<0.0001

690
Figure 11. Effect of infection and coinfection on Treg expansion and immunosuppressive function. a)
Proportion of FoxP3^{+} within CD4^{+} T cells analyzed by flow cytometry over the course of the infection
in non-infected, single Py infected and coinfected (Hp infecting first and simultaneous infection) mice;
b) Proportion of CTLA-4^{+} within FoxP3^{+} CD4^{+} T cells analyzed by flow cytometry over the course of the
infection in non-infected, single Py infected and coinfected (Hp infecting first and simultaneous
infection) mice. Dots represent the raw data, the boxes represent the interquartile range (IQR), the
horizontal lines the median, and whiskers the range of data within 1.5 the IQR.

Using flow cytometry, we also immunophenotyped mice using a large panel of markers in the

spleen (table S2), at day 3, 14 and 21 post-infection. We identified 20 cell populations (table S17) and

their proportions were included as variables in a principal component analysis (PCA), with a PCA per

sampling day. The first two components explained 29.02% and 18.79%, 39.65% and 12.86%, 37.63%

and 15.92% of the total variance, at day 3, 14, and 21 p.i., respectively. The correlation circles showed

that many of the variables included in the PCA had high absolute loadings (table S17, fig. 12a, b, c), and

effectively discriminated the three experimental groups (non-infected, single Py infected and

coinfected mice) over the course of the infection (fig. 12d,e,f).

At day 3 p.i., the scores along the first principal component (PC1) strongly differed between

the three experimental groups (GLM, $F_{2,45}$ = 28.56, n = 48; p < 0.0001), with coinfected mice (groups 4,

5, 6) having higher scores compared to both non-infected and single Py infection (LS-means

comparisons with Bonferroni correction, both p's < 0.0001; fig. 12g). At day 14 and 21 p.i., there was

a complete separation, along the PC1, between the three groups, with single Py infected lying in

between non-infected and coinfected individuals (groups 4, 5, 6) (day 14 p.i.: GLM, $F_{2,43}$ = 313.37, p <

0.0001, n = 46; day 21 p.i.: GLM, $F_{2,51}$ = 257.50, p < 0.0001, n = 54; fig. 12g). The PC2 had a much less

discriminant power among groups (day 3 p.i.: GLM, $F_{2,45}$ = 3.02, p = 0.0588, n = 48; day 14 p.i.: GLM,

$F_{2,43}$ = 1.27, p = 0.2902, n = 46; day 21 p.i.: GLM, $F_{2,51}$ = 7.57, p = 0.0013, n = 54; fig. 12h).

Figure 12. Immunophenotyping of spleen over the course of the infection. Principal component
analysis (PCA) on the proportion of 20 immune cell populations at day 3 (a,d), 14 (b,e), 21 (c,f) p.i. in
non-infected, single Py infected, and coinfected (Hp infecting first and simultaneous infection) hosts.
We report the loadings of the 20 variables on the first two components of the PCA at each sampling
day (a,b,c); the position of each individual host in the bivariate space defined by the PC1 and PC2,
according to their experimental group (d,e,f); the scores on the PC1 (g) and PC2 (h) for the three
experimental groups. For g) and h), dots represent the raw data, the boxes represent the interquartile
range (IQR), the horizontal line the median, and whiskers the range of data within 1.5 the IQR.
725

To go further, we focused on the variables that had strong absolute loadings on the PC1 and

compared them between the groups, with the aim to see if there was a consistent difference between

single Py infected and coinfected hosts (groups 4, 5, 6). The proportion of Th2 (proportion of CD4^{+} T

cells that were GATA-3^{+}) differed between single and coinfected hosts at the three sampling dates

(GLM with a beta distribution of errors, $F_{2,139} = 53.91$, $p < 0.0001$, n = 148; LS-means comparison

between single and coinfected with Bonferroni correction, day 3, p = 0.0002; day 14, p = 0.0102; day

21, $p < 0.0001$; fig. 13a). Among the other variables, only CD8^{+} T cells consistently discriminated

between single Py and coinfected hosts (groups 4, 5, 6), with the proportion of CD8^{+} T cells (proportion

of CD3^{+} that were CD8^{+}) sharply decreasing over time and especially so in coinfected hosts (GLM with

a beta distribution of errors, $F_{2,139} = 347.41$, $p < 0.0001$, n = 148; LS-means comparison between single

and coinfected with Bonferroni correction, day 3, p = 1; day 14, $p < 0.0001$; day 21, $p < 0.0001$, fig.

13b).

738
739 Figure 13. Effect of infection and coinfection on Th2 and CD8^{+} T cells. a) Proportion of GATA-3^{+} within
740 CD4^{+} T cells and b) proportion of CD8^{+} within CD3^{+} T cells analyzed by flow cytometry over the course
741 of the infection in non-infected, single Py infected and coinfected (Hp infecting first and simultaneous

742   infection) hosts. Dots represent the raw data, the boxes represent the interquartile range (IQR), the
743   horizontal lines the median, and whiskers the range of data within 1.5 the IQR.
744

Therefore, Th2 and CD8^{+} T cells were the two cell populations that best discriminated between

Py infected and coinfected hosts (when Py follows Hp). While the effect of coinfection on the rise of

Th2 lymphocytes can easily be understood as the direct consequence of Hp induction of Th2 immunity,

we wished to better investigate the reasons underlying the decrease of CD8^{+} T cells in coinfected mice.

To this purpose, we assessed the proportion of CD8^{+} T cells that expressed three immune checkpoints

in non-infected, single Py infected and coinfected hosts (groups 4, 5 and 6), and predicted that

coinfected mice should have higher proportions of CD8^{+} T cells expressing the immune checkpoints

compared to single infection. Infection enhanced the proportion of CTLA-4^{+} CD8^{+} T cells (proportion of

CD8^{+} that were CTLA-4^{+}) but there was no difference between single infection and coinfection at any

of the sampling day (GLM with a beta distribution of errors: day 14 p.i, t = -0.52, df = 90, p = 1; day 21

p.i., t = -1.19, df = 90, p = 1; fig. 14a). The proportions of LAG-3^{+} CD8^{+} and PD-1^{+} CD8^{+} cells (proportion

of CD8^{+} that were LAG-3^{+} and PD-1^{+}, respectively) were also increased in infected mice compared to

non-infected individuals, however, at day 14 p.i. there was also a higher proportion of LAG-3^{+} and PD-

1^{+} CD8^{+} T cells in coinfected mice compared to single infection (GLM with a beta distribution of errors:

LAG-3, day 14 p.i.: t = 3.38, df = 91, p = 0.0163; day 21 p.i., t = 2.36, df = 91, p = 0.3040; PD-1, day 14

p.i.: t = 3.94, df = 90, p = 0.0024; day 21 p.i., t = 2.26, df = 91, p = 0.3948, fig. 14b,c).

761
762   Figure 14. Effect of infection and coinfection on CD8^{+} T cell exhaustion. a) Proportion of CTLA-4^{+} within
763   CD8^{+} T cells, b) LAG-3^{+} within CD8^{+} T cells, c) PD-1^{+} within CD8^{+} T cells analyzed by flow cytometry at
764   day 14 and 21 p.i. in non-infected, single Py infected and coinfected (Hp infecting first and

765 simultaneous infection) hosts. Dots represent the raw data, the boxes represent the interquartile
766 range (IQR), the horizontal lines the median, and whiskers the range of data within 1.5 the IQR.
767

Persistent antigenic stimulation and high levels of inhibitory receptors (immune checkpoints)

can lead to the exhaustion of CD8^{+} T cells, characterized by a loss of effector functions and proliferative

potential (McLane et al. 2019), that could explain the increase in the CD4^{+}/CD8^{+} ratio above the

homeostatic value (between 1.5 and 2.5) (McBride and Striker 2017). Deviations from this homeostatic

value have been associated with severe symptoms in a few infectious diseases (e.g., Pascual-Dapena

et al. 2022). We therefore wished to investigate if high values of the CD4^{+}/CD8^{+} ratio also predicted

mortality in our system. We could not investigate this point at the individual level because data on the

proportion of immune cells were gathered on mice that were euthanized at specific days post-

infection. Nevertheless, we could correlate the CD4^{+}/CD8^{+} ratio at day 14 and 21 p.i. with the mortality

rate (the proportion of mice reaching the end points) within each experimental group and found that

indeed the higher the ratio the higher the mortality risk (spearman correlation, Rs = 0.766, n = 100, p

< 0.0001, fig. 15).

Figure 15. Correlation between the CD4$^+$/CD8$^+$ ratio at day 14 and 21 p.i. and the mortality rate in non-
infected, single Py infected and coinfected (Hp infecting first and simultaneous infection) hosts.
Mortality refers to the proportion of hosts reaching the experimental end points within groups. Dots
represent the raw data, the line a linear regression fit and the band the 95% CI of the slope.
785
786 **Discussion**
787
We showed that the order of infection plays a paramount role in determining the outcome of

the coinfection between an intestinal nematode and a *Plasmodium* parasite. In particular, Py virulence

substantially increased when infecting hosts that were previously (or simultaneously) infected with Hp,

compared both to hosts with single infections and to hosts that were infected with Py first and then

with Hp. Contrary to Py, virulence of Hp was minimally affected by the coinfection, since Hp only

produced mild symptoms whatever the order of the infection. These results are partially in agreement

with our initial predictions. We hypothesized that previous infection with either Py or Hp would

polarize the immune response towards Th1 or Th2 effectors making the ground more favorable for a

subsequent infection, and resulting in more severe disease symptoms. This prediction was met when

Py infected mice harboring Hp, but not when Hp infected mice harboring Py. Therefore, there is a

strong asymmetry in the effect of coinfection between Py and Hp, depending on the order of the

infection. The increase in Py virulence in mice previously infected with Hp is consistent with previous

results on this system (Tetsutani et al. 2009), suggesting that previous Hp infection impairs the

subsequent immune response to Py (Noland et al. 2008; Tetsutani et al. 2009).

The possible evolutionary reasons underlying this asymmetry are manifold. Intestinal

nematodes usually produce chronic infections where the hosts keep shedding parasite eggs for months

or even years depending on the species (Morand 1996). Inter-host transmission success and parasite

fitness is tightly associated with the duration of egg shedding (patent period), therefore any parasite

trait that compromises host health and survival is likely counter selected in these systems. In

agreement with this view, nematode infections are usually well tolerated and host damage is usually

observed only when parasite burden is high (Brooker 2010; Lippens et al. 2016). Since reinfection was

not possible in our experiment, parasite burden was constrained by the initial number of infective

larvae given to the host. It might be interesting to investigate to what extent the lack of increase in Hp

virulence in coinfected hosts could change when using higher infective doses (Lippens et al. 2016), or

allowing hosts to be reinfected. Although the transmission success of Py cannot be directly assessed

from the proportion of iRBC, longer persistence of high parasite density, as observed in coinfected

hosts, should increase the likelihood of gametocyte production, as reported for other *Plasmodium*

species (see Tadesse et al. 2017). In agreement with this view, Py transmission success to the dipteran

vector was enhanced when mice were coinfected with the helminth *Echinostoma caproni* (Noland et

al. 2007). Therefore, the cost of virulence is probably higher in Hp than in Py. Alternatively, increased

Py virulence might be maladaptive if host overexploitation and death jeopardize parasite fitness

through reduced transmission success.

Whatever the benefit or disadvantage of changes in virulence for Py, from the host

perspective, coinfection did incur costs both in terms of general health and specific markers of Py

infection. In particular, whether single infected hosts still gained mass during the 5 weeks p.i., at a rate

that was similar to the non-infected hosts, coinfection induced a loss of body mass (when Py infected

mice previously infected with Hp) or temporarily slowed down the gain in body mass (when Hp infected

mice previously infected with Py). In agreement with the results on changes in body mass, host

mortality (reaching of the end points) was only reported in coinfection groups where Py followed the

Hp infection. Interestingly, there was no difference according to the timing of the infection, suggesting

that the importance of the order of the infection is conserved and relatively consistent over different

coinfection scenarios. In another coinfection model, involving the cestode *Taenia crassiceps* and

Plasmodium yoelii 17XL, Salazar-Castañón et al. (2018) found that coinfected mice had relatively longer

survival time compared to single Py infected hosts and that the gain in survival was related to the

timing of the infection (the longer the delay between the infection, the better the gain in survival time),

suggesting that the effect of timing of infection might be model-dependent.

Our prediction of increased virulence in coinfected hosts was based on the rationale that

previous infection with nematodes polarizes the immune system towards a Th2 response (Reynolds et

al. 2012). In agreement with this hypothesis, we found that Th2 indeed discriminated the three

experimental groups, with higher percentage of GATA-3^{+} within CD4^{+} T cells in coinfected hosts (when

Py follows Hp) compared to both single Py infected and non-infected mice. Accordingly, we also

predicted that coinfected mice should have an impaired capacity to deal with the Py infection and

indeed we found that parasitemia was still high at day 21 p.i. in coinfected hosts compared to single

Py infected mice. Therefore, direct damage produced by Py multiplication might account for the more

severe disease symptoms observed in coinfected hosts. In agreement with this view, changes in RBC

counts over the course of the infection mirrored changes in parasitemia, with coinfected groups still

suffering from anemia at day 21 p.i., when single Py infected mice had already started to recover.

The fitness consequences of the damage caused by Py multiplication also depend on the host

capacity to repair damaged tissues, or in other terms on the capacity to tolerate the infection

(Medzhitov et al. 2012). In particular, RBCs are constantly renewed during hematopoiesis and

therefore hosts that can restore lost RBCs at a faster pace should be able to better tolerate the

infection (i.e., to pay a smaller infection cost) compared to hosts with a slower rate of RBC renewal

(Chang et al. 2004). Given that coinfected hosts suffered from higher anemia, compensating for the

higher rate of RBC loss would have needed a higher production of reticulocytes. However, we found

that coinfected hosts had similar plasma levels of EPO and similar proportions of reticulocytes, as

assessed by the MGV, compared to single infected hosts. Therefore, despite higher parasitemia and

higher anemia, coinfected hosts only replaced RBCs at a similar rate of single infected hosts, and

therefore were less tolerant to the Py infection. This finding suggests that any improvement of the

capacity to renew lost RBCs should reduce the cost of coinfection. Indeed, experimental administration

of rEPO to coinfected hosts partially improved the symptoms of the disease, as also previously reported

(Kaiser et al. 2006), and improved host tolerance to the infection. However, the magnitude of the

effects was small, suggesting that other aspects of the physiopathology of the coinfection are probably

more important determinants of the coinfection costs. In addition, the production of reticulocytes also

replenishes the reservoir of cells that can be exploited by Py for its own replication, which can also

contribute to maintain parasitemia over longer period of time and possibly exacerbates disease

severity (Chang et al. 2004; Tsubata et al. 2005).

Massive release of free heme groups has the potential to damage host tissues through their

prooxidant, proinflammatory and cytotoxic effects (Kumar and Bandyopadhyay 2005; Immenschuh et

al. 2017). Previous studies have shown that the effectiveness of the mechanisms of detoxification of

free heme groups are key determinants of host survival (Pamplona et al. 2007; Seixas et al. 2009) and

liver function restoring once the parasite has been cleared (Dey et al. 2014), although the anti-

inflammatory properties of HO-1 might also promote liver infection (Epiphanio et al. 2008). We

therefore assessed the expression of the *Hmox1* gene in splenocytes and the amount of the enzyme

HO-1 in plasma. As for the renewal of lost RBCs, given that coinfected hosts had higher amount of free

hemoglobin compared to single infection (due to the higher RBC lysis), we expected to find a higher

expression of *Hmox1* and more HO-1 in plasma of coinfected hosts. However, although the gene was

overexpressed in coinfected mice (the gene was highly overexpressed in infected mice compared to

non-infected hosts), the amount of enzyme was similar in coinfected and single Py infected hosts,

possibly due to the degradation of the enzyme through the ubiquitin-proteasome system (Lin et al.

2008; Chau 2015). We also found that another mechanism allowing the host to deal with free

hemoglobin (the scavenger receptor CD163) (Kristiansen et al. 2001) was downregulated in RPM of

coinfected and single infected hosts.

Free heme group is also recognized as a DAMP by the immune system and can induce an

overreacting inflammatory response leading to host damage (Fortes et al. 2012). Coinfection between

Hp and another model species of murine malaria (*Plasmodium chabaudi* AS) has been reported to

increase host mortality (Su et al. 2005), due to liver pathology involving hepatic IFN-γ, IL-17 and IL-22

(Helmby 2009). Although infected hosts overexpressed IFN-γ, IL-10 and TGF-$\beta1$ compared to non-

infected mice, there was no difference between coinfected and single Py infected mice. Similarly, we

did not find any difference in the percentage of FoxP3$^+$ within CD4$^+$ T cells between single Py infected

and coinfected mice; however, the percentage of CTLA-4$^+$ within FoxP3$^+$ CD4$^+$ T cells was higher in

coinfected mice compared to single Py infected hosts during the peak of the acute infection. Therefore,

although we did not find an expansion of Treg in Py infected mice (as previously shown, Tetsutani et

al. 2009), the immunosuppressive capacities of Treg were upregulated in single Py infected mice, and

even more so in coinfected hosts through the CTLA-4 immune checkpoint (see Kurup et al. 2017).

Therefore, coinfected mice appeared to have an upregulated immunosuppressive function, possibly

accounting for the failure to control Py multiplication.

We went a step further by identifying 20 immune cell populations in the spleen by spectral

flow cytometry using a 27-color panel. The results of the PCA clearly showed that the three

experimental groups clustered in different areas of the space defined by the first two components,

and especially so at day 14 and 21 p.i., with the single Py infection group lying in between the non-

infected and the coinfection groups. The cell population that best discriminated between single Py

infected and coinfected hosts was the CD8$^+$ T cells that got exhausted more in coinfected mice. Several

Py epitopes are recognized by CD8$^+$ T cells during the blood stage of the infection (Howland et al. 2015).

Moreover, previous work has shown that CD8$^+$ T cells play a role in the protective immunity against

blood-stage infection with Py (Imai et al. 2010), and chronic infection with the nematode *Litosomoides*

sigmodontis interferes with the anti-*Plasmodium* CD8$^+$ T cell response (Kolbaum et al. 2012). Infection

with Hp has also been shown to suppress CD8$^+$ T cells in mice subsequently infected with the protozoan

Toxoplasma gondii (Khan et al. 2008). Exhaustion of CD8$^+$ cells results from the overexpression of

immune checkpoints whose function is to avoid immunopathology during persistent antigenic

exposure (Chandele et al. 2010; Wykes and Lewin 2018; McLane et al. 2019). In agreement with this,

we found that the proportion of both PD-1$^+$ and LAG-3$^+$ within CD8$^+$ T cells was higher in coinfected

hosts compared to single Py infection at day 14 post-infection. Mechanisms supposed to protect the

hosts from immunopathology (Howland et al. 2015) might thus actually make them more susceptible

to parasite exploitation (Scholzen et al. 2009; Frimpong et al. 2019), and especially so when hosts are

coinfected by parasites with different exploitation strategies.

One of the consequences of the CD8$^+$ exhaustion is an increase of the ratio between CD4$^+$ and

CD8$^+$ T cells. Deviations of the CD4$^+$/CD8$^+$ ratio from the homeostatic values (inverted ratio below 1, or

increased values above 2.5) have been investigated in a few host-pathogen systems, and found to

correlate with poor host survival prospects (McBride and Striker 2017). For instance, high values of the

CD4$^+$/CD8$^+$ ratio have been shown to be predictors of patient mortality during SARS-CoV-2 infection

(De Zunai et al. 2021; Pascual-Dapena et al. 2022). We found similar results, although the correlation

between the CD4$^+$/CD8$^+$ ratio and mortality could only be assessed at the population (inter-group)

level. The increase of the CD4$^+$/CD8$^+$ ratio probably reflects a global, temporary, dysfunction of the

immune response, which favors the replication rate of Py in coinfected hosts. In agreement with this

view, BALB/c mice infected with Py and depleted of CD8$^+$ T cells suffered from greater parasitemia and

higher mortality compared to control individuals during the period of peak parasitemia (Imai et al.

2015).

This work provides some relevant findings for the epidemiology of the coinfection between

nematodes and *Plasmodium* and possibly for the evolution of virulence when parasites exploit the

same host. In terms of the epidemiology of the disease, a key question is whether infection order is

random or if it intrinsically depends on the life cycle of the parasite. We suggest that, in the specific

case of the coinfection between gastrointestinal nematodes and *Plasmodium*, hosts might have higher

chances to suffer from ordered infections where *Plasmodium* infects hosts already harboring worms.

This suggestion is based on the observation that gastrointestinal nematodes usually establish chronic,

steady state, infections that can last for months (or even years for some human helminths) while

Plasmodium produces acute infections (lasting 2-4 weeks) that can either be cleared or lead to

subsequent relapses (again depending on the parasite and the host species). However, this hypothesis

rests on the assumption that hosts have equal probabilities to be infected by the two parasites per unit

of time, or in other words that the probability of infection is not age-dependent. It should also be

reminded that our experimental work only considered primary infections (reinfection was not

allowed). However, in the real world, hosts are repeatedly exposed to multiple parasites and when

there is no sterilizing immunity, previous infection does not fully prevent subsequent reinfection. The

complexity due to age-dependent probability of infection and repeated exposure/infection might

therefore blur the importance of the infection order as a driver of disease severity.

We also think that these results are relevant to predict how selection might shape the optimal

level of virulence (defined as infection-induced host damage) when parasites exploit hosts that harbor

coinfecting parasites that elicit different immune effectors. A key prediction here is that species-

specific cost of virulence might constraint the evolution of host damage in different ways in coinfecting

parasites. Experimental evolution and theoretical modelling would be valuable tools to explore this

question.

A final thought is that, although we considered that the coinfection dynamics with *Plasmodium*

and nematodes is regulated by top-down mechanisms involving the host immune response, we cannot

ignore that both parasites (and nematodes in particular) can also interfere with the host immune

response for their own benefit. This paves the way for a scenario where the top-down mechanisms

might also be under parasite control.

Acknowledgments

We are grateful to Valérie Saint Giorgio and all the staff of the animal facility for taking care of the

animals.

Funding

The work has been funded by the French Agence Nationale de la Recherche (grant # ANR-21-CE35-

0015).

Author contribution

GS, BF, MR and BR conceived the study and gathered the funding; AD, LB, NP, GS and BF collected the

data; AD, LB, EG performed the lab work; NP assisted with the spectral flow cytometry analysis; GS

analyzed the data; GS, AD and LB wrote the first draft of the manuscript; all authors revised and

approved the final version.

Data availability statement

All the data will be made available in DRYAD once the manuscript has been accepted for publication.

Conflict of interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

Adegnika AA, Kremsner PG. 2012. Epidemiology of malaria and helminth interaction: e review from

2001 to 2011. Current Opinion in HIV and AIDS 7: 221-224.

Afolabi MO, Ale BM, Dabira ED, Agbla SC, Bustinduy AL, Ndiaye JLA, Greenwood B. 2021. Malaria and

helminth co-infections in children living in endemic countries: A systematic review with meta-

analysis. PLoS Neglected Tropical Diseases 15: e0009138.

Alizon S, de Roode JC, Michalakis Y. 2013. Multiple infections and the evolution of virulence. Ecology

Letters 16, 556-567.

Bansemir AD, Sukhdeo MVK. 1994. The food resource of adult *Heligmosomoides polygyrus* in the small

intestine. Journal of Parasitology 80, 24.

Billet LS, Wuerthner VP, Hua J, Relyea RA, Hoverman JT. 2020. Timing and order of exposure to two

echinostome species affect patterns of infection in larval amphibians. Parasitology 147: 1515-

1523.

Brooker S. 2010. Estimating the global distribution and disease burden of intestinal nematode

infections: Adding up the numbers – A review. International Journal for Parasitology 40: 1137-

1144.

Budischak SA, Wiria AE, Hamid F, Wammes LJ, Kaisar MMM, van Lieshout L, Sartono E, Supali T,

Yazdanbakhsh M, Graham AL. 2018. Competing for blood: the ecology of parasite resource

competition in human malaria-helminth co-infections. Ecology Letters 21: 536.

Chandele A, Mukerjee P, Das G, Ahmed R, Chauhan VS. Phenotypic and functional profiling of malaria-

induced CD8 and CD4 T cells during blood-stage infection with *Plasmodium yoelii*. Immunology

132: 273-286.

Chang K-H, Tam M, Stevenson MM. 2004. Modulation of the course and outcome of blood-stage

malaria by erythropoietin-induced reticulocytosis. The Journal of Infectious Diseases 189: 735-

743.

Chau L-Y. 2015. Heme oxygenase-1: emerging target of cancer therapy. Journal of Clinical Science 22:

22.

Clay PA, Rudolf VHW. 2019. How parasite interaction strategies alter virulence evolution in multi-

parasite communities. Evolution 73: 2189.

Coelho CH, Gazzinelli-Guimaraes PH, Howard J, Barnafo E, Alani NAH, Muratova O, McCormack A,

Kelnhofer E, Urban Jr JF, Narum DL, Anderson C, Langhorne J, Nutman TB, Duffy PE. 2019.

Chronic helminth infection does not impair immune response to malaria transmission blocking

vaccine Pfs230D1-EPA/Alhydrogel® in mice. Vaccine 37: 1038-1045.

Craig JM, Scott AL. 2017. Antecedent *Nippostrongylus* infection alters the lung immune response to

Plasmodium berghei. Parasite Immunology 39: e12441.

Degarege A, Erko B. 2016. Epidemiology of *Plasmodium* and helminth coinfection and possible reasons

for heterogeneity. BioMed Research International 2016: 3083568.

Degarege A, Veledar E, Degarege D, Erko B, Nacher M, Madhivanan P. 2016. *Plasmodium falciparum*

and soil-transmitted helminth co-infections among children in sub-Saharan Africa: a systematic

review and meta-analysis. Parasite Vectors 9: 344.

Dey S, Mazumder S, Siddiqui AA, Iqbal MS, Banerjee C, Sarkar S, De R, Goyal M, Bindu S,

Bandyopadhyay U. 2014. Association of heme oxygenase 1 with the restoration of liver function

after damage in murine malaria by *Plasmodium yoelii*. Infection and Immunity 8: 3113-3126.

De Zuani M, Laznickova P, Tomaskova V, Dvoncovan M, Forte G, Stokin GB, Sramek V, Helan M, Fric J.

2022. High CD4-to-CD8 ratio identifies an at-risk population susceptible to lethal COVID-19.

Scandinavian Journal of Immunology 95: e13125.

Epiphanio S, Mikolajczak SA, Gonçalves LA, Pamplona A, Portugal S, Albuquerque S, Goldberg M,

Rebelo S, Anderson DG, Akinc A, Vomlocher H-P, Kappe SHI, Soares MP, Mota MM. Heme

oxygenase-1 is an anti-inflammatory host factor that promotes murine *Plasmodium* liver

infection. Cell Host & Microbe 3: 331-338.

Ezenwa VO, Jolles AE. 2011. From host immunity to pathogen invasion: the effects of helminth

coinfection on the dynamics of microparasites. Integrative and Comparative Biology 51: 540.

Fenton A. 2013. Dances with worms: the ecological and evolutionary impacts of deworming on

coinfecting pathogens. Parasitology 140: 1119-1132.

Filbey KJ, Camberis M, Chandler J, Turner R, Kettle AJ, Eichenberger RM, Giacomin P, Le Gros G. 2019.

Intestinal helminth infection promotes IL-5- and CD4^{+} T cell-dependent immunity in the lung

against migrating parasites. Mucosal Immunology 12: 352-362.

Fortes GB, Alves LS, de Oliveira R, Dutra FF, Rodrigues D, Fernandez PL, Souto-Padron, T, De Rosa MJ,

Kelliher M, Golenbock D, Chan FKM, Bozza MT. 2012. Heme induces programmed necrosis on

macrophages through autocrine TNF and ROS production. Blood 119: 2368-2375.

Frimpong A, Kusi KA, Adu-Gyasi D, Amponsah J, Ofori MF, Ndifon W. 2019. Phenotypic evidence of T

cell exhaustion and senescence during symptomatic *Plasmodium falciparum* malaria. Frontiers

in Immunology 10: 1345.

Graham AL. 2008. Ecological rules governing helminth-microparasite coinfection. PNAS 105: 566.

Gregory RD Montgomery SSJ, Montgomery WI. 1992. Population biology of *Heligmosomoides*

polygyrus (Nematoda) in the wood mouse. Journal of Animal Ecology 61: 749-757.

Griffiths EC, Fairlie-Clarke K, Allen JE, Metcalf CJE, Graham AL. 2015. Bottom-up regulation of malaria

population dynamics in mice co-infected with lung-migratory nematodes. Ecology Letters 18:

1387-1396.

Hartgers FC, Yazdanbakhsh M. 2006. Co-infection of helminths and malaria: modulation of the immune

responses to malaria. Parasite Immunology 28: 497.

Helmby H. 2009. Gastrointestinal nematode infection exacerbates malaria-induced liver pathology.

Journal of Immunology 182: 5663.

Howland SW, Claser C, Poh CM, Gun SY, Rénia L. 2015. Pathogenic CD8$^+$ T cells in experimental cerebral

malaria. Seminars in Immunopathology 37: 221-231.

Hürlimann E, Houngbedji CA, Yapi RB, N'Dri PB, Silué KD, Ouattara M, Utzinger J, N'Goran EK, Raso G.

2019. Antagonistic effects of *Plasmodium*-helminth co-infection on malaria pathology in

different population groups in Côte d'Ivoire. PLoS Neglected Tropical Diseases 13: e0007086.

Imai T, Shen J, Chou B, Duan X, Tu L, Tetsutani K, Moriya C, Ishida H, Hamano S, Shimokawa C, Hisaeda

H, Himeno K. 2010. Involvement of CD8$^+$ T cells in protective immunity against murine blood-

stage infection with *Plasmodium yoelii* 17XL strain. European Journal of Immunology 40: 1053-

1061.

Imai T, Ishida H, Suzue K, Taniguchi T, Okada H, Shimokawa C, Hisaeda H. 2015. Cytotoxic activities of

CD8$^+$ T cells collaborate with macrophages to protect against blood-stage murine malaria. eLIFE

4: e04232.

Imrie R, Walsh SK, Roberts KE, Lello J, Longdon B. 2023. Investigating the outcomes of virus coinfection

within and across host species. PLoS Pathogens 19: e1011044.

Immenschuh S, Vijayan V, Janciauskiene S, Gueler F. 2017. Heme as a target for therapeutic

interventions. Frontiers in Pharmacology 8: 146.

Kaiser K, Texier A, Ferrandiz J, Meiller A, Latour C, Peyron F, Cespuglio R, Picot S. 2006. Recombinant

human erythropoietin prevents the death of mice during cerebral malaria. Journal of Infectious

Diseases 193: 987-995.

Karvonen A, Jokela J, Laine A-L. 2019. Importance of sequence and timing in parasite coinfections.

Trends in Parasitology 35: 109-118.

Khan IA, Hakak R, Eberle K, Sayles P, Weiss LM, Urban Jr JF. 2008. Coinfection with *Heligmosomoides*

polygyrus fails to establish CD8^{+} T-cell immunity against *Toxoplasma gondii*. Infection and

Immunity 76: 1305-1313.

Knowles SCL. 2011. The effect of helminth co-infection on malaria in mice: a meta-analysis.

International Journal for Parasitology 41: 1041.

Kolbaum J, Escbach M-L, Steeg C, Jacobs T, Fleischer B, Breloer M. 2012. Efficient control of

Plasmodium yoelii infection in BALB/c and C57BL/6 mice with pre-existing *Strongyloides ratti*

infection. Parasite Immunology 34: 388-393.

Kolbaum J, Tartz S, Hartmann W, Helm S, Nagel A, Heussler V, Sebo P, Fleischer B, Jacobs T, Breloer M.

2012. Nematode-induced interference with the anti-Plasmodium CD8^{+} T-cell response can be

overcome by optimizing antigen administration. European Journal of Immunology 42: 890-900.

Kotepui M, Mala W, Kwankaew P, Kotepui KU, Ramirez Masangkay F, Wilairatana P. 2023. Distinct

cytokine profiles in malaria coinfection: A systematic review. PLoS Neglected Tropical Diseases

17: e0011061.

Kristiansen M, Graversen JH, Jacobsen C, Sonne O, Hoffman HJ, Law SK, Moestrup SK. 2001.

Identification of the haemoglobin scavenger receptor. Nature 409: 198-201.

Kumar S, Bandyopadhyay U. 2005. Free heme toxicity and its detoxification systems in human.

Toxicology Letters 157: 175-188.

Kurup SP, Obeng-Adjei N, Anthony SM, Traore B, Doumbo OK, Butler NS, Crompton PD, Harty JT. 2017.

Regulatory T cells impede acute and long-term immunity to blood-stage malaria through CTLA-

4. Nature Medicine 23: 1220-1227.

Kwan JL, Seitz AE, Fried M, Lee K-L, Metenou S, Morrison R, Kabyemela E, Nutman TB, Prevots DR,

Duffy PE. 2018. Seroepidemiology of helminths and the associations with severe malaria among

infants and young children in Tanzania. PLoS Neglected Tropical Diseases 12: e0006345.

Lin P-H, Chiang M-T, Chau L-Y. 2008. Ubiquitin-proteasome system mediates heme oxygenase-1

degradation through endoplasmatic reticulum-associated degradation pathway. Biochimica et

Biophysica Acta 1783: 1826-1834.

Lippens C, Guivier E, Faivre B, Sorci G. 2016. Reaction norms of host immunity, host fitness and parasite

performance in a mouse - intestinal nematode interaction. International Journal for Parasitology

46: 133-140.

Ma Y, Su X-Z, Lu F. 2020. The roles of Type I interferon in co-infections with parasites and viruses,

bacteria, or other parasites. Frontiers in Immunology 11: 1805.

McBride JA, Striker R. 2017. Imbalance in the game of T cells: What can the CD4/CD8 T-cell ratio tell us

about HIV and health? PLoS Pathogens 13: e1006624.

McLane, L, Abdel-Hakeem MS, Wherry EJ. 2019. CD8 T cell exhaustion during chronic viral infection

and cancer. Annual Review of Immunology 37: 457-495.

Medzhitov R, Schneider DS, Soares MP. 2012. Disease tolerance as a defense strategy. Science 335:

936-941.

Morand S. 1996. Life-history traits in parasitic nematodes: a comparative approach for the search of

invariants. Functional Ecology 10: 210-218.

Nacher M. 2011. Interactions between worms and malaria: good worms or bad worms? Malaria

Journal 10: 259.

Noland GS, Chowdhury DR, Urban Jr JF, Zavala F, Kumar N. 2010. Helminth infection impairs the

immunogenicity of a *Plasmodium falciparum* DNA vaccine, but not irradiated sporozoites, in

mice. Vaccine 28: 2917-2923.

Noland GS, Graczyk TK, Fried B, Kumar N. 2007. Enhanced malaria parasite transmission from helminth

co-infected mice. American Journal of Tropical Medicine and hygiene 76: 1052.

Noland GS, Urban JF, Fried B, Kumar N. 2008. Counter-regulatory anti-parasite cytokine responses

during concurrent *Plasmodium yoelii* and intestinal helminth infections in mice. Experimental

Parasitology 119: 272-278.

Olatunde AC, Cornwall DH, Roedel M, Lamb TJ. 2022. Mouse models for unravelling immunology of

blood stage malaria. Vaccines 10: 1525.

Paludan SR. 1998. Interleukin-4 and interferon-γ: the quintessence of a mutual antagonistic

relationship. Scandinavian Journal of Immunology 48: 459-468.

Pamplona A, Ferreira A, Balla J, Jeney V, Balla G, Epiphanio S, Chora A, Rodrigues CD, Gregoire IP,

Cunha-Rodrigues M, Portugal S, Soares MP, Mota MM. 2007. Heme oxygenase-1 and carbon

monoxide suppress the pathogenesis of experimental cerebral malaria. Nature Medicine 13:

703–710.

Pascual-Dapena A, Chillaron JJ, Llauradó G, Arnau-Barres I, Flores J, Lopez-Montesinos I, Sorlí L,

Martinez-Pérez JL, Gómez-Zorrilla S, Du J, García-Giralt N, Güerri-Fernández R. 2022. Individuals

with higher CD4/CD8 ratio exhibit increased risk of acute respiratory distress syndrome and in-

hospital mortality during acute SARS-CoV-2 infection. Frontiers in Medicine 9: 924267.

Reynolds LA, Filbey KJ, Maizels RM. 2012. Immunity to the model intestinal helminth parasite

Heligmosomoides polygyrus. Seminars in Immunopathology 34: 829-846.

Salazar-Castañón VH, Juárez-Avelar I, Legorreta-Herrera M, Govezensky T, Rodriguez-Sosa M. 2018.

Co-infection: the outcome of *Plasmodium* infection differs according to the time of pre-existing

helminth infection. Parasitology Research 117: 2767.

Salazar-Castañón VH, Legorreta-Herrera M, Rodriguez-Sosa M. 2014. Helminth parasites alter

protection against *Plasmodium* infection. BioMed Research International 2014: 913696.

Scholzen A, Minigo G, Plebanski M. 2009. Heroes or villains? T regulatory cells in malaria infection.

Trends in Parasitology 26: 16-25.

Seixas E, Gozzelino R, Chora A, Ferreira A, Silva G, Larsen R, Rebelo S, Penido C, Smith NR, Coutinho A,

Soares MP. 2009. Heme oxygenase-1 affords protection against noncerebral forms of severe

malaria. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences 106: 15837-15842.

Segura M, Matte C, Thawani N, Su Z, Stevenson MM. 2009. Modulation of malaria-induced

immunopathology by concurrent gastrointestinal nematode infection in mice. International

Journal for Parasitology 39: 1525.

Shen S-S, Qu X-Y, Zhang W-Z, Li J, Lv Z-Y. 2019. Infection against infection: parasite antagonism against

parasites, viruses and bacteria. Infectious Diseases of Poverty 8: 49.

Su Z, Segura M, Morgan K, Loredo-Osti JC, Stevenson MM. 2005. Impairment of protective immunity

to blood-stage malaria by concurrent nematode infection. Infection and Immunity 73: 3531-

3539.

Su Z, Segura M, Stevenson MM. 2006. Reduced protective efficacy of a blood-stage malaria vaccine by

concurrent nematode infection. Infection and Immunity 74: 2138-2144.

Supali T, Verweij JJ, Wiria AE, Djuardi Y, Hamid F, Kaisar MMM, Wammes LJ, van Lieshout L, Luty AJF,

Sartoro E, Yazdanbakhsh M. 2010. Polyparasitism and its impact on the immune system.

International Journal for Parasitology 40: 1171-1176.

Szabo E, Bowhay C, Forrester E, Liu H, Dong B, Coria AL, Perera S, Fung B, Badawadagi N, Gaio C, Bailey

K, Ritz M, Bowron J, Ariyaratne A, Finney CAM. 2024. *Heligmosomoides bakeri* and *Toxoplasma*

gondii co-infection leads to increased mortality associated with changes in immune resistance

in the lymphoid compartment and disease pathology. PLoS ONE 19: e02922408.

Tadesse FG, van den Hoogen L, Lanke K, Schildkraut J, Tetteh K, Aseffa A, Mamo H, Sauerwein R, Felger

I, Drakeley C, Gadissa E, Bousema T. 2017. The shape of the iceberg: quantification of

submicroscopic *Plasmodium falciparum* and *Plasmodium vivax* parasitemia and gametocytemia

in five low endemic settings in Ethiopia. Malaria Journal 16: 99.

Tetsutani K, Ishiwata K, Ishida H, Tu L, Torii M, Hamano S, Himeno K, Hisaeda H. 2009. Concurrent

infection with *Heligmosomoides polygyrus* suppresses anti-*Plasmodium yoelii* protection

partially by induction of CD4$^+$CD25$^+$Foxp3$^+$ Treg in mice. European Journal of Immunology 39:

2822-2830.

Tsubata S, Ebe K, Kawamura T, Ishimoto Y, Tomiyama-Miyaji C, Watanabe H, Sekikawa H, Aoyagi Y,

Abo T. 2005. Protection against malaria by anti-erythropoietin antibody due to suppression of

erythropoiesis in the liver and at other sites. Immunology and Cell Biology 83: 638-642.

Viney ME, Graham AL. 2013. Patterns and processes in parasite co-infection. Advances in Parasitology

82: 321-369.

Wait LF, Kamiya T, Fairlie-Clarke KJ, Metcalf CJE, Graham AL, Mideo N. 2021. Differential drivers of

intraspecific and interspecific competition during malaria-helminth co-infection. Parasitology

148: 1030-1039.

Webb EL, Ekii AO, Pala P. 2012. Epidemiology and immunology of helminth-HIV interactions. Current

Opinion in HIV and AIDS 7: 245-253.

Wykes MN, Lewin SR. 2018. Immune checkpoint blockade in infectious diseases. Nature Reviews

Immunology 18: 91-104.