TRAIT-SPECIFIC TRADE-OFFS PREVENT NICHE EXPANSION IN TWO PARASITES

Eva J. P. Lievens[1,2], Yannis Michalakis[2,†] and Thomas Lenormand[1,†]

[†]equal contribution

[1]UMR 5175 CEFE, CNRS–Université de Montpellier–Université P. Valéry–EPHE, 1919 Route de Mende,
34293 Montpellier Cedex 5, France

[2]UMR 5290 MIVEGEC, CNRS–IRD–Université de Montpellier, 911 Avenue Agropolis BP 64501, 34394
Montpellier Cedex 5, France

ABSTRACT

The evolution of host specialization has been studied intensively, yet it is still often difficult to determine

why parasites do not evolve broader niches – in particular when the available hosts are closely related

and ecologically similar. Here, we used an experimental evolution approach to study the evolution of

parasite specialization, and its underlying traits, in two sympatric parasites: *Anostracospora rigaudi* and

Enterocytospora artemiae, microsporidians infecting the brine shrimp *Artemia franciscana* and *Artemia*

parthenogenetica. In the field, both parasites regularly infect both hosts, yet experimental work has

revealed that they are each semi-specialized. We serially passaged the parasites on one, the other, or an

alternation of the two hosts; after ten passages, we assayed the infectivity, virulence, and spore

production rate of the evolved lines. In accordance with previous studies, *A. rigaudi* maintained a higher

fitness on *A. parthenogenetica*, and *E. artemiae* on *A. franciscana*, in all treatments. Further, we showed

that the origin of this specialization was not infectivity, which readily evolved and showed a weak trade-

off among host species for both parasites. Instead, there was a strong trade-off in spore production,

suggesting that the ability to exploit the host and produce spores is the barrier preventing the evolution

of generalism in this system. Intriguingly, the trait-specific trade-offs appear to be very similar for both

parasites. This study highlights that the shape of between-host trade-offs can be very heterogeneous

across parasite traits, so that only some traits are pivotal to specialization.

KEYWORDS

Ecological specialization, niche, host specificity, experimental evolution, parasite life history, multi-host

parasites, *Artemia*, microsporidians.

INTRODUCTION

Most parasites manifest a degree of specialization in nature, with niches that do not cover the entire

community of potential hosts. This occurs even in communities of ecologically and physiologically similar

host species (e.g. Antonovics et al. 2002, Hall et al. 2009, Streicker et al. 2013, Lievens et al. 2019),

begging the question of why parasites do not evolve to extend their niche. Answering this question is

particularly relevant when trying to predict the future evolution of a parasite, for example with regards

to the emergence of new diseases (Cleaveland et al. 2001) or the impact of invasive hosts (Prenter et al.

2004, Kelly et al. 2009).

The evolution of host specialization – i.e. the evolution of parasitic niches – is generally studied through

the lens of ecological specialization theory. A cornerstone of specialization theory is the assumption that

adaptation to one environment trades off with adaptation to another (reviewed in e.g. Futuyma and

Moreno 1988, Kassen 2002, Ravigne et al. 2009). The strength of the fitness trade-offs determines, to a

large degree, whether specialist or generalist strategies evolve: strong trade-offs favor the evolution of

specialists, while weak trade-offs favor the evolution of generalists. At first glance, therefore, we might

view specialism in a parasite population as an indicator that there are strong fitness trade-offs between

the hosts. This would imply that the parasite could never evolve to become a generalist. However,

specialization is also governed by the availability and demography of the different environments (e.g.

Bell and Reboud 1997, Ronce and Kirkpatrick 2001, Ravigne et al. 2009). Low encounter rates with the

alternative host can maintain specialism in spite of weak trade-offs (Benmayor et al. 2009), especially if

that host is an ecological sink (Holt and Gaines 1992, Holt and Hochberg 2002, Lenormand 2002, Ching

et al. 2013). In this case, a demographic change in the host community could indeed prompt a shift

towards generalism in the parasite. This scenario would seem especially likely among similar host

species, where we might expect trade-offs to be weaker (cf. Hereford 2009). To disentangle the

consequences of trade-offs from those of host availability, experimental evolution studies are necessary

(cf. Kassen 2002, Fry 2003).

Many experimental evolution studies have been done on parasite specialization, yielding a variety of

outcomes: evidence for fitness trade-offs (e.g. Turner and Elena 2000, Yourth and Schmid-Hempel 2006,

Legros and Koella 2010), mixed support for trade-offs (e.g. Fry 1996, Agrawal 2000, Nidelet and Kaltz

2007, Magalhães et al. 2009, Bedhomme et al. 2012, Messina and Durham 2015), selection for

generalism in fluctuating environments (e.g. Poullain et al. 2008, Bruns et al. 2014, Magalhães et al.

2014), and complex effects of migration and host availability (e.g. Benmayor et al. 2009, Ching et al.

2013). However, experimental evolution studies that take the natural context of parasite populations

into account are rare (Jaenike and Dombeck 1998, Fellous et al. 2014). In addition, few studies look for

the traits underlying fitness trade-offs (Jaenike and Dombeck 1998, Magalhães et al. 2009, Bedhomme

et al. 2012, Messina and Durham 2015). Parasite fitness is a composite of successful infection, host

exploitation, and transmission success, and any of these traits may pose problems when adapting to

new hosts. Low fitness in a new host may result from strong trade-offs in one or a few key traits, or from

the accumulation of weak trade-offs in most traits. However, only strong trade-offs may prevent the

evolution of a generalist parasite on the long term. Identifying whether such key traits occur is a largely

unexplored, but crucial question to understand patterns of host specialization.

In this study, we investigated whether trade-offs in host use limit the evolution of specialization of two

naturally occurring parasites, and if so, upon which traits these trade-offs act. We used the

microsporidians *Anostracospora rigaudi* and *Enterocytospora artemiae* and their sympatric hosts, the

brine shrimp *Artemia parthenogenetica* and *Artemia franciscana*. The two parasites are ecologically

similar, can complete their life cycles on both hosts, and commonly infect both hosts in the field (Rode

et al. 2013b). Nonetheless, they each show a degree of specialization: *A. rigaudi* has much higher fitness

in *A. parthenogenetica* and cannot persist without this host in the field, while *E. artemiae*'s fitness is

much higher in *A. franciscana* (Lievens et al. 2018, 2019). To disentangle the effects of host availability

from trade-offs for these semi-specialized parasites, we manipulated their host environment by serially

passaging them on one, the other, or an alternation of the two hosts. We then assayed the infectivity,

virulence, and spore production rate of the evolved lines, and asked: [1] did manipulating the host

environment affect the degree of specialization of the parasites?; [2] what was the role of the

underlying traits?; and [3] were these results consistent with trade-offs in host use?

METHODS

Hosts and parasites

Natural system

Artemia is a genus of small crustaceans occurring in hypersaline environments. Our study system, the

saltern of Aigues-Mortes on the Mediterranean coast of France, contains two sympatric *Artemia* species.

The first, *A. parthenogenetica*, is an asexual clade native to the area; the second, *A. franciscana*, is a

sexual species that was introduced from North America in 1970 and has since become highly prevalent

(Amat et al. 2005, Rode et al. 2013b). The two species coexist for most of the year, and can usually be

found in the same microhabitats (Lievens et al. 2019).

A. rigaudi and *E. artemiae* are two of the most prominent parasites infecting *Artemia* in Aigues-Mortes,

with infections of either reaching prevalences of up to 100% in both host species (Lievens et al. 2019).

Both microsporidians are horizontally transmitted parasites of the gut epithelium: once established,

infections continuously release spores into the environment with the host's feces (Rode et al. 2013a).

Experiments revealed that the fitness of *A. rigaudi* and *E. artemiae* is higher when infecting respectively

A. parthenogenetica and *A. franciscana* (Lievens et al. 2019). This is mainly due to differences in spore

production, although *E. artemiae* is also a poor infector of *A. parthenogenetica* and *A. rigaudi* has

suboptimal virulence in *A. franciscana*.

Origin of experimental parasites

We obtained our experimental parasites from the same laboratory stocks of *A. rigaudi* and *E. artemiae*

that were used by Lievens et al. (2019) to estimate infectivity, virulence, and spore production. The

microsporidians in these stocks were collected in Aigues-Mortes and maintained on a mix of both hosts.

Before starting the serial passages, we made sure that the stocks were singly infected by using them to

infect lab-bred hosts, testing those hosts for the presence of both microsporidians, and re-starting the

stocks from singly infected hosts only (see Supplementary Material for more details). Note that although

we tried to maximize the genetic diversity of our stocks by using spores produced by both host species,

originating in several sites and at different times, we do not know if the resulting microsporidian

populations were genetically diverse or not.

Experimental evolution

We serially passaged the microsporidians *A. rigaudi* and *E. artemiae* on the host species *A. franciscana*,

A. parthenogenetica, or an alternation of the two. After 10 passages, we assayed the infectivity,

virulence, and spore production of each line, and compared these among treatments.

Experimental conditions

See Supplementary Methods.

Serial passages

We subjected A. rigaudi and E. artemiae to serial passaging under three evolutionary treatments: 'A. f.

host', 'A. p. host', and 'Alternating hosts'. In the first two regimes, the parasites encountered only A.

franciscana or only A. parthenogenetica; in the third regime, the parasites encountered alternating

passages of A. franciscana and A. parthenogenetica. Each microsporidian × treatment combination was

replicated four times, producing a total of 24 parasite lines. Parasites underwent ten serial passages,

each lasting three weeks. The protocol is depicted in Fig. 1; details can be found in the Supplementary

Methods.

Two aspects of our passaging protocol should be pointed out: first, the time between passages (three

weeks) is enough to allow infections to be transmitted within passaged groups (Rode et al. 2013a). Thus,

low infection rates at the start of a passage could be compensated by high within-passage transmission.

Second, we did not control the number of spores that were transmitted from one group of hosts to the

next. Thus, the size of the inoculum and of the microsporidian population in all passages after P1 were

dependent on the infection dynamics that developed within each replicate line.

Final assays

At the end of the serial passage experiment, we tested the infectivity, virulence, and spore production of

each evolved line in both *A. franciscana* and *A. parthenogenetica*. We tested all surviving parasite lines

based on the spores they produced at the end of P10, and an additional subset of the parasite lines

based on backup spores collected after P6 (see Results). Details on spore collection after P6 and P10 can

be found in the Supplementary Methods.

We performed two final assays (described in Fig. 1, details in the Supplementary Methods). The first

assay tested the infectivity of the evolved lines; it was replicated on 40 *A. parthenogenetica* and 40 *A.*

franciscana individuals for each line. In parallel with the first, a second assay tested the virulence and

spore production of each evolved line. This assay was also replicated on 40 *A. parthenogenetica* and 40

A. franciscana per evolved line. Because we suspected that there would be fewer infections when *A.*

parthenogenetica was exposed to *E. artemiae*, we increased the level of replication for these

combinations, adding an extra 20 *A. parthenogenetica*. We also included 80 control *A. parthenogenetica*

and 80 control *A. franciscana*, which were not exposed to spores but otherwise treated identically.

Spore production was measured by quantifying the number of spores produced by infected individuals

over a two-day period after three weeks of infection; this corresponds to the window for transmission

during the serial passage experiment.

Statistical analyses

All analyses were carried out in R version 3.5.1 (R Core Team 2014), using the packages lme4 (linear

mixed modeling, Bates et al. 2015) and survival (survival analyses, Therneau 2014). Unless stated

otherwise, we built full models with the relevant experimental factors, and tested for the significance of

effects using the likelihood ratio test. If post-hoc testing was necessary, we used Tukey HSD tests from

the packages multcomp (Hothorn et al. 2008) and lsmeans [ref].

Serial passages

During the serial passage experiment, we collected data on host survival and parasite population size.

Here, we tested whether these variables changed over the course of the experiment.

Host survival was quantified as the proportion of surviving hosts in each line at the end of each passage.

Because we did not maintain "control" host populations during the serial passage experiment, host

survival is relative (e.g. survival in 'Alternating hosts' vs. '*A. f.* host' treatments), and can only be

compared within host species; we therefore analyzed it separately for *A. franciscana* and *A.*

parthenogenetica. Linear mixed models included survival as a binomial response variable, *Treatment*,

Passage number (as a continuous variable measuring time), *Parasite species* and all interactions as fixed

effects, and *Line* as a random effect. In addition, we included *Passage* as a random factor, to control for

background variation in the quality of the hosts. Lines where parasites were lost (see Results) were

excluded.

To test whether the parasite population size changed, we built linear mixed models including *Treatment*,

Passage number (as a continuous variable measuring time), and their interaction as fixed effects, and

Line as a random variable. *A. rigaudi* and *E. artemiae* lines were analyzed separately. The population size

was *ln*-transformed, and zero counts (lost lines) were excluded.

Final assays

In the final assays, we tested the effects of the passaging treatment on the infectivity, virulence, and

spore production of the two parasites; we then compared a composite measure of parasite fitness. For

each variable described below, analyses proceeded as follows. *A. rigaudi* and *E. artemiae* lines were

analyzed separately. We began by testing whether surviving and revived lines were different, looking

only at those treatments that included revived lines (models with fixed effects *Revival*, *Treatment*, *Assay*

host, and their interactions). If they were not different, the revived lines were included in the

subsequent analyses (models with fixed effects *Treatment*, *Assay host*, and their interaction). *Line* was

always included as a random variable, or as a frailty variable for survival analyses.

Infectivity was analyzed as the proportion of infected individuals at the end of the first assay (a binomial

response) in a generalized linear mixed model. For virulence, the effects of *Treatment* were tested using

log-logistic survival models, stratified over *Assay host* (this allowed the host species to have a different

baseline survival shape). So that the results could be interpreted in terms of survival relative to

uninfected hosts, we included the survival data of the control hosts as an additional *Treatment* category.

However, we excluded any hosts that had been exposed to a parasite but not infected (cf. Lievens et al.

2018). We also excluded any hosts that died before day 11 of the assay, because infection could not be

reliably detected before this day (see Supplementary Methods). To analyze the effects on spore

production, we used the spore count in the fecal sample as a negative binomial response variable in a

generalized linear mixed model. Fecal samples were only pooled for infected individuals; uninfected

hosts were therefore implicitly excluded from the model.

Finally, we used spore production and infectivity to produce a composite fitness measure for each line.

We used a measure of fitness that was representative for the context of the experiment, being the

projected number of infections occurring if the line were passaged onto a new set of susceptible hosts.

We calculated this as the total number of spores produced by the surviving individuals over a two-day

period after three weeks of incubation (thus virulence is implicit), multiplied by the infectiousness of a

single spore. Infectiousness, the probability of a single spore to start an infection, was calculated based

on the results of the first assay. Following an independent action model with birth-death processes, the

infectiousness of one spore is $-\ln\left(\frac{noninfected}{exposed}\right)/D$, where D is the spore dose, in our case 750 spores

(Schmid-Hempel 2011, pg. 225-6). We analyzed fitness using a linear mixed model, after *ln*+1

transformation.

RESULTS

Serial passages

Of the twenty four parasite lines, four were lost during passaging (Table 1). Two of these were lost

before we could collect a backup spore sample after P6; of the other two, only one line's P6 spores

could be revived and used in the final assays.

At the beginning of passages P5, P6, and P7, exceptionally high mortality occurred in several groups of

new hosts as they were being exposed to the parasites produced by the old hosts (Table 2). These

episodes were concentrated in the treatments '*A. f.* host'. Notably, the passaging step from P5 to P6 was

repeated three times without success for the line *E. artemiae* × ʹ*A. f.* hostʹ – Replicate 4. The transfer

was eventually achieved after 6 weeks of incubation in the P5 hosts, as the other lines were being

passaged from P6 to P7. We denote this transfer as ʹP5 → P7ʹ for consistency, but P7 is only the 6th

passage for this particular line. To investigate whether these effects were due to increased virulence or

demographic effects (increased parasite load), we included backup spores produced by these lines in the

final assays (see below).

Host survival was not constant throughout the serial passage experiment, even when the background

variation in host quality was taken into account (Fig. 2). As the passages progressed, the survival of *A.*

franciscana in *A. rigaudi* × ʹ*A. f.* hostʹ lines decreased as compared to the others (significant triple

interaction, $\chi^2(2)$ = 5.5, *p* = 0.02, Supp. Table 1; post-hoc -4.1 < *z* < -2.5, 0.0001 < *p* < 0.06). Because we

could not separate the background host mortality from parasite-induced effects, we cannot say whether

this change was due to increasing parasite-induced mortality in the *A. rigaudi* × ʹ*A. f.* hostʹ lines, or to

decreasing parasite-induced mortality in the other lines. For *A. parthenogenetica*, survival rates became

progressively higher in *A. rigaudi* relative to *E. artemiae* lines, as well as in ʹAlternating hostsʹ relative to

ʹ*A. p.* hostʹ lines (significant effects of *Parasite species* and *Treatment* in interaction with *Passage*

number, $\chi^2(1)$ = 11.4 and 8.6, *p* < 0.001 and *p* < 0.01, respectively, Supp. Table 1). Again, we could not

distinguish between positive changes in *A. rigaudi* and ʹAlternating hostsʹ lines or negative changes in *E.*

artemiae and ʹ*A. p.* hostʹ lines.

The estimated population size of the parasites also varied through time (Fig. 3). For *A. rigaudi*, the

population grew over the course of the experiment ($\chi^2(1)$ = 10.0, *p* < 0.01 for *Passage number*, Supp.

Table 1), and was significantly larger for lines evolving on *A. parthenogenetica* than for lines evolving on

A. franciscana ($\chi^2(2)$ = 7.2, *p* = 0.03 for *Treatment*, Supp. Table 1; post-hoc *z* = 2.7, *p* = 0.02). For *E.*

artemiae, only the passaging regime impacted the population size, which was significantly higher in lines

evolving on *A. franciscana* than in those evolving on *A. parthenogenetica* ($\chi^2(2)$ = 10.4, *p* < 0.01 for

Treatment, Supp. Table 1; post-hoc *z* = 3.3, *p* < 0.01).

Final assays

During the final assays, we tested all surviving evolved lines, as well as a set of lines revived from the

backup P6 spore samples (Table 3). These included all the lines in the parasite/treatment combination *E.*

artemiae × ʹ*A. f.* hostʹ, most of which experienced a period of exceptional mortality during the

transmission events before the end of P6 (Table 2). The two *E. artemiae* × ʹAlternating hostsʹ lines whose

P6 hosts were *A. franciscana* (Replicates 1 & 2) were also revived to act as controls for the effect of

storage, but revival was only successful for Replicate 2. Finally, we succeeded in reviving the spores of

the lost line *A. rigaudi* × 'A. f. host' – Replicate 2.

In the first assay, we tested for effects of passaging treatment on infectivity (Fig. 4, replicates shown in

Supp. Fig. 1). The infectivity of *A. rigaudi* was unaffected by storage effects ($\chi^2(1) = 1.6$, $p = 0.21$), and did

not change in response to passaging treatment ($\chi^2(2) = 2.8$, $p = 0.25$, Supp. Table 2); it tended to be

higher in *A. parthenogenetica* ($\chi^2(1) = 3.7$, $p = 0.054$, Supp. Table 2). In contrast, the infectivity of *E.*

artemiae was reduced by storage at 4°C ($\chi^2(1) = 4.6$, $p = 0.03$; dashed lines in Supp. Fig. 1), so the revived

lines were excluded from further analysis. The infectivity of surviving *E. artemiae* lines was generally

higher in *A. franciscana* than in *A. parthenogenetica*, but the difference was less strong after passaging

on 'Alternating hosts' and '*A. p.* host' ($\chi^2(2) = 8.1$, $p = 0.02$ for interaction effect, Supp. Table 2).

In the second assay, we tested for effects of passaging treatment on virulence and spore production. As

expected, we detected infection in the majority of the exposed hosts in all host-parasite combinations

except A. parthenogenetica-E. artemiae (Table 4). No infection was detected for the line *A. rigaudi* × '*A.*

p. host' – Replicate 1, so it was excluded from further analyses.

For both *A. rigaudi* and *E. artemiae*, parasite-induced mortality was unaffected by storage at 4°C

(respectively $\chi^2(1.0) = 0.2$, $p = 0.64$ and $\chi^2(1.2) = 0.9$, $p = 0.39$). The revived lines were therefore included

in the analyses. Overall, mortality was higher for *A. parthenogenetica*. For *A. rigaudi*, there was an

additional effect of passaging treatment: when assayed on *A. parthenogenetica*, virulence was highest

for lines passaged on *A. franciscana*, intermediate for lines passaged on alternating hosts, and lowest for

lines passaged on *A. parthenogenetica* itself ($\chi^2(3.0) = 10.4$, $p = 0.02$ for interaction effect, Supp. Table

2). For *E. artemiae* lines, virulence was not affected by passaging treatment, nor by the interaction

between treatment and assay host ($\chi^2(3.6) = 3.7$, $p = 0.38$ and $\chi^2(4.5) = 5.8$, $p = 0.27$, respectively, Supp.

Table 2; Fig. 4, replicates shown in Supp. Fig. 2).

Similarly, spore production at passaging was unaffected by storage at 4°C ($\chi^2(1) = 0.2$, $p = 0.69$ for *A.*

rigaudi; $\chi^2(1) = 0.8$, $p = 0.38$ for *E. artemiae*), so all lines were included in the further analyses. Spore

production was higher in *A. parthenogenetica* for *A. rigaudi* and in *A. franciscana* for *E. artemiae* ($\chi^2(1) = $

14.8 and $= 16.5$, $p = 0.0001$ and < 0.0001, respectively, Supp. Table 2). However, there were no effects of

treatment, nor of the interaction between treatment and assay host ($\chi^2(2) \leq 0.7$ and ≤ 1.7, $p \geq 0.71$ and $\geq$

0.43, respectively, Supp. Table 2; Fig. 4, replicates shown in Supp. Fig. 3).

Finally, we analyzed an overall fitness measure for each line: the projected number of hosts that would

be infected at passaging (Fig. 5). For *A. rigaudi*, storage at 4°C had no effect on the composite traits of

fitness (see above), so the single revived line was included in the analysis. We also included the line *A.*

rigaudi × '*A. p.* host' – Replicate 1, which failed to infect hosts in the second assay, with fitness set to 0

(excluding the line did not change the results). *A. rigaudi* fitness was always higher when tested on *A.*

parthenogenetica, with no effect of passaging treatment, or of the interaction between treatment and

assay host ($\chi^2(1) = 11.9$, $\chi^2(2) = 2.2$ and 2.5, $p < 0.001$, $= 0.34$ and $= 0.29$, respectively, Supp. Table 2). For

E. artemiae, in contrast, the patterns of fitness mirrored those of infectivity. As storage at 4°C affected

infectivity (see above), the revived lines were excluded. *E. artemiae* fitness was always lower in *A.*

parthenogenetica, but less so after passaging on 'Alternating hosts' and '*A. p.* host' ($\chi^2(2) = 6.4$, $p = 0.04$

for interaction effect, Supp. Table 2).

DISCUSSION

We investigated the evolution of host specialization, and its underlying traits, in the microsporidian

parasites *A. rigaudi* and *E. artemiae*. In the field, these parasites infect two sympatric species of *Artemia*,

each with a degree of host specialization: *A. rigaudi* is preferentially adapted to *A. parthenogenetica*,

and *E. artemiae* to *A. franciscana* (the "matched" hosts, Lievens et al. 2018). To test whether this

pattern is shaped by host availability or by fitness trade-offs, we experimentally evolved the parasites on

one or both of their natural hosts. We found that the parasites remained semi-specialized in all

passaging conditions. The different parasite traits did not play an equal role in this outcome: spore

production remained specialized in both parasites, infectivity readily evolved towards generalism, and

virulence played a minor role. Our results are consistent with a strong trade-off acting on spore

production and a weak trade-off on infectivity, and suggest that spore production is the key trait

preventing the evolution of generalism in this system.

The evolution of specialization and its underlying traits

Our first conclusion is that both *A. rigaudi* and *E. artemiae* display a robust pattern of specialization: the

fitness of both microsporidians was higher in the matched hosts than in the mismatched hosts, even

after extended passaging on the latter (Fig. 5). This result is consistent with our previous ecology- and

life history-based findings (Lievens et al. 2018, 2019), and aligns with the general host-conservative

behavior of microsporidians (Smith 2009).

A. rigaudi's specialization for *A. parthenogenetica* was caused by a disparity in spore production. This

parasite produced many more spores in *A. parthenogenetica*. Neither infectivity nor spore production

changed detectably during the serial passages, but the passaging treatment did affect virulence (Fig. 4).

When tested in *A. parthenogenetica*, *A. rigaudi* lines that had evolved on that host were less virulent

than lines that had evolved on *A. franciscana*. Whether this was due to an incidentally high virulence on

a 'novel' host, or to an adaptive decrease in virulence on a 'known' host, is unknown, but both are

plausible (Woolhouse et al. 2001, Alizon et al. 2009). The effect of virulence on overall fitness was minor,

however, so the parasite stayed equally specialized for *A. parthenogenetica* in all treatments (Fig. 5).

These results correspond well with previous findings (Lievens et al. 2018).

For *E. artemiae*, specialization was apparent for spore production and infectivity. *E. artemiae* spores had

a higher chance of infecting *A. franciscana*, and *E. artemiae* infections also produced more spores in *A.*

franciscana (Fig. 4). Compounded, these two traits produce a clear pattern of specialization (Fig. 5).

Unlike that of *A. rigaudi*, however, *E. artemiae*'s fitness did evolve in some treatments. *E. artemiae* lines

whose passaging history included *A. parthenogenetica* had a higher fitness on this host, while their

fitness in *A. franciscana* was not detectably changed (compare cross & circle to triangle in Fig. 5). *E.*

artemiae can thus evolve a more generalist strategy without a detectable trade-off. This observation

supports the mounting evidence that "costs" of adaptation to different environments may not always be

present, as expected theoretically (Lenormand et al. 2018) and observed empirically (Falconer 1990,

Agrawal 2000, Kassen 2002, Nidelet and Kaltz 2007, Magalhães et al. 2009, Bedhomme et al. 2012,

Remold 2012, Gallet et al. 2014, Messina and Durham 2015). *E. artemiae*'s fitness change was driven by

a change in infectivity, while virulence and spore production were static. Interestingly, changes in

infectivity have also been found to drive the evolution of specialists and generalists in the

microsporidian *Brachiola algerae*, although in this case there was a correlated loss of infectivity in other

hosts (Legros and Koella 2010).

The difference in infectivity among the evolved lines of *E. artemiae* can be interpreted in two ways: its

infectivity in *A. parthenogenetica* either decreased when the parasite was no longer exposed to this

host, or increased when the parasite was forced to persist in it. We consider the second to be more

likely. The first possibility could be achieved by the accumulation of conditionally deleterious alleles

(neutral in *A. franciscana*, deleterious in *A. parthenogenetica*, Kawecki 1994) or through a loss of genetic

diversity (Yourth and Schmid-Hempel 2006). However, given the size of the initial inoculum and the

limited timeframe of the experiment, we doubt that such processes occurred. It would be easier for *E.*

artemiae to accumulate beneficial mutations when passaged on *A. parthenogenetica*. This hypothesis is

also supported by previous experimental results, which describe the infectivity of the stock population

of *E. artemiae* as resembling that of the '*A. f.* host' evolved lines (Lievens et al. 2018). If so, adaptation

likely occurred through an accumulation of mutations during passaging on *A. parthenogenetica*, which

are beneficial in that host and neutral in *A. franciscana*. Another possibility is that beneficial mutations

occurred in all passaging treatments, but that adaptation to *A. parthenogenetica* had an incidental

positive effect in *A. franciscana* that matched the adaptation to the '*A. f.* host' treatment.

E. artemiae's virulence did not differ among treatments at the end of the serial passaging, and we found

no evidence that it evolved over the course of the experiment. In particular, we found no evidence that

the high death rates caused by *E. artemiae* in *A. franciscana* between P4 and P6 were caused by a higher

virulence (Fig. 4). Instead, demographic effects were the likely culprit: *A. franciscana* does not limit *E.*

artemiae's peak spore production to a certain maximum (Lievens et al. 2018), so a higher infective dose

in this combination might lead to a higher peak transmission rate, which would increase the infective

dose and so on, until the number of invading spores was so high that recipient hosts were overwhelmed

(e.g. Ebert et al. 2000).

Trade-offs in infectivity and spore production

An important advantage of this study is that *A. rigaudi* and *E. artemiae* share the same context: the two

parasites are ecologically similar, sympatric, and infect the same host species, so we can reasonably

expect that they are subject to similar life history and environmental constraints. Below, we take

advantage of this to compare the evolved changes in infectivity and spore production for the two

microsporidians, arriving at the compelling conclusion that the strength of their life history trade-offs is

trait-dependent, but that the traits respond similarly in the two species.

The observed changes in infectivity can be explained by the existence of a weak trade-off between

infectivity in *A. franciscana* and *A. parthenogenetica*. Consider first *E. artemiae*, whose ability to infect *A.*

parthenogenetica improved when passaged on that host, without attendant losses in *A. franciscana*.

Such cost-free adaptation could arise if the ancestral '*A. franciscana*-adapted' infectivity of *E. artemiae*

was located slightly below the boundary of a weak trade-off curve (such as would be expected if the

ancestral population was not perfectly adapted to the conditions of the experiment, Fry 2003). There

would then be little improvement possible in *E. artemiae*'s fitness on *A. franciscana*, but a substantial

improvement in *A. parthenogenetica* could easily be achieved (blue arrow in Fig. 6)(Martin and

Lenormand 2015), as seen when *E. artemiae* was passaged on this host (Fig. 4). The infectivity of *A.*

rigaudi can be interpreted in the same context. *A. rigaudi*'s ancestral infectivity is largely generalist

(Lievens et al. 2018), so that the potential improvements in fitness would be small in either direction,

thus producing the unchanged infectivity that we observed across treatments (Fig. 4).

The weak trade-off model implies that the evolution of generalist infectivity should be straightforward,

begging the question of why *E. artemiae*'s ancestral population remained specialized for this trait. We

speculate that the specialization of the ancestral *E. artemiae* population is maintained by source-sink

dynamics in the natural host-parasite community. In the field, *E. artemiae* is present year-round, while

A. parthenogenetica are only present from late spring to fall, so its population predominantly infects,

and evolves on, *A. franciscana* (Lievens et al. 2019). In this case, adaptations towards increased

infectivity in the mismatched host may be continually eroded by selection in the matched host (Holt and

Hochberg 2002, Lenormand 2002). By forcing *E. artemiae* to evolve on *A. parthenogenetica*, we blocked

these source-sink dynamics, allowing generalist infectivity to evolve. In comparison, *A. rigaudi* almost

exclusively occur in communities containing both host species (Lievens et al. 2019), potentially

explaining why this microsporidian had already evolved generalist infectivity.

The second important trait for *A. rigaudi* and *E. artemiae* was spore production, which remained

strongly specialized in all treatments (Fig. 4). This result could be explained by the existence of a strong

trade-off in spore production between the hosts. Such a trade-off would allow small improvements in

the direction of increased specialization (black arrows in Fig. 6), but make improvements on the novel

host much more difficult to achieve (red arrows in Fig. 6); it would also prevent the emergence of a

generalist phenotype. Mechanistically, such a strong trade-off could be related to the distinct strategies

of host exploitation necessary to thrive in *A. franciscana* and *A. parthenogenetica*. The precise

physiology of the host species is likely to be different (they have been diverging for an estimated 40

million years, Baxevanis et al. 2006), and indeed the mechanisms of virulence and within-host regulation

employed by *A. rigaudi* and *E. artemiae* in their matched hosts differ (Lievens et al. 2018, Lievens et al.

unpublished data), with *A. rigaudi* causing more survival virulence, and *E. artemiae* more reproductive

virulence. Successful exploitation of *A. franciscana* and *A. parthenogenetica* could therefore require very

different toolkits, preventing the evolution of generalism and reducing the likelihood of a host switch

(cf. Gemmill et al. 2000).

Taken together, our results provide strong evidence that the microsporidians' traits are constrained by

different trade-off shapes. Intriguingly, while the trade-offs are trait-specific, they are not species-

specific. It seems that while *A. franciscana* and *A. parthenogenetica* are not physiologically similar

enough to allow the evolution of generalism, *A. rigaudi* and *E. artemiae* are ecologically similar enough

to share the same constraints.

Perspectives

Overall, we find that the natural semi-specialization of *A. rigaudi* and *E. artemiae* is primarily shaped by

a strong trade-off acting on spore production. Spore production is therefore a key trait blocking the

evolution of generalism. However, host availability did affect the degree of specialization, by allowing

the evolution of generalist infectivity. We therefore predict that the natural population of *E. artemiae*

may eventually evolve to become less specific, as *A. rigaudi* is, but that neither parasite is likely to

become a true generalist or to switch hosts.

It is worth noting that our conclusions would have been very different if we had not measured the

parasites' traits separately. Based on the overall fitness (Fig. 5), we would have concluded that *A. rigaudi*

was unable to adapt to its mismatched host, while *E. artemiae* was able to evolve towards generalism

after exposure to *A. parthenogenetica*. This would have suggested that the two parasites had

asymmetrical fitness trade-offs between hosts: a strong trade-off for *A. rigaudi*, and a weaker trade-off

for *E. artemiae*. Ignoring the individual traits, therefore, can have important consequences for the

interpretation of field patterns, and for the prediction of a parasite's future evolution. Our results

suggest that more theoretical studies of specialization should be set in a multi-trait context, with each

trait able to exhibit weak or strong trade-offs and evolve accordingly. Such studies would be better

equipped to describe the continuum between generalist and specialist strategies, and to single out the

traits favoring their evolution.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thank C. Gilliot for her help establishing the stock populations, and C. Gilliot and T. Mathieu for their

help designing the experimental equipment. We are also grateful to R. Zahab for her assistance with

PCRs, and to R. Zahab, L. Olazcuaga, and J. Pantel for helping out in times of need. E. J. P. L. received

financial support from a French Ministry of Research fellowship. TL and YM acknowledge support from

CNRS and IRD.

REFERENCES

Agrawal, A. A. 2000. Host-range evolution: Adaptation and trade-offs in fitness of mites on alternative hosts. Ecology 81:500–508.

Alizon, S., A. Hurford, N. Mideo, and M. Van Baalen. 2009. Virulence evolution and the trade-off hypothesis: history, current state of affairs and the future. Journal of Evolutionary Biology 22:245–59.

Amat, F., F. Hontoria, O. Ruiz, A. J. Green, M. I. Sánchez, J. Figuerola, and F. Hortas. 2005. The American brine shrimp as an exotic invasive species in the western Mediterranean. Biological Invasions 7:37–47.

Antonovics, J., M. Hood, and J. Partain. 2002. The ecology and genetics of a host shift: *Microbotryum* as a model system. The American Naturalist 160:S40–S53.

Bates, D., M. Maechler, B. Bolker, and S. Walker. 2015. Fitting Linear Mixed-Effects Models Using lme4. Journal of Statistical Software 67:1–48.

Baxevanis, A. D., I. Kappas, and T. J. Abatzopoulos. 2006. Molecular phylogenetics and asexuality in the brine shrimp *Artemia*. Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution 40:724–738.

Bedhomme, S., G. Lafforgue, and S. F. Elena. 2012. Multihost experimental evolution of a plant RNA virus reveals local adaptation and host-specific mutations. Molecular Biology and Evolution 29:1481–1492.

Bell, G., and X. Reboud. 1997. Experimental evolution in *Chlamydomonas* II. Genetic variation in strongly contrasted environments. Heredity 78:1–11.

Benmayor, R., D. J. Hodgson, G. G. Perron, and A. Buckling. 2009. Host Mixing and Disease Emergence. Current Biology 19:764–767.

Bruns, E., M. L. Carson, and G. May. 2014. The jack of all trades is master of none: A pathogen's ability to infect a greater number of host genotypes comes at a cost of delayed reproduction. Evolution 68:2453–2466.

Ching, J., S. A. Musheyev, D. Chowdhury, J. A. Kim, Y. Choi, and J. J. Dennehy. 2013. Migration enhances adaptation in bacteriophage populations evolving in ecological sinks. Evolution 67:10–17.

Cleaveland, S., M. K. Laurenson, and L. H. Taylor. 2001. Diseases of humans and their domestic mammals: pathogen characteristics, host range and the risk of emergence. Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences 356:991–9.

Ebert, D., C. D. Zschokke-Rohringer, and H. J. Carius. 2000. Dose effects and density-dependent regulation of two microparasites of *Daphnia magna*. Oecologia 122:200–209.

Falconer, D. S. 1990. Selection in different environments: effects on environmental sensitivity (reaction
norm) and on mean performance. Genetical Research 56:57.

Fellous, S., G. Angot, M. Orsucci, A. Migeon, P. Auger, I. Olivieri, and M. Navajas. 2014. Combining
experimental evolution and field population assays to study the evolution of host range breadth.
Journal of Evolutionary Biology 27:911–919.

Fry, J. D. 1996. The evolution of host specialization: are trade-offs overrated? The American Naturalist
148:S84–S107.

Fry, J. D. 2003. Detecting ecological trade-offs using selection experiments. Ecology 84:1672–1678.

Futuyma, D. J., and G. Moreno. 1988. The Evolution of Ecological Specialization. Annual Review of
Ecology and Systematics 19:207–233.

Gallet, R., Y. Latour, B. S. Hughes, and T. Lenormand. 2014. The dynamics of niche evolution upon abrupt
environmental change. Evolution 68:1257–1269.

Gemmill, A. W., M. E. Viney, and A. F. Read. 2000. The evolutionary ecology of host-specificity:
experimental studies with *Strongyloides ratti*. Parasitology 120:429–437.

Hall, S. R., C. R. Becker, J. L. Simonis, M. A. Duffy, A. J. Tessier, and C. E. Cáceres. 2009. Friendly
competition: evidence for a dilution effect among competitors in a planktonic host-parasite
system. Ecology 90:791–801.

Hereford, J. 2009. A quantitative survey of local adaptation and fitness trade-offs. The American
Naturalist 173:579–88.

Holt, R. D., and M. S. Gaines. 1992. Analysis of adaptation in heterogeneous landscapes: implications for
the evolution of fundamental niches. Evolutionary Ecology 6:433–447.

Holt, R. D., and M. E. Hochberg. 2002. Virulence on the edge: a source-sink perspective. Pages 104–119
in U. Dieckmann, J. A. J. Metz, M. W. Sabelis, and K. Sigmund, editors. Adaptive dynamics of
infectious diseases: in pursuit of virulence management. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge,
UK.

Hothorn, T., F. Bretz, and P. Westfall. 2008. Simultaneous Inference in General Parametric Models.
Biometrical Journal 50:346–363.

Jaenike, J., and I. Dombeck. 1998. General-purpose genotypes for host species utilization in a nematode
parasite of *Drosophila*. Evolution 52:832–840.

Kassen, R. 2002. The experimental evolution of specialists, generalists, and the maintenance of diversity.
Journal of Evolutionary Biology 15:173–190.

Kawecki, T. J. 1994. Accumulation of deleterious mutations and the evolutionary cost of being a
generalist. The American Naturalist 144:833–838.

Kelly, D. W., R. A. Paterson, C. R. Townsend, R. Poulin, and D. M. Tompkins. 2009. Parasite spillback: A
neglected concept in invasion ecology? Ecology 90:2047–2056.

Legros, M., and J. C. Koella. 2010. Experimental evolution of specialization by a microsporidian parasite.
BMC Evolutionary Biology 10:159.

Lenormand, T. 2002. Gene flow and the limits to natural selection. Trends in Ecology and Evolution
17:183–189.

Lenormand, T., N. Harmand, and R. Gallet. 2018. Cost of resistance: an unreasonably expensive concept.
Rethinking Ecology 3:51–70.

Lievens, E. J. P., J. M. A. Perreau, P. Agnew, Y. Michalakis, and T. Lenormand. 2018. Decomposing
parasite fitness reveals the basis of specialization in a two-host, two-parasite system. Evolution
Letters 2:390–405.

Lievens, E. J. P., N. O. Rode, J. Landes, A. Segard, R. Jabbour-Zahab, Y. Michalakis, and T. Lenormand.
2019. Long-term prevalence data reveals spillover dynamics in a multi-host (*Artemia*), multi-
parasite (Microsporidia) community. International Journal for Parasitology.

Magalhães, S., E. Blanchet, M. Egas, and I. Olivieri. 2009. Are adaptation costs necessary to build up a
local adaptation pattern? BMC Evolutionary Biology 9:182.

Magalhães, S., A. Cailleau, E. Blanchet, and I. Olivieri. 2014. Do mites evolving in alternating host plants
adapt to host switch? Journal of Evolutionary Biology 27:1956–1964.

Martin, G., and T. Lenormand. 2015. The fitness effect of mutations across environments: Fisher's
geometrical model with multiple optima. Evolution 69:1433–1447.

Messina, F. J., and S. L. Durham. 2015. Loss of adaptation following reversion suggests trade-offs in host
use by a seed beetle. Journal of Evolutionary Biology 28:1882–1891.

Nidelet, T., and O. Kaltz. 2007. Direct and correlated responses to selection in a host-parasite system:
testing for the emergence of genotype specificity. Evolution 61:1803–1811.

Poullain, V., S. Gandon, M. A. Brockhurst, A. Buckling, and M. E. Hochberg. 2008. The evolution of
specificity in evolving and coevolving antagonistic interactions between a bacteria and its phage.
Evolution 62:1–11.

Prenter, J., C. MacNeil, J. T. A. Dick, and A. M. Dunn. 2004. Roles of parasites in animal invasions. Trends
in Ecology and Evolution 19:385–390.

R Core Team. 2014. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for Statistical
Computing, Vienna, Austria.

Ravigne, V., U. Dieckmann, and I. Olivieri. 2009. Live where you thrive: joint evolution of habitat choice
and local adaptation facilitates specialization and promotes diversity. The American Naturalist
174:E141–E169.

Reeve, M. R. 1963. The filter-feeding of *Artemia* I. In pure cultures of plant cells. The Journal of
Experimental Biology 40:195–205.

Refardt, D., and D. Ebert. 2006. Quantitative PCR to detect, discriminate and quantify intracellular
parasites in their host: an example from three microsporidians in Daphnia. Parasitology 133:11–8.

Remold, S. 2012. Understanding specialism when the Jack of all trades can be the master of all.
Proceedings of the Royal Society of London, Series B 279:4861–9.

Rode, N. O., J. Landes, E. J. P. Lievens, E. Flaven, A. Segard, R. Jabbour-Zahab, Y. Michalakis, P. Agnew, C.
P. Vivarès, and T. Lenormand. 2013a. Cytological, molecular and life cycle characterization of
Anostracospora rigaudi n. g., n. sp. and *Enterocytospora artemiae* n. g., n. sp., two new
microsporidian parasites infecting gut tissues of the brine shrimp *Artemia*. Parasitology 140:1168–
85.

Rode, N. O., E. J. P. Lievens, A. Segard, E. Flaven, R. Jabbour-Zahab, and T. Lenormand. 2013b. Cryptic
microsporidian parasites differentially affect invasive and native *Artemia* spp. International Journal
for Parasitology 43:795–803.

Ronce, O., and M. Kirkpatrick. 2001. When sources become sinks: migrational meltdown in
heterogeneous habitats. Evolution 55:1520–1531.

Schmid-Hempel, P. 2011. Evolutionary parasitology: the integrated study of infections, immunology, and
genetics. Oxford University Press, Oxford, UK.

Smith, J. E. 2009. The ecology and evolution of microsporidian parasites. Parasitology 136:1901–1914.

Streicker, D. G., A. Fenton, and A. B. Pedersen. 2013. Differential sources of host species heterogeneity
influence the transmission and control of multihost parasites. Ecology Letters 16:975–984.

Therneau, T. M. 2014. A Package for Survival Analysis in S.

Turner, P. E., and S. F. Elena. 2000. Cost of host radiation in an RNA virus. Genetics 156:1465–1470.

Woolhouse, M. E. J., L. H. Taylor, and D. T. Haydon. 2001. Population Biology of Multihost Pathogens.
Science 292:1109–1112.

Yourth, C. P., and P. Schmid-Hempel. 2006. Serial passage of the parasite *Crithidia bombi* within a colony
of its host, *Bombus terrestris*, reduces success in unrelated hosts. Proceedings of the Royal Society
of London, Series B 273:655–659.

TABLES

Table 1. Parasite lines that were lost during the experiment. Underlined are the hosts from which we collected a

backup spore sample.

Parasite line	Lost between
A. rigaudi × 'A. f. host' – Repl. 2	<u>P6</u> & P7
A. rigaudi × 'A. f. host' – Repl. 3	P4 & P6
A. rigaudi × 'Alternating hosts' – Repl. 4	P1 & P4
E. artemiae × 'A. p. host' – Repl. 3	<u>P6</u> & P7

545 **Table 2.** Parasite lines that had exceptionally high mortality during one or more transmission events (≤ 5 new hosts

546 survived). To prevent the loss of these lines, we added five extra new hosts to the group at the beginning of the

547 incubation period. If all new hosts died, the transmission step was repeated for that line. Underlined are the hosts

548 from which we collected a backup spore sample.

Parasite line	Passage	Details
A. rigaudi × 'A. f. host' – Repl. 1	<u>P6</u> → P7	≤ 5 P7 hosts survived; 5 hosts added
A. rigaudi × 'A. f. host' – Repl. 2	P5 → P6	≤ 5 P6 hosts survived; 5 hosts added
	<u>P6</u> → P7	≤ 5 P7 hosts survived; 5 hosts added
A. rigaudi × 'A. f. host' – Repl. 3	<u>P6</u> → P7	≤ 5 P7 hosts survived; 5 hosts added
E. artemiae × 'A. f. host' – Repl. 1	P5 → P6	≤ 5 P6 hosts survived; 5 hosts added
	<u>P6</u> → P7	≤ 5 P7 hosts survived; 5 hosts added
E. artemiae × 'A. f. host' – Repl. 2	P4 → P5	0 P5 hosts survived; transmission repeated
	<u>P6</u> → P7	≤ 5 P7 hosts survived; 5 hosts added
E. artemiae × 'A. f. host' – Repl. 4	P4 → P5	≤ 5 P5 hosts survived; 5 hosts added
	P5 → P6	0 P6 hosts survived (three repetitions); eventually skipped
	<u>P5</u> → P7	≤ 5 P7 hosts survived; 5 hosts added

550 **Table 3.** Evolved lines used for the final assays. Abbreviations: Y, yes; N, no.

Parasite species/Treatment	Replicate	Used?	Notes
A. rigaudi × 'A. f. host'	1	Y	
	2 revived	Y	Lost, but revived from P6 backup sample.
	3	N	Lost.
	4	Y	
A. rigaudi × 'Alternating hosts'	1	Y	
	2	Y	
	3	Y	
	4	N	Lost.
A. rigaudi × 'A. p. host'	1	Y	
	2	Y	
	3	Y	
	4	Y	
E. artemiae × 'A. f. host'	1 + 1 revived	Y	Revived from P6 to compare virulence.
	2 + 2 revived	Y	Revived from P6 to compare virulence.
	3 + 3 revived	Y	Revived from P6 to compare virulence.
	4 + 4 revived	Y	Revived from P5 to compare virulence.
E. artemiae × 'Alternating hosts'	1	Y	Attempted revival from P6 was unsuccessful.
	2 + 2 revived	Y	Revived from P6 to compare virulence.
	3	Y	
	4	Y	
E. artemiae × 'A. p. host'	1	Y	
	2	Y	
	3	N	Lost, attempted revival from P6 was unsuccessful.
	4	Y	

552 **Table 4.** Detection of infection in the second assay. Only hosts that died after day 10 are included here, to allow for
553 the delay in detection time (see Supplementary Methods).

Parasite species	Infected hosts
A. rigaudi	
A. franciscana	66 %
A. parthenogenetica	70 %
E. artemiae	
A. franciscana	68 %
A. parthenogenetica	34 %

Figure 1. Experimental evolution protocol. **Serial passages:** [1] Passage 1 (P1): a group of 40 uninfected hosts was
exposed to a saturating dose of stock *A. rigaudi* or *E. artemiae* spores, and [2] the infections were allowed to
incubate. [3] Passaging (P1 → P2): the infection was transmitted naturally, by placing the surviving P1 hosts in a
strainer above a new group of uninfected hosts. [4] The incubation and passaging steps were repeated for P2-P10.
[5] After passaging, the surviving old hosts were counted (P1-P10) and used to estimate the population size of the
parasite (P1, P4, P7), produce backup spore samples (P6), or produce the spores for the final assays (P10). **Final**
assays: [1st] An uninfected host was exposed to a low dose of evolved *A. rigaudi* or *E. artemiae* spores, and PCR-
tested for the presence of the microsporidian after a short incubation period. [2nd] An uninfected host was
exposed to a saturating dose of evolved *A. rigaudi* or *E. artemiae* spores, and mortality and spore production were
tracked for 90 days.

Serial passaging

Final assays

Figure 2. Host survival during the serial passage experiment (a compound of background host mortality and
parasite-induced mortality). Colors denote the parasite treatment (blue, *A. rigaudi*; red, *E. artemiae*); symbols
denote the passaging treatment (triangles, '*A. f.* host'; crosses, 'Alternating hosts'; circles, '*A. p.* host'); vertical bars
represent the 95% CIs.

Figure 3. Parasite population size, as estimated for each passaging line (*In* scale). Colors denote the parasite
treatment (blue, *A. rigaudi*; red, *E. artemiae*); symbols denote the passaging treatment (triangles, '*A. f.* host';
crosses, 'Alternating hosts'; circles, '*A. p.* host'); vertical bars represent the 95% CIs. Lost lines (lines with an
estimated population size of 0) are not included in the figure.

Figure 4. Infectivity, virulence, and spore production during the final assays. Infectivity is the percentage of hosts

infected during the first assay. Virulence and spore production were measured in the second assay: virulence is the

acceleration factor (the ratio of time-until-death) compared to the unexposed controls of the same species, spore

production is the number of spores produced per (surviving) infected host at the time of passaging (*In* scale).

Vertical bars represent the 95% CIs.

Assay host

Figure 5. Fitness during the final assays (projected number of infections at passaging, *ln* + 1 scale). Vertical bars

represent the 95% CIs.

Assay host

Figure 6. We speculate that the observed patterns of specialization in infectivity and spore production are

determined by weak and strong trade-offs in performance between *A. franciscana* and *A. parthenogenetica* (see

text for more information). Symbols: *A. rigaudi*, circle; *E. artemiae*; triangle. Black arrows, small changes are

possible; blue arrow, a large change is possible; red arrows, changes in the direction of selection are not possible

unless preceded by reverse specialization.

592