1   **Host nutrient supply mediates facilitation and competition between plant viruses**
2

Amy E. Kendig[1*], Elizabeth T. Borer[1], Emily N. Boak[2], Tashina C. Picard[1], and Eric W.

Seabloom[1]

Author affiliations: 1. Department of Ecology, Evolution, and Behavior, University of

Minnesota, St. Paul, MN 55108, USA. 2. Department of Horticultural Sciences, Texas A&M

University, College Station, TX 77843, USA. *Present address: Agronomy Department,

University of Florida, Gainesville, FL 32611, USA.

Correspondence: Amy Kendig, email: aekendig@gmail.com

Abstract

Ecological theory that predicts the effects of resource availability on species interactions has

been explored across a range of systems. Yet, application of this theory to communities of host-

associated pathogens has been limited. Host resources and diet can impact disease severity and

prevalence, and these resource effects on disease may be mediated by pathogen-pathogen

interactions within hosts infected with multiple pathogens. As with free-living organisms,

pathogen species can alter each other's population growth rates, population densities, and

transmission to new hosts through facilitative or antagonistic processes. We used a model grass-

virus system (Barley and Cereal Yellow Dwarf Viruses) to test the hypothesis that host nutrition

can constrain virus-virus interactions by simultaneously determining both within-host density

and transmission to new hosts. Hosts (oats) were grown in growth chambers with different

concentrations of soil nitrogen (N) and phosphorus (P) and infected with one or both viruses (i.e.,

coinfection). We quantified the impacts of nutrient addition on virus-virus interactions through

within-host density (i.e., the concentration of viruses in a plant) and transmission to new hosts.

Nutrients promoted facilitation of one virus (CYDV-RPV) through increased density (elevated

N) and increased transmission (elevated N and P) with coinfection relative to single infection.

The other virus (BYDV-PAV) experienced facilitation through increased density when nutrients

were limited, but nutrient addition led to antagonistic effects of coinfection on density (elevated

N and P) and transmission (elevated N). Our results highlight opportunities for novel insights

from testing predictions of community ecology in disease systems, including nutrient-dependent

facilitation and nutrient-mediated interactions during transmission that were not predicted by

within-host dynamics. This study contributes to the growing literature on ecological interactions

among coinfecting pathogens by demonstrating that resource availability can mediate pathogen-

pathogen interactions both within hosts and during transmission.

Key words: coinfection, facilitation, resource competition, transmission, within-host, barley and

cereal yellow dwarf viruses

Introduction

Resource supply rates can alter the outcome of many species interactions, including

competition (Tilman 1977), predation (Oksanen et al. 1981), and facilitation (Gough et al. 2016).

While there is a rich body of theoretical and empirical literature exploring of the effects of

resource supply on ecological dynamics, most of this work has focused on free-living organisms

(Tilman 1982, Holt et al. 1994, Miller et al. 2005). However, pathogens, parasites, and other

symbionts comprise a large proportion of the diversity on earth (Lafferty et al. 2006, Qin et al.

2010), and the resources consumed by hosts, i.e., host nutrition, is an important mediator of

resource supply to these organisms (Smith et al. 2005). Over 20 year ago, Smith and Holt (1996)

used resource-competition theory to explore the effects of resource supply rate on pathogen-

pathogen interactions, but there have been few empirical extensions since the publication of this

seminal work (but see Chant and Gbaja 1985, Lacroix et al. 2014, 2017, Wale et al. 2017a,

2017b). In addition, theory in disease ecology has focused on among-host transmission and host

population dynamics and typically assumes that within-host processes reach an instantaneous

equilibrium (Keeling and Rohani 2008). Recently, Strauss et al. (2019) developed a

metacommunity model that combines the within-host pathogen dynamics explored by Smith and

Holt (1996) with an iconic two-pathogen, disease-ecology model (May and Nowak 1994) and

demonstrated that within-host pathogen-pathogen interactions can have strong effects on

pathogen dynamics at the host population scale. Here, we experimentally tested the effects of

host nutrition on the within-host population dynamics and among-host transmission rates of two

plant viruses in a grass host.

Pathogens can interact with one another through a variety of mechanisms within plants

(Sofonea et al. 2017), many of which can depend on resource availability. They can compete for

resources, such as host cells or materials for replication (e.g. proteins and ribosomes, Smith and

Holt 1996). For example, drug-resistant and susceptible malaria strains compete for pABA

within mice, which can be manipulated through diet (Wale et al. 2017a, 2017b). Pathogens also

can interact through the host's immune system, triggering or suppressing immune reactions

(Ezenwa et al. 2010). Immune functioning in mammals depends on vitamins, zinc, iron, and

iodine (Katona and Katona-Apte 2008), and plant susceptibility to certain pathogens can depend

on the C:N of nutrients in the soil (Hoffland et al. 1999). Pathogens also can produce molecules

that are toxic (i.e., spite) or can be used by other pathogens (i.e., common goods) (Abdullah et al.

2017). The production of such molecules depends on the availability of resources such as

nitrogen and carbon (Brown et al. 2009). Therefore, host diet may modify pathogen-pathogen

interactions through resource competition, immune-mediated interactions, and the exchange of

molecules.

76   Within-host, pathogen-pathogen interactions can affect overall pathogen fitness by

altering host population-scale rates such as transmission, recovery, and mortality (Mideo et al.

2008). Pathogens that reach higher densities within hosts are more likely to produce more

propagules for direct or vector-assisted transmission (Handel and Rohani 2015). In addition,

infections that last longer provide more opportunities for transmission to occur. In many cases,

within-host pathogen densities predict the probability of transmission given host-to-host contact,

but this relationship is not universal (Froissart et al. 2010, Handel and Rohani 2015). For

example, vector feeding time (Power et al. 1991) and pathogen-vector compatibility (D'Arcy and

Burnett 1995) also can affect the rate of transmission. Nutrients can mediate vector preference

for hosts and the amount of time a vector spends feeding on hosts (Nowak and Komor 2010),

which may alter how sensitive pathogen transmission is to within-host interactions. Pathogens

can also interact with one another within vectors, interfering with pathogen-vector compatibility

(Wen et al. 1991). The nutrition of hosts or vectors may affect this process.

89   A well-studied group of viruses that infects crops and wild plants, the Barley and Cereal

Yellow Dwarf Viruses (B/CYDVs, D'Arcy and Burnett 1995, Power et al. 2011), provide an

ideal system for investigating how nutrient availability mediates the outcome of pathogen-

pathogen interactions through within-host virus densities and transmission between hosts.

Nitrogen (N) can promote B/CYDV within-host density through increased host size (Whitaker et

al. 2015, but see Lacroix et al. 2017) and alleviate antagonistic interactions during co-inoculation

of two B/CYDVs (Lacroix et al. 2014). In addition, the composition of virus particles and the

processes of replication and transmission likely require similar resources across B/CYDVs

(D'Arcy and Burnett 1995, Sterner and Elser 2002). Therefore, it is likely that B/CYDVs

compete for resources within a shared host. Further, N and P can affect B/CYDV infection

prevalence in grasslands (Seabloom et al. 2010, 2013, Borer et al. 2014), which may be driven

by nutrient effects on within-host virus density, vector preferences for hosts, or vector population

growth rates (Mordecai et al. 2016, Shaw et al. 2017).

Here, we tested the hypothesis that host nutrition can constrain virus-virus interactions by

simultaneously determining both within-host density and transmission to new hosts. In a growth

chamber experiment, we manipulated soil N and P concentrations and quantified the resulting

interactions between two B/CYDVs within plants and during transmission between plants.

Consistent with models of pathogen-pathogen resource competition, we expected that nutrient

limitation would decrease the within-host density of the inferior competitor in coinfected plants

relative to singly infected plants and could ultimately lead to competitive exclusion (Tilman

1982, Smith and Holt 1996, Strauss et al. 2019). We expected that within-host competition

would affect transmission rates through links between within-host dynamics and transmission

(Handel and Rohani 2015, Strauss et al. 2019), but that transmission also would depend on

pathogen-density-independent vector processes (Power et al. 1991, D'Arcy and Burnett 1995).

Methods

The B/CYDV group is capable of infecting many grass species in locations around the

world (D'Arcy and Burnett 1995), making it likely that these viruses encounter a range of plant

N and P concentrations. The single-stranded RNA viruses are persistently transmitted by grass-

feeding aphids and the two virus species we used in this study, BYDV-PAV (PAV, hereafter)

and CYDV-RPV (RPV, hereafter) can both be vectored by the aphid species *Rhopalosiphum*

padi (D'Arcy and Burnett 1995). We maintained cultures of PAV and RPV in *Avena sativa* L.

cv. Coast Black Oat (National plant germplasm system, USDA) by transferring *R. padi* aphids

between infected and healthy *A. sativa* every three weeks (Methods S1). *R. padi* colonies were

maintained on live *A. sativa* plants with mesh cages. We obtained the virus isolates from Dr.

Stewart Gray at Cornell University (Ithaca, NY, USA), and the aphids from Dr. George Heimpel

at the University of Minnesota (St. Paul, MN, USA), who each collected these organisms in their

respective states. Healthy plants, infected plants, and plants with *R. padi* were grown in Sunshine

MVP potting soil (Sun Gro Horticulture, Agawam, MA, USA) and kept in separate growth

chambers at 20°C with a 16:8 h light:dark cycle for one year prior to the experiment.

The experiment was carried out from February to August 2014 over five temporal blocks

(due to space and labor constraints). Variation among temporal blocks was examined in

statistical analyses and included in models when appropriate. *A. sativa* seeds were germinated in

164 mL conical pots with 70% Sunshine medium vermiculite (vermiculite and <1% crystalline

silica; Sun Gro Horticulture) and 30% Turface MVP (calcined clay containing up to 30%

crystalline silica; Turface Athletics, Buffalo Grove, IL, USA) that had been saturated with tap

water. Beginning two days after planting, we watered each plant with one of four modified

Hoagland solutions (7.5 μM N and 1 μM P ("Low"), 7.5 μM N and 50 μM P ("P"), 375 μM N

and 1 μM P ("N"), or 375 μM N and 50 μM P ("N+P"), Table S1), which have been shown to

affect plant growth and virus inoculation success (Hoagland and Arnon 1938, Seabloom et al.

2011, Lacroix et al. 2014). Plants were watered with 30 mL of nutrient solution twice per week

prior to inoculation and weekly following inoculation. After inoculation, plants were moved to a

growth chamber maintained at 20°C with a 16:8 h light:dark cycle under 28W bulbs. Sample

sizes are reported in Table S2.

We inoculated the first set of plants ("source plants") ten to eleven days post planting

with PAV, RPV, or both using ten aphids per plant that fed on our virus cultures (PAV: five

aphids carrying PAV, five mock-inoculated; RPV: five carrying RPV, five mock-inoculated;

both: five carrying PAV, five carrying RPV, Methods S1). We destructively harvested the source

plants at eight different days post inoculation (DPI): 5, 8, 12, 16, 19, 22, 26, or 29 days. We

weighed the stems and leaves and stored approximately 60% of the tissue at -80°C and used the

rest to measure transmission to four "receiving plants" grown in each of the four nutrient

treatments (Methods S1). The receiving plants were harvested 14-15 DPI and all of the stem and

leaf tissue was stored at -80°C. On the first harvesting day, source plants weighed 0.16 g ± 0.006

g (1 s.e., $n = 79$, fresh wet weight) and had, on average, two leaves. By the final harvesting day,

they weighed 0.34 g ± 0.006 g (1 s.e., $n = 92$, fresh wet weight) and had, on average, three

leaves.

To quantify virus densities (number of viruses per mg plant) in source plants, we first

extracted the total RNA from approximately 50 mg of thawed plant tissue from the portion

stored at -80°C. We then used one-step reverse transcription-quantitative polymerase chain

reaction to obtain estimates of the number of copies of PAV and RPV RNA within each sample

(RT-qPCR, see Methods S2 and Table S3 for more details). Virus densities greater than zero and

quantified by RT-qPCR methods were considered indicators of successful infection. We used

RT-PCR and gel electrophoresis to test the transmission success of receiving plants (see Lacroix

et al. 2014 for further details). Plants with accidental infections (i.e. PAV detected in RPV-

inoculated plants and RPV detected in PAV-inoculated plants, Table S2) were included in

analyses as singly infected plants because the timing of the accidental infection was unknown.

Such infections may have been caused by small aphids that escaped inoculation cages (Methods

S1).

We performed all statistical analyses in R version 3.5.2 (R Core Team 2018). To analyze

the effects of nutrient addition and coinfection on virus density in source plants, the infection rate

of source plants, and transmission to receiving plants, we fit Bayesian generalized linear models

to data for each virus species using the brms package (Bürkner 2017). Virus density was

modeled with a Gaussian distribution and formatted as ln(density) ~ coinfection * N addition * P

addition, where coinfection, N addition, and P addition were binary variables (0 or 1, applies to

all other models). Harvesting day was included as a first-order autocorrelation structure (cor_ar

function). Source plant infection was modeled with a Bernoulli distribution (logit-link) and

formatted as infection ~ coinfection * N addition * P addition. Harvesting day was included as a

random effect because autocorrelation structures were not compatible with this family of models.

Transmission was also modeled with a Bernoulli distribution (logit-link) and formatted as

transmission ~ density + coinfection * (N_{source} * P_{source} + $N_{receiving}$ * $P_{receiving}$), where the subscripts

indicate which plant the nutrient treatment was applied to, and density was centered and scaled.

Harvesting day and experimental block were included as crossed random effects. We used data

from a previous experiment that measured PAV and RPV densities and transmission under

almost identical laboratory conditions to inform the priors for the density and transmission

models (Table S4, Lacroix et al. 2017). All models were run with three Markov chains, 6000

iterations each with a 1000 iteration warm-up. We used r-hat values, visualizations of chain

convergence, and visual comparisons of the observed data and simulated data from the posterior

predictive distributions to evaluate model fit. Models with informative and uninformative priors

had similar fits and produced similar estimates (Fig. S1). In the results, we present the estimated

means and 95% highest posterior density intervals (HDI) from models with informative priors.

Results

The proportion of plants successfully infected with PAV increased over the first three

harvesting days (Fig. S2A) while RPV infection was relatively high over time (Fig. S2B). In

successfully infected plants, virus density varied over time, with a general increase over the first

three harvesting days, especially for RPV (Fig. 1A, B). The following results are consistent

whether or not the first two harvesting days are included in the analysis (Fig. S3). Here, we

present results from the full dataset (Table S4).

Coinfection had the most dramatic effect on PAV when plants were grown with low

nutrients, increasing PAV density by 100% (95% HDI: -8.4%, 221%; Fig. 1C). However,

coinfection decreased PAV density when plants were grown with both nutrients (-31.0%, 95%

HDI: -69.0%, 150%). PAV and RPV densities in the same plant were positively correlated across

all nutrient treatments ($\rho = 0.25$, 95% CI: 0.0015, 0.47, df = 60, Fig. 2). In contrast, co-

inoculation had a consistent negative effect on PAV infection, with the greatest reduction when

plants were grown with low nutrients (Fig. S2C).

Coinfection had a slightly positive effect on RPV density when plants were grown with

low nutrients (increased 32.5%, 95% HDI: -45.2%, 123%), but the largest effect was with N

addition (density increased 112%, 95% HDI: -31.6%, 280%; Fig. 1D). P addition led to a slightly

negative impact of coinfection on RPV density (-24.8%, 95% HDI: -73.0%, 39.4%).

Simultaneous N and P addition increased RPV density in both single and coinfection. However,

this effect was driven by P in single infection and N in coinfection. The effects of co-inoculation

on RPV infection mirrored the impacts of coinfection on RPV density (Fig. S2D).

The probability of transmission tended to increase over the first three harvesting days for

both viruses (Fig. 3A, B). A notable exception, however, is RPV transmission from singly

infected plants, which took up to five harvesting days to increase (Fig. 3B). Despite the similarity

in these trends to patterns of virus density (Fig. 1A, B), the relationship between within-host

density and transmission was weak for PAV (Fig. 4A). RPV transmission, however, increased

with within-host density (Fig. 4B).

Nutrient addition to the source plant, especially N, tended to increase PAV transmission

from singly-infected plants (Fig. 3B). However, coinfection decreased PAV transmission by up

to 34.5% when the source plant received N addition (95% HDI: -58.0%, -11.7%). Coinfection

had a slightly positive effect on PAV transmission when the receiving plant was grown with

elevated P, increasing the transmission rate by up to 30.0% (95% HDI: 3.7%, 56.6%), but this

was primarily driven by decreased single infection transmission rather than increased coinfection

transmission.

Coinfection had a large positive effect on RPV transmission, increasing it by up to 69.6%

(95% HDI: 54.1%, 83.4%; source plant = N + P, receiving plant = P, Fig. 3D). In general, P

addition to the source plant increased transmission from coinfected, but not singly infected plants

(Fig. 3D). Similarly, nutrient addition to the receiving plants increased RPV transmission from

coinfected plants but decreased it from singly infected plants (Fig. 3D).

Discussion

Coinfection by multiple pathogens is more the rule than the exception, and pathogen

interactions can alter disease prevalence and severity (Seabloom et al. 2015, Tollenaere et al.

2016, Hassani et al. 2018). In addition, host nutrition can mediate many host-pathogen

interactions (Smith et al. 2005) and may determine the frequency and impacts of coinfection

(Borer et al. 2016, Sofonea et al. 2017, Strauss et al. 2019). Here, we examined the impacts of N

and P availability on virus-virus interactions during two phases: within-host reproduction and

among-host transmission. Within the grass host, viruses interacted through both antagonistic and

facilitative processes, which were dependent on nutrient availability. Virus interactions during

transmission also depended on host nutrients but not within-host interactions (Fig. 5). Together,

these results suggest that nutrient availability influences pathogen-pathogen interactions through

multiple simultaneous processes.

We hypothesized that PAV and RPV would compete for N and P based on multiple lines

of evidence: B/CYDVs likely require similar resources for replication and transmission (D'Arcy

and Burnett 1995, Sterner and Elser 2002), N and P additions have promoted PAV and RPV

infection prevalence and within-host PAV density (Seabloom et al. 2010, 2013, Borer et al.

2014, Whitaker et al. 2015), and N addition has eased negative interactions between PAV and

RPV (Lacroix et al. 2014). Resource competition can lead to more positive interactions with

elevated resources due to lower intensity of competition, or more negative interactions with

elevated resources due to loss of niche dimensionality (Tilman 1982). We found evidence for

resource competition between PAV and RPV. In all cases, RPV had a negative effect on PAV

(infection, density, and transmission; Fig. 5). Adding nutrients tended to decrease PAV density

in and transmission from coinfected hosts, suggesting that PAV may be a superior competitor for

N and P and that adding these resources removed its competitive advantage (Tilman 1982,

Harpole et al. 2016). A major constraint to attributing resource competition to these effects is

that N and P did not seem to be strongly limiting resources for the viruses in our experiment;

elevated nutrients did not enhance virus densities in singly-inoculated plants except in the case of

P addition for RPV. In contrast to our hypothesis, resource competition was not the dominant

force structuring virus-virus interactions because the observed antagonistic interactions may be

explained by other processes and resource-mediated facilitation was pervasive (Fig. 5).

Mechanisms other than resource competition may be appropriate for describing nutrient-

mediated interactions among B/CYDVs. Plant immunity against viruses consists of multiple

pathways that are triggered by different viral characteristics (Mandadi and Scholthof 2013).

Immune responses that target both viruses may explain negative interactions between PAV and

RPV (Abdullah et al. 2017). B/CYDVs possess mechanisms to suppress RNA silencing, a plant

immune mechanism. Complementarity between silencing suppressors may explain facilitation

between PAV and RPV (Liu et al. 2012, Almasi et al. 2015). Another source of facilitation may

be the production of public goods (Wen and Lister 1991). Such goods may be important for

replication, transmission, or both, and may explain incongruencies between nutrient effects on

interactions within the host and during transmission. While some B/CYDVs interact within aphid

vectors, competing for receptor sites, this has not been previously observed for PAV and RPV

(Wen et al. 1991). However, inconsistencies between the results from this experiment and

previous studies on B/CYDVs may be due to the nutrient-dependency of virus-virus interactions.

Exploring the mechanistic underpinnings of nutrient-dependent PAV and RPV interactions

would help clarify the causes of these discrepancies and inform a more general predictive

framework for resource-mediated pathogen-pathogen interactions.

Strauss et al. (2019) demonstrated that the rate of competitive exclusion of pathogens

within hosts relative to host lifespan can affect pathogen densities and disease prevalence. We

did not observe competitive exclusion of either virus over 29 days post inoculation and the

population growth rates of both viruses appeared to equilibrate. In addition, the prevalences of

PAV and RPV in a perennial grass increased over a four-year grassland study (Seabloom et al.

2009), suggesting long-term co-occurrence of these two viruses. Extending the length of the

present experiment or performing mutual invasibility trials would help confirm the stability of

the two-pathogen system (Chesson 2008). Due to fast within-host dynamics relative to host

lifespan and no competitive exclusion, PAV and RPV would be expected to reach higher within-

host densities, but lower prevalences, than "slow-dynamic" competitive pathogens (Strauss et al.

2019), particularly in grass species with infection-induced mortality (Malmstrom et al. 2005).

However, multiple aspects of PAV and RPV interactions remain unknown. Because a large

proportion of PAV infections were so low in concentration that they could not be reliably

quantified, it is unclear whether early dynamics between PAV and RPV include failed

colonization or competitive exclusion. Further, quantifying virus density in vectors and plants

that have received transmission could help identify the stage of transmission at which nutrients

are most influential.

Nutrient-mediated, virus-virus interactions had differential effects on two closely related

viruses, and these effects changed during the two phases of infection that we examined (within-

host interactions and transmission). The metacommunity framework is a useful starting point to

understand disease dynamics, where hosts serve as patches, within-host density is analogous to

within-patch population density, and transmission is analogous to dispersal (May and Nowak

1994, Borer et al. 2016). However, our experiments demonstrate that transmission does not

always depend on within-host density, a common assumption in metacommunity models

(Leibold et al. 2004). In addition, it is clear from our results that nutrients can mediate pathogen-

pathogen interactions through more mechanisms than only resource competition. Building on

existing theories of pathogen-pathogen resource competition (e.g., Smith and Holt 1996) to

include facilitation and immune-mediated interactions would improve predictions about multi-

pathogen infections. For example, models that predict interactions among cross-feeding microbes

(e.g., Harcombe et al. 2014) could be integrated into disease ecology models and models that

include resource-dependent immunity (e.g., Cressler et al. 2014) could be expanded to include

pathogen-pathogen interactions.

Motivated by community ecology theory, we found that nutrient supply to hosts (i.e., host

diet) can impact pathogen interactions. In addition to finding evidence for nutrient-dependent

antagonistic interactions within a grass host, the two-virus system demonstrated nutrient-

dependent facilitation and interactions during transmission that were not predicted by within-host

dynamics. These unexpected findings can help shape the application of community ecology

theory to disease systems. This study also contributes to a growing literature on the impacts of

resources on host-associated microbial communities (Griffin et al. 2017, Berg and Koskella

2018, Reese et al. 2018), which can inform a breadth of practices ranging from medicine to

agriculture. Strengthening the linkages between community ecology and disease ecology will aid

the advancement of both fields and their relevant applications.

Acknowledgements

We are grateful to Christelle Lacroix for help with developing virus quantification

methods and performing the experiments. We would like to thank Melissa Rudeen, Anita

Krause, Nicholas Cupery, Casey Easterday, Kurra Renner, Luc Robichaud, and Alexis Rogers

for assistance with the laboratory experiment. AEK was supported by an NSF IGERT graduate

fellowship at the University of Minnesota (DGE-0653827) and an NSF Graduate Research

Fellowship (base award number 0006595) and ETB and EWS received support from the NSF

program in Ecology and Evolution of Infectious Diseases (grant DEB-1015805).

Literature cited

Abdullah, A. S., C. S. Moffat, F. J. Lopez-Ruiz, M. R. Gibberd, J. Hamblin, and A. Zerihun.

2017. Host–multi-pathogen warfare: Pathogen interactions in co-infected plants. Frontiers

in Plant Science 8:1806.

Almasi, R., W. A. Miller, and V. Ziegler-Graff. 2015. Mild and severe cereal yellow dwarf

viruses differ in silencing suppressor efficiency of the P0 protein. Virus Research 208:199–

206.

Berg, M., and B. Koskella. 2018. Nutrient- and dose-dependent microbiome-mediated protection

against a plant pathogen. Current Biology 28:2487–2492.

Borer, E. T., A.-L. Laine, and E. W. Seabloom. 2016. A multiscale approach to plant disease

using the metacommunity concept. Annual Review of Phytopathology 54:397–418.

Borer, E. T., E. W. Seabloom, C. E. Mitchell, and J. P. Cronin. 2014. Multiple nutrients and

herbivores interact to govern diversity, productivity, composition, and infection in a

successional grassland. Oikos 123:214–224.

Brown, S. P., R. F. Inglis, and F. Taddei. 2009. Evolutionary ecology of microbial wars: within-

host competition and (incidental) virulence. Evolutionary Applications 2:32–39.

Bürkner, P.-C. 2017. brms: An R package for Bayesian multilevel models using Stan. Journal of

Statistical Software 80:1–28.

Chant, S. R., and I. S. Gbaja. 1985. Effect of nutrition on the interaction of viruses and Fusarium

oxysporum in tomato seedlings. Phytoparasitica 13:47–57.

Chesson, P. 2008. Quantifying and testing species coexistence mechanisms. Pages 119–164 *in* F.

Valladares, A. Camacho, A. Elosegi, C. Gracia, M. Estrada, J. C. Senar, and J. M. Gili,

editors. Unity in Diversity: Reflections on Ecology after the Legacy of Ramon Margalef.

Fundacion BBVA, Bilboa, Spain.

Cressler, C. E., W. A. Nelson, T. Day, and E. Mccauley. 2014. Disentangling the interaction

among host resources, the immune system and pathogens. Ecology Letters 17:284–293.

D'Arcy, C. J., and P. A. Burnett. 1995. Barley Yellow Dwarf: 40 Years of Progress. The

American Phytopathological Society, St. Paul, MN, USA.

Ezenwa, V. O., R. S. Etienne, G. Luikart, A. Beja-Pereira, and A. E. Jolles. 2010. Hidden

consequences of living in a wormy world: Nematode-induced immune suppression

facilitates tuberculosis invasion in African buffalo. The American Naturalist 176:613–624.

Froissart, R., J. Doumayrou, F. Vuillaume, S. Alizon, and Y. Michalakis. 2010. The virulence-

transmission trade-off in vector-borne plant viruses: a review of (non-)existing studies.

Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B 365:1907–1918.

Gough, L., N. D. Bettez, K. A. Slavik, W. B. Bowden, A. E. Giblin, G. W. Kling, J. A. Laundre,

and G. R. Shaver. 2016. Effects of long-term nutrient additions on Arctic tundra, stream,

and lake ecosystems: beyond NPP. Oecologia 182:653–665.

Griffin, N. W., P. P. Ahern, J. Cheng, A. C. Heath, O. Ilkayeva, C. B. Newgard, L. Fontana, and

J. I. Gordon. 2017. Prior dietary practices and connections to a human gut microbial

metacommunity alter responses to diet interventions. Cell Host & Microbe 21:84–96.

Handel, A., and P. Rohani. 2015. Crossing the scale from within-host infection dynamics to

between-host transmission fitness: a discussion of current assumptions and knowledge.

Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B 370:20140302.

Harcombe, W. R., W. J. Riehl, I. Dukovski, B. R. Granger, A. Betts, A. H. Lang, G. Bonilla, A.

Kar, N. Leiby, P. Mehta, C. J. Marx, and D. Segrè. 2014. Metabolic resource allocation in

individual microbes determines ecosystem interactions and spatial dynamics. Cell Reports

7:1104–1115.

Harpole, W. S., L. L. Sullivan, E. M. Lind, J. Firn, P. B. Adler, E. T. Borer, J. Chase, P. A. Fay,

Y. Hautier, H. Hillebrand, A. S. MacDougall, E. W. Seabloom, R. Williams, J. D. Bakker,

M. W. Cadotte, E. J. Chaneton, C. Chu, E. E. Cleland, C. D'Antonio, K. F. Davies, D. S.

Gruner, N. Hagenah, K. Kirkman, J. M. H. Knops, K. J. La Pierre, R. L. McCulley, J. L.

Moore, J. W. Morgan, S. M. Prober, A. C. Risch, M. Schuetz, C. J. Stevens, and P. D.

Wragg. 2016. Addition of multiple limiting resources reduces grassland diversity. Nature

537:93–96.

Hassani, M. A., P. Durán, and S. Hacquard. 2018. Microbial interactions within the plant

holobiont. Microbiome 6:58.

Hoagland, D. R., and D. I. Arnon. 1938. The water culture method for growing plants without

soil. Circular/University of California, College of Agriculture, Agricultural Experiment

Station 347:32.

Hoffland, E., M. L. Van Beusichem, and M. J. Jeger. 1999. Nitrogen availability and

susceptibility of tomato leaves to Botrytis cinerea. Plant and Soil 210:263–272.

Holt, R. D., J. Grover, and D. Tilman. 1994. Simple rules for interspecific dominance in systems

with exploitative and apparent competition. The American Naturalist 144:741–771.

Katona, P., and J. Katona-Apte. 2008. The interaction between nutrition and infection. Clinical

Infectious Diseases 46:1582–1588.

Keeling, M. J., and P. Rohani. 2008. Modeling Infectious Diseases in Humans and Animals.

Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ.

Lacroix, C., E. W. Seabloom, and E. T. Borer. 2014. Environmental nutrient supply alters

prevalence and weakens competitive interactions among coinfecting viruses. The New

Phytologist 204:424–433.

Lacroix, C., E. W. Seabloom, and E. T. Borer. 2017. Environmental nutrient supply directly

alters plant traits but indirectly determines virus growth rate. Frontiers in Microbiology

8:2116.

Lafferty, K. D., A. P. Dobson, and A. M. Kuris. 2006. Parasites dominate food web links.

Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America

103:11211–11216.

Leibold, M. A., M. Holyoak, N. Mouquet, P. Amarasekare, J. M. Chase, M. F. Hoopes, R. D.

Holt, J. B. Shurin, R. Law, D. Tilman, M. Loreau, and A. Gonzalez. 2004. The

metacommunity concept: a framework for multi-scale community ecology. Ecology Letters

7:601–613.

Liu, Y., H. Zhai, K. Zhao, B. Wu, and X. Wang. 2012. Two suppressors of RNA silencing

encoded by cereal-infecting members of the family Luteoviridae. Journal of General

Virology 93:1825–1830.

Malmstrom, C. M., C. C. Hughes, L. A. Newton, and C. J. Stoner. 2005. Virus infection in

remnant native bunchgrasses from invaded California grasslands. The New Phytologist

168:217–230.

Mandadi, K. K., and K.-B. G. Scholthof. 2013. Plant immune responses against viruses: How

does a virus cause disease? The Plant Cell 25:1489–1505.

May, R. M., and M. A. Nowak. 1994. Superinfection, metapopulation dynamics, and the

evolution of diversity. Journal of Theoretical Biology 170:95–114.

Mideo, N., S. Alizon, and T. Day. 2008. Linking within- and between-host dynamics in the

evolutionary epidemiology of infectious diseases. Trends in Ecology & Evolution 23:511–

517.

Miller, T. E., J. H. Burns, P. Munguia, E. L. Walters, J. M. Kneitel, P. M. Richards, N. Mouquet,

and H. L. Buckley. 2005. A critical review of twenty years' use of the resource-ratio theory.

The American Naturalist 165:439–448.

Mordecai, E. A., K. Gross, and C. E. Mitchell. 2016. Within-host niche differences and fitness

trade-offs promote coexistence of plant viruses. The American Naturalist 187:E13–E26.

Nowak, H., and E. Komor. 2010. How aphids decide what is good for them: experiments to test

aphid feeding behaviour on Tanacetum vulgare (L.) using different nitrogen regimes.

Oecologia 163:973–984.

Oksanen, L., S. D. Fretwell, J. Arruda, and P. Niemela. 1981. Exploitation ecosystems in

gradients of primary productivity. The American Naturalist 118:240–261.

Power, A. G., E. T. Borer, P. Hosseini, C. E. Mitchell, and E. W. Seabloom. 2011. The

community ecology of barley/cereal yellow dwarf viruses in Western US grasslands. Virus

Research 159:95–100.

Power, A., A. Seaman, and S. Gray. 1991. Aphid transmission of barley yellow dwarf virus:

Inoculation access periods and epidemiological implications. Phytopathology 81:545–548.

Qin, J., R. Li, J. Raes, M. Arumugam, K. S. Burgdorf, C. Manichanh, T. Nielsen, N. Pons, F.

Levenez, T. Yamada, D. R. Mende, J. Li, J. Xu, S. Li, D. Li, J. Cao, B. Wang, H. Liang, H.

Zheng, Y. Xie, J. Tap, P. Lepage, M. Bertalan, J. M. Batto, T. Hansen, D. Le Paslier, A.

Linneberg, H. B. Nielsen, E. Pelletier, P. Renault, T. Sicheritz-Ponten, K. Turner, H. Zhu,

C. Yu, S. Li, M. Jian, Y. Zhou, Y. Li, X. Zhang, S. Li, N. Qin, H. Yang, J. Wang, S.

Brunak, J. Doré, F. Guarner, K. Kristiansen, O. Pedersen, J. Parkhill, J. Weissenbach, P.

Bork, S. D. Ehrlich, J. Wang, M. Antolin, F. Artiguenave, H. Blottiere, N. Borruel, T. Bruls,

F. Casellas, C. Chervaux, A. Cultrone, C. Delorme, G. Denariaz, R. Dervyn, M. Forte, C.

Friss, M. Van De Guchte, E. Guedon, F. Haimet, A. Jamet, C. Juste, G. Kaci, M.

Kleerebezem, J. Knol, M. Kristensen, S. Layec, K. Le Roux, M. Leclerc, E. Maguin, R.

Melo Minardi, R. Oozeer, M. Rescigno, N. Sanchez, S. Tims, T. Torrejon, E. Varela, W. De

Vos, Y. Winogradsky, and E. Zoetendal. 2010. A human gut microbial gene catalogue

established by metagenomic sequencing. Nature 464:59–65.

R Core Team. 2018. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for

Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria.

Reese, A. T., F. C. Pereira, A. Schintlmeister, D. Berry, M. Wagner, L. P. Hale, A. Wu, S. Jiang,

H. K. Durand, X. Zhou, R. T. Premont, A. M. Diehl, T. M. O'Connell, S. C. Alberts, T. R.

Kartzinel, R. M. Pringle, R. R. Dunn, J. P. Wright, and L. A. David. 2018. Microbial

nitrogen limitation in the mammalian large intestine. Nature Microbiology 3:1441–1450.

Seabloom, E. W., C. D. Benfield, E. T. Borer, A. G. Stanley, T. N. Kaye, and P. W. Dunwiddie.

2011. Provenance, life span, and phylogeny do not affect grass species' responses to

nitrogen and phosphorus. Ecological Applications 21:2129–2142.

Seabloom, E. W., E. T. Borer, K. Gross, A. E. Kendig, C. E. Mitchell, E. A. Mordecai, and A. G.

Power. 2015. The community ecology of pathogens: coinfection, coexistence and

community composition. Ecology Letters 18:401–415.

Seabloom, E. W., E. T. Borer, C. Lacroix, C. E. Mitchell, and A. G. Power. 2013. Richness and

composition of niche-assembled viral pathogen communities. PLoS ONE 8:e55675.

Seabloom, E. W., E. T. Borer, C. E. Mitchell, and A. G. Power. 2010. Viral diversity and

prevalence gradients in North American Pacific Coast grasslands. Ecology 91:721–732.

Seabloom, E. W., P. R. Hosseini, A. G. Power, and E. T. Borer. 2009. Diversity and composition

of viral communities: Coinfection of barley and cereal yellow dwarf viruses in California

grasslands. The American Naturalist 173:E79–E98.

Shaw, A. K., A. Peace, A. G. Power, and N. A. Bosque-Pérez. 2017. Vector population growth

and condition-dependent movement drive the spread of plant pathogens. Ecology 98:2145–

2157.

Smith, V. H., and R. D. Holt. 1996. Resource competition and within-host disease dynamics.

Trends in Ecology & Evolution 11:386–389.

Smith, V., T. Jones, and M. Smith. 2005. Host nutrition and infectious disease: an ecological

view. Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment 3:268–274.

Sofonea, M. T., S. Alizon, and Y. Michalakis. 2017. Exposing the diversity of multiple infection

patterns. Journal of Theoretical Biology 419:278–289.

Sterner, R. W., and J. J. Elser. 2002. Ecological Stoichiometry: The Biology of Elements from

Molecules to the Biosphere. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, USA.

Strauss, A. T., L. G. Shoemaker, E. W. Seabloom, and E. T. Borer. 2019. Cross-scale dynamics

in community and disease ecology: relative timescales shape the community ecology of

pathogens. Ecology:e02836.

Tilman, D. 1977. Resource competition between plankton algae: An experimental and theoretical

approach. Ecology 58:338–348.

Tilman, D. 1982. Resource Competition and Community Structure. Princeton University Press,

Princeton, NJ, USA.

Tollenaere, C., H. Susi, and A.-L. Laine. 2016. Evolutionary and epidemiological implications of

multiple infection in plants. Trends in Plant Science 21:80–90.

Wale, N., D. G. Sim, M. J. Jones, R. Salathe, T. Day, and A. F. Read. 2017a. Resource limitation

prevents the emergence of drug resistance by intensifying within-host competition.

Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America

114:13774–13779.

Wale, N., D. G. Sim, and A. F. Read. 2017b. A nutrient mediates intraspecific competition

between rodent malaria parasites in vivo. Proceedings of the Royal Society B

284:20171067.

Wen, F., and R. M. Lister. 1991. Heterologous encapsidation in mixed infections among four

isolates of barley yellow dwarf virus. Journal of General Virology 72:2217–2223.

Wen, F., R. M. Lister, and F. A. Fattouh. 1991. Cross-protection among strains of barley yellow

dwarf virus. Journal of General Virology 72:791–799.

Whitaker, B. K., M. A. Rúa, and C. E. Mitchell. 2015. Viral pathogen production in a wild grass

host driven by host growth and soil nitrogen. New Phytologist 207:760–768.

Data availability

Code is available in the first author's GitHub repository (https://github.com/aekendig/nutrients-

plant-viruses) and will be archived with data at https://portal.edirepository.org.

Figure legends

Figure 1. The effects of nutrient addition (N, P, or both) and coinfection on the log-transformed density of (A) PAV and (B) RPV measured over time (days post inoculation). Points and error bars represent mean +/- 1 SE. The model estimated mean and 95% HDI of log-transformed (C) PAV and (D) RPV density for each inoculation and nutrient treatment, pooled over time.

Figure 2. Log-transformed PAV and RPV density in the same coinfected plants.

Figure 3. The effects of nutrient addition to the source plant (N, P, or both) and coinfection on the probability of (A) PAV and (B) RPV transmission measured over time (days post inoculation). Points and error bars represent mean +/- 1 95% CI. The model estimated mean and 95% HDI of (C) PAV and (D) RPV transmission for each inoculation and receiving plant nutrient treatment, pooled over time. Points are colored by the source plant nutrient treatment.

Figure 4. The relationship between virus density and the probability of transmission for (A) PAV and (B) RPV after accounting for impacts of coinfection and nutrient addition (Fig. 3). Points represent raw data, colored by the nutrient treatment of the source plant. Lines and shaded intervals represent the model estimated mean and 95% HDI, respectively.

Figure 5. Graphical summary of results, including the within-host densities and transmission rates of PAV (left side of plants) and RPV (right side of plants). The single infection baseline depicts the density of each virus within singly-infected plants (filled area relative to leaf area) and the transmission rate between plants (thickness of arrows). It does not correspond to any

particular nutrient treatment but shifts in the values it represents for each nutrient treatment. Low

nutrients, N addition, P addition, and N + P addition depict the changes in virus density and

transmission due to coinfection under each nutrient treatment relative to the single infection

baseline. The source and receiving plants have the same nutrient treatment. Larger areas

(accompanied by +) and larger arrows (accompanied by + or ++) indicate that coinfection

benefitted the virus through density or transmission, respectively. Smaller areas (accompanied by

-) and smaller arrows (accompanied by -) indicate that coinfection suppressed the virus. No

effect of coinfection is represented by areas and arrows the same size as the single infection

baseline (accompanied by 0).

Figure 1

Figure 2

Figure 3

543   **Figure 4**

Figure 5