

Evolutionary comparison between viral lysis rate and
latent period

Juan A. Bonachela*and Simon A. Levin

Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology, Princeton University,
Princeton, New Jersey, 08544, USA

Keywords: Bacteriophage; phytoplankton; latency period; burst size; evolutionarily stable strategy; eco-evolutionary dynamics.

*jabo@princeton.edu

Abstract

Marine viruses shape the structure of the microbial community. They are, thus, a key determinant of the most important biogeochemical cycles in the planet. Therefore, a correct description of the ecological and evolutionary behavior of these viruses is essential to make reliable predictions about their role in marine ecosystems. The infection cycle, for example, is indistinctly modeled in two very different ways. In one representation, the process is described including explicitly a fixed delay between infection and offspring release. In the other, the offspring are released at exponentially distributed times according to a fixed release rate. By considering obvious quantitative differences pointed out in the past, the latter description is widely used as a simplification of the former. However, it is still unclear how the dichotomy “delay versus rate description” affects long-term predictions of host-virus interaction models. Here, we study the ecological and evolutionary implications of using one or the other approaches, applied to marine microbes. To this end, we use mathematical and eco-evolutionary computational analysis. We show that the rate model exhibits improved competitive abilities from both ecological and evolutionary perspectives in steady environments. However, rate-based descriptions can fail to describe properly long-term microbe-virus interactions. Moreover, additional information about trade-offs between life-history traits is needed in order to choose the most reliable representation for oceanic bacteriophage dynamics. This result affects deeply most of the marine ecosystem models that include viruses, especially when used to answer evolutionary questions.

30 Introduction

Viruses are the most numerous organisms on Earth. They play diverse roles in the
32 biotic component of practically any ecosystem. Especially remarkable is the case of
marine ecosystems. Marine viruses are important sources of mortality at every trophic
34 level. Potential hosts range from whales and commercial fish species to zooplankton,
heterotrophic bacteria and microbial autotrophs [1]. Viruses are key components of the
36 microbial loop and, therefore, the biogeochemical cycle of elements such as nitrogen or
phosphorus [2]. They are responsible for more than 40% of marine bacterial mortality
38 [2], contributing importantly to shaping the community [3, 4, 5]. The relevance of *virio-*
oplankton not only stems from the “predatory” pressure they exert, but also from the
40 subsequent release of organic nutrients (able to supply a considerable amount of the
nutrient demand of, e.g. heterotrophic bacterioplankton [6]); or their contribution to
42 microbial genetic diversity in the ocean through horizontal gene transfer [5, 7, 8].

The vast majority of these roles are assumed by marine viruses that eventually kill the
44 host cell [9]. The standard *lytic infection* can be summarized in the following steps [10]: *i)*
free viruses diffusing in the medium encounter and attach to cells at a certain *adsorption*
46 *rate*; *ii)* after injecting its nucleic acid into the host cell, the virus takes control of the host
synthesis machinery in order to replicate its genetic material (DNA or RNA, depending
48 on the type of virus [8]) and produce the proteins that will form the components of the
viral offspring (*eclipse period*); *iii)* during the *maturation* stage (or *rise period*), the new
50 *virions* are assembled; *iv)* finally, the virus synthesizes the *holin* protein, which perforates
the plasma membrane allowing viral endolysins (lysoenzymes) to reach and lyse the cell
52 wall, thereby releasing offspring and cellular organic compounds to the medium.

The *latent period* (steps *ii-iv* above), controlled by the so-called *gene t* (or holin gene)
54 [11], is one of the most important viral life-history traits. So are the *burst size* (offspring
number, intimately related to the duration of the infection), and the adsorption rate. The
56 latent period is studied intensively in the viral literature not only due to its ecological

importance, but also owing to the small pleiotropic effect that its evolutionary change
58 has on other phenotypic traits [12].

On the other hand, the latent period links ecological and evolutionary change, as
60 mutations in this trait influence the demography of the population and the environment
influences which latent periods are favored by selection [11, 13], closing in this way
62 an eco-evolutionary feedback loop [14]. Furthermore, the short generation times and
numerous offspring of viruses facilitate rapid evolution [15], and a possible overlap
64 between ecological and evolutionary timescales. All these factors provide evidence for
the importance of using a proper description of the ecological interactions between virus
66 and host in order to make reliable evolutionary predictions.

In the theoretical literature for marine viruses, mostly centered on viruses that infect
68 bacteria (*bacteriophages*), host-virus interactions are represented in two different ways.
One approach explicitly considers the latent period imposing a fixed delay between the
70 adsorption and the release of the offspring [16]. In the other approach, new viruses are
continuously released at a certain *lytic rate*, with cells that are simultaneously infected
72 bursting at different post-infection times, exponentially distributed [17, 18]. Thus, in the
delay model the survival of each and every infected cell is ensured up to an infection
74 age that equals the fixed latent period, whereas survival responds to a probabilistic rule
in the rate model. The latter can actually be seen as a simplification of the former
76 that facilitates mathematical and computational analysis of the interactions. Indeed, the
ecological outcome of the two approaches seems to be, a priori, qualitatively similar in
78 spite of the obvious difference in the timing of the infection [19]. While in the delay model
progeny show periods of no release (e.g. initial stages of viral culture experiments), in the
80 rate model viral offspring are liberated at all times. However, little attention has been
paid to quantifying thoroughly how these differences affect the long-term predictions by
82 the two kinds of models. Here, we aim to fill this gap.

In this paper, we focus on the eco-evolutionary differences between the two approaches

84 to the description of the lytic infection cycle. This comparison may prove very useful to
assess the evolutionary consequences of the simplifying assumptions in these models, and
86 therefore the long-term reliability of a whole group of different models for host-virus
dynamics available in the literature. The rate-based approach is used to model not
88 only diverse aspects of host-lytic virus interactions [20], but also other types of viral
infection cycles such as lysogeny [21] or shedding [22]. In the latter, viruses continuously
90 produce and release virions during the entire infection period. Some examples include
filamentous phages, and viruses of an enormous importance for humans such as Ebola,
92 SARS, smallpox, varicella-zoster virus, and HIV [23]. In some retroviruses such as HIV,
both burst and continuous production modes have actually been suggested [22]. Thus,
94 this question transcends purely technical matters such as model selection. Indeed, this
study can potentially serve to compare the evolutionary strategies of a wide selection of
96 viruses with very different infection cycles.

As a model case, we use bacteriophages, due to their importance for biogeochemical
98 cycles; it also allows us to resort to the extensive modeling bibliography available, in
which the two approaches to the infection cycle are used. On the other hand, we consider
100 mutations only in the holin gene, in order to isolate the effects of evolution on the key
differentiating trait for the two strategies: the latent period (or, equivalently, lysis rate).
102 Thus, we first present the two models for lytic infection. After briefly comparing them
from an ecological perspective, we turn our attention to their evolutionary divergences.
104 Under this framework, we discuss the ecological and evolutionary contrast between the
two forms for the life-history *trade-off* between latent period and burst size that have
106 been proposed in the literature. Finally, we comment on the implications of all the above
for the descriptions of host-virus interactions in general, and marine bacteriophages in
108 particular. This study will contribute to the reliability of long-term predictions regarding
the interaction between a wide variety of viruses and their hosts.

110 1 Modeling host–virus interactions

1.1 112 *Environment*

112 In order to compare the two approaches to the infection cycle, we first set common idealized environmental conditions by using two-stage chemostats [24].

114 Two-stage chemostats are basically composed of a continuous culture for bacterial hosts, coupled to a continuous culture of co-existing bacteria and viruses. A flow of 116 nutrients from a fresh medium to the first chemostat facilitates bacterial growth, and a flow of “fresh” hosts from the first chemostat to the second chemostat allows for 118 the development of the viral population. Finally, both virus and bacterial cells are washed out from the second chemostat at a certain rate. The described flows, which 120 can loosely resemble e.g. the continuous passage or migratory events occurring in the mammalian gastrointestinal tract [25], enable a steady state for the overall system. From 122 the perspective of marine bacteriophages, *quasi*-stationary conditions may be found in stratified waters where cyanobacteria, among the most common targets for virioplankton, 124 dominate.

Such a steady state is very convenient from the mathematical standpoint, as is the 126 continuous source of hosts, which helps alleviate the oscillations that are frequently observed in standard predator-prey models [24] (see below). In addition, the continuous 128 flow of uninfected hosts constitutes a relief for the bacterial population from the evolutionary pressure of the virus and, therefore, prevents bacteria from embarking on 130 an otherwise expected co-evolutionary arms race [13, 20]. This allows us to focus on viral evolution only. Thus, two-stage chemostats provide a controlled environment whose 132 conditions are easily reproducible in the laboratory; they also offer general results that can be adapted to other environments, as discussed below.

134 Lastly, the environmental parameters are chosen to avoid multiple infections (see table A in Appendix A), preventing in this way any kind of intra-cellular competition among

1.2 Ecological analysis of the delay model (DM)

138 Let us study first the approach to lysis in which the individuals of the viral population
 release their offspring after exactly the same latent period. The model describing this
 140 cycle implements explicitly the delay between adsorption and burst. If $[C]$ represents the
 concentration of uninfected bacterial cells, $[V]$ the concentration of free viruses, and $[I]$
 142 the concentration of infected bacteria, the dynamics of the interactions between host and
 virus can be modeled using the equations [16]:

$$\frac{d[C](t)}{dt} = \mu [C] - k[C][V] - w[C] + w[C_0] \quad (1)$$

$$\frac{d[I](t)}{dt} = k[C][V] - (k[C]_{t-L}[V]_{t-L}) e^{-wL} - w[I] \quad (2)$$

$$\frac{d[V](t)}{dt} = (b k[C]_{t-L}[V]_{t-L}) e^{-wL} - k[C][V] - m[V] - w[V], \quad (3)$$

144 where μ represents the growth rate of uninfected hosts; k , the adsorption rate; m , the
 viral mortality or decay rate; w , the washout rate; L and b , the viral latent period and
 146 burst size, respectively; and the subscript $t - L$ indicates that the term is evaluated a
 lytic cycle (latent period) in the past.

148 We initially consider a monomorphic viral population (i.e. all individuals share the same
 phenotype –or trait values). Thus, the first equation describes the dynamics of the host
 150 population as a result of growth (first term), infection events (second term), washout
 process (third term) and inflow of uninfected cells (fourth term). The second equation
 152 considers the dynamics of infected cells, whose number grows due to adsorption events
 (first term), and decreases due to dilution (last term), and lysis of cells (second term); the
 154 latter term is the result of correcting the number of cells that were infected L time steps
 before, $k[C]_{t-L}[V]_{t-L}$, using the probability for those cells to survive dilution during that

156 time (e^{-wL} term) [16]. Likewise, the free virus population grows owing to those lysed
 cells (first term, number of lysis events times the burst size), and is reduced by adsorption
 158 (second term), natural mortality (third term) or dilution (last term).

We assume a simple Monod formulation for the growth rate of bacteria, given by:

$$\mu([N]) = \frac{\mu_{max}[N]}{[N] + K_N}, \quad (4)$$

160 in which μ_{max} is the maximum growth rate for the cell and K_N its half-saturation
 constant (defined as the concentration at which the growth rate of the cell equals half its
 162 maximum). See table A for units. Note that we use here the standard assumption that
 infected cells effectively allocate all their resources to viral production (i.e. $\mu_I \sim 0$).

164 To these equations, we must add the dynamics of the nutrient:

$$\frac{d[N]}{dt} = w([N_0] - [N]) - \mu([N])[C]/Y, \quad (5)$$

where $[N_0]$ is the inflow of nutrient feeding uninfected host cells and Y is a yield or
 166 efficiency parameter accounting for the efficiency for bacterial cells to transform uptake
 into growth.

168 The equations above can be solved for the stationary state, expected under chemostat
 conditions. Writing, for simplicity, $\bar{\mu} = \mu([N]_{st})$, we obtain a trivial solution for the
 170 virus-free configuration $[V]_{st} = [I]_{st} = 0$, $[C]_{st} = w[C_0]/(w - \bar{\mu})$. This solution is always
 feasible (see Appendix B). On the other hand, the non-trivial steady state is given by the
 172 expressions:

$$[C]_{st} = \frac{w + m}{k (be^{-wL} - 1)} \quad (6)$$

$$[I]_{st} = \frac{(\bar{\mu} - w)(w + m)}{k w} \frac{(1 - e^{-wL})}{(be^{-wL} - 1)} + (1 - e^{-wL}) [C_0], \quad (7)$$

$$[V]_{st} = \frac{\bar{\mu} - w}{k} + \frac{w[C_0] (be^{-wL} - 1)}{w + m}, \quad (8)$$

feasible as long as $L < \ln(b)/w$ and $\bar{\mu} > w(1 - [C_0]/[C]_{st})$ (see Appendix B). The stability of the trivial solution is determined by the basic reproductive number, \mathcal{R}_0 . This observable is the expected number of secondary infections arising from a single individual in an equilibrium susceptible population [26]. Thus, $\mathcal{R}_0 < 1$ indicates an eventual fall into the phage-free state, whereas $\mathcal{R}_0 > 1$ points to the instability of this trivial state. From Eq.(3), it is easy to find that $\mathcal{R}_0 = \frac{b k [C]_{st} e^{-wL}}{k [C]_{st} + m + w}$. Thus, the trivial equilibrium changes stability for $\mathcal{R}_0 = 1$ or, in other words, for a $[C]_{st}$ given by Eq.(6). Therefore, the latter condition opens the possibility of a *transcritical bifurcation* [27]. However, the deduction of general stability conditions for the non-trivial state is a highly nontrivial task, beyond the scope of this article. We refer the reader to the extensive mathematical literature devoted to study of the local and global stability of host-virus systems similar to the one presented here [28]. On the other hand, oscillations are a common outcome of predator-prey interactions, and frequently seen in bacteriophage models [29]. For the sake of mathematical tractability (especially for evolutionary matters), we focus our analysis on the region of the parameter space where stationarity can be found (but see Discussion). With these words of caution, we assume hereafter that the generic feasible steady state above fulfills those stability conditions and proceed with the rest of the analysis. Indeed, Eqs.(6)-(8) prove to be stable for the realistic range of parameters used in this study, as shown in our simulations below. The chosen parametrization represents generically marine lytic T bacteriophages and a bacterial species (see table A).

Finally, the stationary growth rate for the viral population (per-capita change in the

194 concentration of free virus) is given by:

$$\mu_v = (b e^{-wL} - 1) k [C]_{st}. \quad (9)$$

Because the average number of surviving offspring per cell is given by:

$$\langle b \rangle = b e^{-wL}, \quad (10)$$

196 Eq.(9) indicates that stationary co-existence is possible (i.e. $\mu_v = m + w$) only when
 $\langle b \rangle = \frac{m+w}{k[C]} + 1$ (i.e. $\mathcal{R}_0 = 1$), which ensures that the average number of offspring per
 198 cell is larger than one.

1.3 *Ecological analysis of the rate model (RM)*

200 Following the same notation above, infections in which the offspring are released at a
 certain lysis rate $k_L = 1/L$ can be described by the equations:

$$\frac{d[C](t)}{dt} = \mu [C] - k[C][V] - w[C] + w[C_0] \quad (11)$$

$$\frac{d[I](t)}{dt} = k[C][V] - k_L[I] - w[I] \quad (12)$$

$$\frac{d[V](t)}{dt} = b k_L[I] - k[C][V] - m[V] - w[V], \quad (13)$$

202 where the delay terms have been replaced by instantaneous terms (i.e. evaluated at time
 t). In this way, there is unceasingly new virions joining the free virus population, with
 204 host cells being lysed at a rate k_L . Eqs.(4)-(5) complete the description of the dynamics
 of the system.

206 The stationary states are described by the trivial configuration $[V]_{st} = [I]_{st} = 0$,
 $[C]_{st} = w[C_0]/(w - \bar{\mu})$, always feasible (see Appendix B), and the non-trivial steady
 208 state:

$$[C]_{st} = \frac{(w+m)(k_L+w)}{k[k_L(b-1)-w]} \quad (14)$$

$$[I]_{st} = \frac{(\bar{\mu}-w)(w+m)}{k[k_L(b-1)-w]} + \frac{w[C_0]}{k_L+w} \quad (15)$$

$$[V]_{st} = \frac{\bar{\mu}-w}{k} + w[C_0] \frac{k_L(b-1)-w}{(w+m)(k_L+w)}, \quad (16)$$

feasible for $L < (b-1)/w$ and $\bar{\mu} > w(1 - [C_0]/[C]_{st})$. The definition of the basic
 210 reproductive number, $\mathcal{R}_0 = \frac{b k_L [I]_{st}}{(k[C] + m + w)[V]_{st}}$, leads once more to a potential transcritical
 bifurcation for $[C]_{st}$ given by Eq.(14), which results from the condition $\mathcal{R}_0 = 1$. Also
 212 similarly to the previous model, our realistic parametrization is able to yield stable
 solutions. Thus, we assume that the stationary state fulfills the stability conditions
 214 and refer the reader to the existing literature for a detailed study of these [17]. Lastly,
 we can deduce the viral growth rate as in the case of the DM:

$$\mu_v = \left(\frac{k_L b}{k_L + w} - 1 \right) k [C]_{st}, \quad (17)$$

216 for which, by realizing that:

$$\langle b \rangle = \frac{k_L b}{k_L + w}, \quad (18)$$

we can conclude again that the nontrivial stationary state is maintained thanks to the
 218 condition $\langle b \rangle = \frac{m+w}{k[C]} + 1$, again equivalent to $\mathcal{R}_0 = 1$.

1.4 *The trade-off latent period – burst size*

220 It is advisable to note that latent period and burst size are not independent. The number
 of offspring is determined by the timing of the lysis. Moreover, the time spent in producing
 222 new virions increases the generation time (sum of extra- and intra-cellular viral lifetime).
 This sets an obvious life-history trade-off realized in the dichotomy “immediate but low

224 reproduction” and “delayed but larger offspring” that shapes the evolution of b and L .

Little information about life-history trade-offs is available for marine viruses.
226 However, two mathematical forms have been suggested for this specific trade-off in
the general bacteriophage literature. One takes into account that the parental virus
228 is utilizing limited host resources to synthesize the virions [30]:

$$b = \frac{M}{\gamma} (1 - e^{-\gamma(L-E)}), \quad (19)$$

where M is the maturation rate, E represents the eclipse period, and γ is the decay rate
230 for the bacterial resources. The other form assumes that the time needed to deplete host
resources is much larger than the latent period, therefore simplifying the exponential
232 relationship above to a linear function [31]:

$$b = M(L - E). \quad (20)$$

Although the first option seems more mechanistic, most experimental evidence points to
234 the linear relationship as the more frequently observed form for the trade-off [31]. In
spite of the lack of information, and for the sake of concreteness, we assume here that
236 marine phages can potentially show any of these two trade-offs. Thus, we perform all the
calculations keeping in mind that b is an increasing function of L , $f(L)$, replacing later
238 such a function by each of the two forms mentioned above.

2 Evolutionary Analysis

240 Aiming to gain some knowledge on the evolutionary consequences linked to one or the
other lytic descriptions, we now focus our attention on invasion experiments. Invasion
242 analysis provides a unified framework with which we can reach some classic results,
together with novel ones (see Appendix B). As explained above, we consider only
244 alterations on the gene t , controlling the duration of the latent period. Thus, mutants

and residents differ only in L (and, therefore, in b as well). We consider that the form of
 246 the trade-off, $f(L)$, is the same for both viral populations.

2.1 *An evolutionarily stable strategy (ESS) for the delay model*

248 If we assume that the invading mutant (subscript M) perturbs the otherwise stable state
 of the resident population (subscript R), the possibility for invasion is decided by the sign
 250 of the invasion-matrix eigenvalue (see Appendix B):

$$\lambda = \frac{1}{L_M} W_n \left(k[C_R]_{st} b_M L_M e^{-(k[C_R]_{st} + m)L_M} \right) - (k[C_R]_{st} + w + m), \quad (21)$$

where $W_n(z)$ is the so-called Lambert function, defined as the solution to $W_n(z)e^{W_n(z)} = z$
 252 [32]. The analysis of the sign of λ provides the condition for strategy L^* to resist any
 invasion:

$$f'(L^*) = w f(L^*). \quad (22)$$

254 As shown in Appendix B, the solution to this equation minimizes $[C]_{st}$ (Eq.(6)) and
 maximizes μ_v (Eq.(9)). Thus, L^* is an ESS. This result is also reached after defining the
 256 invasion fitness function, $s_{LR}(L_M) = \lambda$, and analyzing its derivatives.

The result of solving Eq.(22) for the exponential trade-off, Eq.(19), and linear trade-off,
 258 Eq.(20), is summarized in table 1. These results can be graphically obtained representing
 the pairwise invasibility plots (PIP) [33] for the two forms of $f(L)$. Fig.1 (left) portrays
 260 the case of the exponential trade-off.

The sign of the invasion fitness depicted in the PIP provides essential information.
 262 Because $s_{LR}(L_M) < 0$ for any L_M when $L_R = L^*$, these solutions for the DM (table
 1) resist any invasion. L^* also maximizes μ_v , and therefore is an ESS. On the other hand,
 264 $s_{LR}(L_M) > 0$ for $L_R < L_M < L^*$ and $L^* < L_M < L_R$, ensuring that phenotypes closer to

Model	Trade-off	Evolutionarily Stable Strategy	
DM	Exponential	$L^* = \frac{1}{\gamma} \ln(1 + \gamma/w) + E$	$b^* = M/(w + \gamma)$
	Linear	$L^* = 1/w + E$	$b^* = M/w$
RM	Exponential	$L^* = \frac{-1}{\gamma} W_n \left(-e^{-\frac{\gamma(Ew+1+w/\gamma)}{w}} \right) - \frac{\gamma + w}{\gamma w}$	$b^* = \frac{M}{\gamma} (1 - e^{-\gamma(L^*-E)})$
	Linear	—	—

Table 1: Summary of ESS calculated analytically for the delay model (DM) and the rate-based model (RM) using the exponential and the linear forms for the trade-off between burst size b and latent period L .

L^* can invade populations with phenotypes further from that strategy. Therefore, L^* is also a convergence-stable strategy (CSS) [33].

2.2 An ESS for the rate model

After following similar steps to those of the previous section, the condition to be fulfilled for L^* to be an ESS candidate is (see Appendix B):

$$f'(L^*) = \frac{w f(L^*)}{1 + w L^*}. \quad (23)$$

We can now combine Eq.(23) with Eqs.(19) and (20) to obtain L^* for the exponential and linear trade-offs, respectively. In the case of the former, the evolutionarily stable strategy can be found in table 1.

This singularity maximizes fitness (see above) and, therefore, is an ESS. Furthermore, L^* is, at least for the chosen parametrization, a CSS. These results can be easily confirmed, as in the previous case, with the numerical analysis of the derivatives of $s_{L_R}(L_M)$ or plotting the corresponding PIP, qualitatively similar to the one shown in Fig.1 (left).

278 Interestingly, combining Eq.(20) with Eq.(23) (or $\partial s/\partial L = 0$) does not offer any feasible
solution. Moreover, the only line providing a change of sign for the invasion fitness is the
diagonal $L_M = L_R$ (see Fig.1, right panel).

280 **3** *Unconstrained evolution*

Invasion analysis focuses on natural selection. The little pleiotropy expected for mutations
282 affecting L , and the steady environment reached under chemostat conditions, allow
invasion analysis to provide reliable evolutionary predictions if there are infinitesimal
284 differences between mutant and parent phenotypes [34]. These limitations are shared
by most of the available theoretical frameworks, which may also require ecological
286 equilibrium as necessary condition for mutation/immigration events to occur [27].

We present now numerical simulations aimed to check if the ESSs calculated above are
288 indeed reached in the absence of these constraints. To this end, we use an eco-evolutionary
framework in which new mutants are created in the system at random times not
necessarily coinciding with ecological stationary states. Similarly to the framework
290 employed in [20, 35], new phenotypes can be introduced periodically in the system
(invasion by migration), or by creating mutants through a genetic algorithm used at
292 random times. These times are in part determined by each phenotype's population size
and a common, fixed mutation rate. New phenotypes are identical to the mutating
294 phenotype except for the latent period, which changes in an *arbitrarily* large amount.

296 The simulation scheme is basically as follows: the model equations (ecological
interactions describing either the DM or the RM) are numerically integrated; at times
298 calculated as specified above, a new (invading/mutant) virus phenotype is introduced
into the system. The ecological dynamics then resumes, now with a new viral population
300 in the medium competing against the existing ones (namely the dominant resident and
contenders) for the host, which is their only available resource. This competition drives
302 some phenotypes to extinction, which may change which species dominates, and thus

the (L, b) of the total viral population. These steps are repeated until, eventually, one
304 phenotype comes along that is able to resist any invasion. This phenotype will remain
as the dominant strain regardless of the other existing or incoming phenotypes. If this
306 phenotype is indeed an ESS, its fitness will be larger than that of any other strain. Thus,
due to its competitive advantage, the population size of the dominant phenotype will
308 eventually be much larger than that of any other species in the system, and the average
 (L, b) of the population will converge in the long term to this species' trait pair, (L^*, b^*) .

310 The evolutionary succession described above can be observed in Fig.2 (left). This
figure portrays the average latent period of the population, as well as the latent period
312 of the instantaneous dominant phenotype, over time. We keep in these simulations
the parametrization given by table A. After a long transient, the population reaches
314 an evolutionarily stable state, ESS_{sim} . As depicted in Fig.2 (right), the evolutionary
steady states obtained in different realizations of the framework fluctuate around the
316 analytical ESS, with a very small variance. This result is robust, for it is observed either
using random mutation times or periodic immigration events. Moreover, this result is
318 also reached when an “everything-is-everywhere” (EiE) approach is used [36, 37]. In
EiE approaches, a large number of fixed phenotypes, that is, with no possibility for
320 evolutionary change, is used to initialize the system; these phenotypes, intended to
represent all possible genetic variability, compete for the available resource until only
322 one strain remains. As we observe in Fig.2 (right), the phenotype able to out-compete
the rest is consistently close to the ESS predicted analytically for the lytic strategy
324 and trade-off used in the simulation. These results are observed for any combination of
model/trade-off studied above except for the linear case of the RM for which, as deduced
326 earlier, no ESS is expected.

In any case studied, an initial test simulation with monomorphic viral and host
328 populations showed stationary values for $[C]$, $[V]$ and $[I]$ that match the analytical
solutions, confirming the assumed stability of the stationary state.

330 4 Discussion and comparison of models

4.1 *Ecological comparison*

332 The steady-state value of the observables deduced above, and how they change with
environmental (chemostat) conditions, can give us some initial insight on the ecological
334 behavior of the two lytic models.

As stated before, the ecological outcome of the two modes is qualitatively similar. For
336 instance, for both release models, $[C]_{st}$ and μ_v are positively correlated with w (Fig.3,
left). $[V]_{st}$, on the other hand, shows non-monotonicity (Fig.3, right). These results
338 remain valid for any of the two trade-off functions above. This positive correlation of the
amount of resources needed (host cells) and viral growth rate with the dilution rate is
340 not trivial, attending to Eqs.(6) and (9), and Eqs.(14) and (17). For the host population,
increasing the dilution rate increases the nutrient input rate, fostering host growth; in
342 consequence, the viral population can grow faster as well.

On the other hand, we can measure the relative difference Δ in the stationary
344 concentrations of host, virus and infected cells between the two models (defined as
 $\Delta_X = 1 - [X]_{st_{RM}} / [X]_{st_{DM}}$, with $X = C, V$, or I , respectively), as a function of b
346 and L . In Fig.4, we can observe that the stationary $[C]$ is lower in the case of the RM
for any feasible pair of L and b , while the stationary $[V]$ is larger. In this case, the
348 exponential trade-off has been used, but a qualitatively similar pattern is observed for
the linear form of the trade-off (results not shown).

350 This improved ecological performance for the RM is a consequence of the different
timing between the two lytic cycles [34]: while in the DM there is a fixed delay
352 between the infection of any cell and its subsequent effects (i.e. viral reproduction and
disease propagation), in the RM distributed bursts have immediate consequences on the
354 population. Accordingly, the final viral population for the RM is larger and grows faster;
it also needs less resources (Fig.4, and Fig.6). According to classic competition theory

356 [38], this would indicate that viral populations releasing continuously their offspring
(e.g. shedding viruses) are better competitors for any feasible combination of b and
358 L . However, the fact that this strategy performs better in isolation does not necessarily
mean that it can out-compete the delayed strategy when present in the same environment
360 [11]. Moreover, the fact that delayed lysis and not shedding dominates in, e.g. marine
environments highlights the limitation of these simplified models to produce reliable
362 ecological and evolutionary predictions without the proper modifications [34, 39].

We can also define the rate of infection (ROI) as $k[V]$ [13], whose behavior parallels
364 that of the viral population size as we have assumed k to be constant. For the
parametrization in table A, the frequency of infection in the population is never beyond
366 50 – 60 infections per day. This number is reduced to 20 infections per day when $[C_0] = 0$
(one-stage chemostat). Such low values confirm the suitability of the single-infection
368 assumption used here. Moreover, the difference in ROI, as Δ_V , is negative for any realistic
value of w , L or b , due to the (obvious) higher speed of infection spread by the rate-based
370 model.

Lastly, we can compare the nontrivial stationary states of the two models once dilution
372 and other mortality events are discounted from the viral offspring. It is easy to see that,
when the steady-state solutions, Eq.(6)-(9) and Eq.(14)-(17), are expressed as functions of
374 each model's $\langle b \rangle$, Eq.(10) and Eq.(18) respectively, both models offer identical values
for $[C]_{st}$, $[V]_{st}$, and μ_v , while $[I]_{st}$ is larger for the DM (Fig.5, left). In other words,
376 DM viruses need more infections to maintain growth, population density and resource
requirements similar to those of the RM. However, for the same values of (b, L) , the RM
378 shows a much larger amount of surviving offspring than the DM (Fig.5, right), explaining
why the former out-performs the latter in Figs.3-6. Note that these relative differences
380 depend only on the latent period, and therefore are not influenced by the particular
trade-off assumed.

382 4.2 Evolutionary comparison

Focusing now on the ESS, for both delay and rate models not only does the ESS
384 minimize the amount of resources needed by the virus (i.e. $[C]_{st}$, Eqs.(22) and (23)),
but it also maximizes the viral population size and its fitness (Fig.6). These results
386 have been obtained theoretically in the past for the DM under low ROI and optimality
conditions (e.g. [13]). This explains why the ESS coincides with the dominant phenotype
388 in EiE experiments: the ESS makes the best use of the available resources and, thus,
out-competes any other phenotype. In addition, the fitness value at the ESS increases
390 with $[C]_{st}$ for both cycles (Eqs.(9) and (17)). The hump shape shown in Fig.6 (right)
has been experimentally observed [31], pointing to the possibility of singular strategies
392 in controlled environments.

On the other hand, the DM results in a smaller fitness than the rate-based release for any
394 value of the latent period, including the ESS (Fig.6, right). Importantly, the selection
gradient (slope of the fitness function) close to the ESS is much larger for the delay model
396 than for the rate model. This enhanced selection strength accelerates evolution, because
it enhances differences between phenotypes [27].

398 It is noteworthy to mention that the maturation period at the ESS, $L^* - E$ (step *iii*)
of the cycle description above) is phage-independent for the DM. In this model, the time
400 needed to assembly the new virions depends exclusively on the dilution rate and/or the
host physiological state (a function of γ). In the RM, however, maturation also depends
402 on E . This is due to the fact that for this model the end of the eclipse period immediately
leads to a possible start of the infectious stage of the population (release of offspring).
404 This dependence on E provides the phage with control over its entire reproductive cycle.

Let us delve now into the reasons for the lack of ESS in the case of the RM and linear
406 trade-off. Mathematically, the condition for the mutant to invade, $[C_M]_{st} < [C_R]_{st}$, is
translated into $b_R < b_M$ using Eqs.(14) and (20); the phenotype with the larger burst
408 size always invades. Furthermore, there is no limit to this alternation, as there is no

extrema to the viral fitness (Fig.7, left). This is owing to the fact that, for a linear
410 relationship between burst size and latent period, the fitness cost of increasing b and L
in the RM is always smaller than the benefit. In consequence, there is no change in sign
412 for the invasion fitness other than that expected when the roles of mutant and resident
are exchanged (see Fig.1, right).

414 From an evolutionary point of view, the key is again the timing of the offspring release.
In the rate-based model, the trade-off between latent period and burst size influences the
416 average number of virions liberated per unit time in the population, but offspring start to
be released instantaneously. Thus, unless the resources in the host set a limit to b (case of
418 the exponential trade-off, Eq.(19) and Fig.7, left), the impact on viral fitness of increasing
 b at the expense of increasing L is always positive. Note that the fitness associated with
420 the linear trade-off is always larger than that of the exponential one (Fig.7, left). On
the other hand, increasing (L, b) in the case of the delay description has a much stronger
422 effect on viral fitness, due to the increase in the time needed to release *any* of the new
virions [34]. This enhanced differentiation between approaches is eventually translated
424 into the larger selection strength observed in Fig.6 (right).

Finally, Fig.7 (right) shows the behavior of L^* when w , positively correlated with host
426 quantity (see Fig.3), varies. For both models, a larger host availability or quality select
for shorter latent periods (Fig.7, right). Thus, improved growth conditions favor shorter
428 generation times. This result has been observed experimentally [11, 40] and obtained
theoretically by other means (see e.g. [12, 30]). For the RM, however, L^* is always
430 larger than that of the DM. Nonetheless, the continuous release allows the fitness in RM
populations to be larger than that of DM ones to the smaller impact of varying the latent
432 period for the former (Fig.6, right).

4.3 *The role of oscillations*

434 As commented above, host-virus models are prone to oscillatory equilibria. Indeed,
the models presented here can show such behavior by, e.g. increasing k beyond
436 $10^{-9} l \text{ cell}^{-1} d^{-1}$. Oscillations prevent stationary solutions from being realized, for example
due to sudden population collapse or strong fluctuations around stationary values. Thus,
438 parametrizations leading to oscillations prevent the ecological and evolutionary analysis
presented here from being applicable.

440 The presence of a second chemostat (i.e. $[C_0] \neq 0$) has helped us find a realistic region
of the parameter space where oscillations are not present. Developing an analytical
442 framework able to predict ecological and evolutionary behavior in the presence of such
oscillations remains elusive to this date.

444 **5 Conclusions**

The numerical value for the ESS and the qualitative behavior described here have been
446 observed in phage experiments (tables 1 and A). However, this is not to say that real
bacteriophages are close to their (optimal) evolutionarily stationary state. The intra-
448 and inter-specific variability observed in measured latent periods indicates that there are
other factors, not considered in this idealized study, that contribute to the exact value of
450 the latent period shown by real viruses. For instance, constantly changing environmental
conditions that include hosts potentially co-evolving with the virus will most certainly
452 change the latent period¹ selected for in each case.

This is especially true for marine environments, for which strict stationary conditions are
454 hardly found even in stratified waters. Keeping the same formalism used here, we can
implement easily more realistic environments changing Eq.(5) (for instance, incorporating
456 remineralization of nutrients by bacteria, or periodic pulses), and playing with the sources

¹Among other traits, for instance k .

of “fresh” host or dilution. Nonetheless, the study under chemostat conditions presented
458 here provides valuable information on the qualitative behavior of different lytic strategies.

Continuous cultures are very extended in the experimental literature. As shown
460 here, in these environments populations with distributed latent periods prove to have
many ecological and evolutionary advantages. Everything being equal, RM populations
462 start releasing offspring (i.e. become infectious) earlier, providing the RM virus with
competitive advantage over the DM one. Moreover, dynamic evolution of the latent
464 period under the same environmental conditions leads the rate-based population toward
an ESS in which the virus utilizes less resources to produce larger population sizes and
466 larger viral fitness with smaller generation times.

The strength of selection for this model is, however, much smaller than for the case
468 of DM viruses. Smaller fitness gradients slow down evolutionary succession and, thus,
may prevent the ESS for RM viruses from being eventually realized. Moreover, it can
470 in principle put, e.g. shedding strategies in competitive disadvantage if the bacterial
host co-evolves, because a burst lytic virus may adapt more quickly to changes in the
472 host. Even in the absence of DM viruses, RM viruses may not adapt quickly enough to
host co-evolution, leading to a much slower (or even eventually vanishing) Red-Queen
474 dynamics. However, the expected changing fitness landscape will influence non-trivially
the adaptation rate in both descriptions. For viruses that can show either infection cycle,
476 shedding provides quick invasion whereas burst lysis provides quick adaptation.

On the other hand, we have mathematically proved that the linear form for the
478 trade-off between burst size and latent period yields an endless evolutionary succession
in the case of the RM. Linear trade-offs have been experimentally observed for
480 bacteriophages, and maxima for the viral fitness have been measured in the same
experiments. Therefore, the standard formulation of the RM presented here may
482 lead to unrealistic predictions about bacteriophage evolution in steady environments.
Thus, if used to describe long-term behavior of this and other phages such as phages

484 with non-linear virion assemblage or, e.g. shedding, more appropriate environments,
biological constraints, and trade-offs need to be used. Possible improvements to capture
486 a shedding cycle correctly should include an explicit eclipse period in the exponential
release distribution, and de-couple offspring release from cell mortality. On the other
488 hand, further research is needed in order to find which functional forms for the relation
between life-history traits correspond specifically to marine phages.

490 Thus, the classic modeling trade-off between simplicity and realism materializes once
again. The study presented here shows that, with the trade-offs analyzed, even though
492 applying the simpler RM model to bacteriophages provides qualitatively similar ecological
results to those of the DM, the former may not be reliable for evolutionary matters, leaving
494 the latter as the only available alternative. On the other hand, the delay terms complicate
the analysis of the DM. This prevents its inclusion in bigger modeling frameworks such
496 as models for oceanic biogeochemistry, which lack a realistic explicit representation of
marine viruses. Thus, a new theoretical description is needed, able to capture the essential
498 ecological *and* evolutionary aspects of the marine host-virus dynamics without the use of
delay terms. Finding new paths to the regularization of the delay terms fulfilling these
500 features remains as an open question.

Another open issue relates to finding a theoretical framework able to tackle the
502 eco-evolutionary interactions in host-virus systems. In this paper, we focused on the
analytical description of stationary states in both ecological and evolutionary timescales,
504 ensured by the chosen environmental conditions and parametrization. However, such a
framework could describe analytically more realistic situations such as the evolutionary
506 succession (i.e. transients) observed in our simulations. This theoretical framework would
be able to capture the feedback loop between ecology and evolution provided by rapid
508 evolutionary events, non-vanishing evolutionary jumps, and overlapping generations.
These three features break in one way or another the simplifying assumptions of the
510 available theoretical frameworks such as adaptive dynamics.

This study evidences the importance of taking into account *both* ecological and
512 evolutionary aspects of the dynamics between host and virus, subject to rapid evolution.
This is especially relevant if we are interested in reliable long-term predictions for the
514 system under scrutiny. The inclusion of viruses in the description of biogeochemical
cycles is one important example, as reliable estimates of viral dynamics are crucial to
516 understand any future climate change scenario. Another sound example is phage therapy,
which is re-emerging as an alternative to antibiotics. The design of efficient treatments
518 requires a reliable estimate not only of instantaneous population sizes but also of possible
co-evolutionary events between phages and bacteria. The new theoretical alternatives
520 suggested here will prove to be essential to this end.

Acknowledgments

522 We want to thank Anne Maria Eikeset, Yoh Iwasa, Roger Kouyos, Duncan Menge, Alex
Washburne, and Joshua Weitz for helpful discussions in early stages of this research. We
524 thank the editor and the two anonymous reviewers for their feedback, which has improved
enormously this manuscript. We are also grateful for the support from NSF under grant
526 OCE-1046001 and by the Cooperative Institute for Climate Science (CICS) of Princeton
University and the National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration's (NOAA)
528 Geophysical Fluid Dynamics Laboratory (GFDL).

A Appendix A: Table of definitions and parameter values

530

Table A: Compilation of symbols and parameter values. Data for the host taken from [41]. Data for the virus into the ranges used/shown in [11, 13, 20, 30, 35, 42]. The yield parameter, Y , has been adjusted to obtain a maximum growth $\mu_{max} = Y V_{max} = 18d^{-1}$, value which is also in harmony with the previous references.

Symbol	Description	Units	Value
$[N]$	Dissolved Inorganic Nitrogen Concentration	$mol\ l^{-1}$	Variable
$[C]$	Non-infected Host Concentration	$cell\ l^{-1}$	Variable
$[I]$	Infected Host Concentration	$cell\ l^{-1}$	Variable
$[V]$	Free Virus Concentration	$cell\ l^{-1}$	Variable
k_L	Lysis Rate	d^{-1}	Evolutionary variable
L	Latent Period	d	Evolutionary variable
b	Burst Size	<i>virions</i>	Evolutionary variable
μ_v	Virus Population Growth Rate	d^{-1}	Variable
μ	Host Population Growth Rate	d^{-1}	Variable
μ_{max}	Maximum Host Population Growth Rate	d^{-1}	18
Y	Yield Parameter	$cell\ mol^{-1}$	4.5×10^{13}
V_{max_N}	Maximum Nutrient Uptake Rate	$mol\ cell^{-1}\ d^{-1}$	4×10^{-13}
K_N	Half-Saturation Constant the Nutrient	$mol\ l^{-1}$	10^{-6}
k	Adsorption Rate	$l\ cell^{-1}\ d^{-1}$	$10^{-10}, 5 \times 10^{-9}$
m	Virus Mortality Rate	d^{-1}	0.1, 5
M	Maturation Rate	<i>virions</i> d^{-1}	1.44×10^3
E	Eclipse Period	d	0.0139
γ	Host Resources Decay Rate	d^{-1}	1.44
$[C_0]$	Non-infected Host Supply Concentration	$cell\ l^{-1}$	10^8
$[N_0]$	Dissolved Inorganic Nutrient Supply Concentration	$mol\ l^{-1}$	50×10^{-6}
w	Chemostat Dilution Rate	d^{-1}	2.4

B Appendix B

532

B.1 Feasibility of the trivial stationary states

For both models, a trivial stationary solution is given by the phage-free state $[V]_{st} =$
 $[I]_{st} = 0$, $[C]_{st} = w[C_0]/(w - \bar{\mu})$, with $\bar{\mu} = \mu([N]_{st})$. Stationary conditions also require
that:

534

$$\frac{d[N]}{dt} = 0 \iff ([N_0] - [N]_{st}) = \bar{\mu} \frac{[C]_{st}}{Y} \quad (24)$$

$$= \bar{\mu} \frac{w[C_0]}{Y(w - \bar{\mu})}, \quad (25)$$

536 or, rearranging terms:

$$([N_0] - [N]_{st})(w - \bar{\mu}) = \bar{\mu} \frac{[C_0]}{Y} \quad (26)$$

Because $\bar{\mu} = \mu([N]_{st})$ increases with $[N]_{st}$ and vanishes at zero, and the two terms on
 538 the left hand side decrease with $[N]_{st}$ and are positive at zero, the Intermediate Value
 Theorem ensures a solution to the equation above for which both sides are positive (i.e.
 540 $0 < \mu([N]_{st}) < w$ and $0 < [N]_{st} < [N_0]$). Thus, the trivial stationary state is always
 feasible.

542 B.2 Feasibility of the non-trivial solutions

For both models, an analysis similar to the one above ensures that $0 < \mu([N]_{st})$ and
 544 $0 < [N]_{st} < [N_0]$. On the other hand, the necessary positivity condition for $[C]_{st}$, $[V]_{st}$,
 and $[I]_{st}$ imposes:

$$\mu([N]_{st}) \geq w \left(1 - \frac{[C_0]}{[C]_{st}} \right). \quad (27)$$

546 and, $L \leq \ln b/w$ for the DM, whereas for the RM the latter condition becomes $L \leq$
 $(b - 1)/w$.

548 **B.3 Invasion analysis**

B.3.1 Delay Model:

550 If we assume that the invader perturbs the otherwise stable state of the resident
 population (subindex R), the dynamic equations for the mutant (subindex M) can be
 552 written as:

$$\frac{d[V_M](t)}{dt} = (b_M k[C_R]_{st}[V_M]_{t-L_M}) e^{-wL_M} - k[C_R]_{st}[V_M] - m[V_M] - w[V_M], \quad (28)$$

$$\frac{d[I_M](t)}{dt} = k[C_R]_{st}[V_M] - (k[C_R]_{st}[V_M]_{t-L_M}) e^{-wL_M} - w[I_M], \quad (29)$$

where $[C_R]_{st}$ ($[C_M]_{st}$) represents Eq.(6) calculated using the resident (mutant) traits. By
 554 definition, the evolutionarily stable strategy (ESS) cannot be invaded by any mutant or
 immigrant phenotype. Thus, the sign of the invasion eigenvalue (i.e. eigenvalue associated
 556 with the equations above) will provide the conditions for the phenotype (L^* , b^*) to be
 uninvadable. The eigenvalues λ are the result of solving $|J + J_D e^{-\lambda L_M} - \lambda I| = 0$ [28],
 558 where J is the Jacobian matrix associated with the instantaneous terms of the equations,
 J_D that of the delayed terms, and I is the identity matrix. The condition above can be
 560 translated into:

$$\begin{vmatrix} k[C_R]_{st} (b_M e^{-(w+\lambda)L_M} - 1) - w - m - \lambda & 0 \\ -k[C_R]_{st} (e^{-(w+\lambda)L_M} - 1) & -w - \lambda \end{vmatrix} = (A(\lambda) - \lambda)(B - \lambda) = 0. \quad (30)$$

One eigenvalue is, trivially, given by $\lambda = B = -w$. Thus, if the other eigenvalue, resulting
 562 from solving the implicit equation $\lambda = A(\lambda) = k[C_R]_{st} (b_M e^{-(w+\lambda)L_M} - 1) - w - m$ is
 positive, the mutant can invade, whereas a negative value will ensure unbeatability for
 564 the resident. This remaining eigenvalue is given by:

$$\lambda = \frac{1}{L_M} W_n \left(k [C_R]_{st} b_M L_M e^{-(k [C_R]_{st} + m) L_M} \right) - (k [C_R]_{st} + w + m), \quad (31)$$

where $W_n(z)$ is the so-called Lambert function, defined as the solution to $W_n(z)e^{W_n(z)} = z$ [32]. The condition $\lambda = 0$ provides the marginal case:

$$A(0) = 0 \quad \iff \quad \frac{m + w}{k(b_M e^{-w L_M} - 1)} = [C_R]_{st} \quad \iff \quad [C_M]_{st} = [C_R]_{st}, \quad (32)$$

For the resident to resist invasion (i.e. $\lambda < 0$), $[C_R]_{st} < [C_M]_{st}$. Alternatively, for the mutant to invade ($\lambda > 0$), $[C_M]_{st} < [C_R]_{st}$. Therefore, the phenotype that minimizes $[C]_{st}$ will be an ESS candidate. Thus:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d[C]_{st}}{dL} = 0 &\iff \frac{db}{dL} = w b; \\ &\iff f'(L^*) = w f(L^*). \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

This condition, deduced in [12] by other means, can also be deduced looking for the invading strategy that maximizes μ_v , Eq.(9). From Eq.(33), it easily follows that $d^2[C]_{st}/dL^2$ is positive at L^* . Thus, the solution to Eq.(33) indeed provides an uninvadable strategy that maximizes fitness, i.e. the ESS.

Equivalently, the condition given by Eq.(33) can be found by realizing that Eq.(31) can be used to define the invasion fitness function, $s_{LR}(L_M) = \lambda$. Thus, evolutionary singularities are given by the points L^* such that the derivative of s with respect to L vanishes, $\frac{\partial s_{LR}(L_M)}{\partial L_M} \Big|_{L^*} = 0$. It is also possible to show that both the second derivative of $s_{LR}(L_M)$ and $\frac{d}{dL} \left(\frac{\partial s_{LR}(L_M)}{\partial L_M} \Big|_{L_M=L_R=L} \right)$ are, at least for the parametrization in table A, negative when evaluated at $L = L^*$. In this way, the analytical conditions for L^* to be an ESS and a CSS, respectively, are fulfilled.

B.3.2 Rate Model:

582 We now follow similar steps to deduce the expressions for the ESS in the case of the rate model. The equations for the mutant are, in this case:

$$\frac{d[V_M](t)}{dt} = b_M k_{L,M}[I_M] - k[C_R]_{st}[V_M] - m[V_M] - w[V_M] \quad (34)$$

$$\frac{d[I_M](t)}{dt} = k[C_R]_{st}[V_M] - k_{L,M}[I_M] - w[I_M], \quad (35)$$

584 and the characteristic equation for the invasion eigenvalue is given by:

$$|J - \lambda I| = \begin{vmatrix} -k_{L,M} - w - \lambda & k[C_R]_{st} \\ k_{L,M}b_M & -k[C_R]_{st} - w - m - \lambda \end{vmatrix} = \begin{vmatrix} A - \lambda & B \\ C & D - \lambda \end{vmatrix} = 0. \quad (36)$$

A and D are by definition negative in any feasible scenario. Thus, the only remaining
586 condition to be fulfilled for the resident state to be uninvadable is, following the Routh-Hurwitz criteria, $BC < AD$. After some algebra, this condition is translated
588 again into $[C_R]_{st} < [C_M]_{st}$. Therefore, the phenotype minimizing $[C]_{st}$ will be a possible ESS. Thus, using Eq.(14):

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d[C]_{st}}{dL} = 0 &\iff \frac{db}{dL} = \frac{w b}{1 + w L}; \\ &\iff f'(L^*) = \frac{w f(L^*)}{1 + w L^*}. \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

590 This same condition can be reached by defining the invasion fitness function $s_{LR}(L_M) = BC - AD$ and using $\frac{\partial s_{LR}(L_M)}{\partial L_M}|_{L^*} = 0$.




Figure 1: Pairwise invasibility plots. Yellow zones represent pairs of resident and mutant latent periods for which the mutant can take over the population (positive invasion fitness, $s_{L_R}(L_M)$); in black zones, the resident can resist invasion (negative invasion fitness). Left: PIP obtained with the DM using the exponential form of the trade-off $b = f(L)$; no point on the vertical $L_R = L^*$ line falls into a yellow zone, ensuring that L^* is an ESS. Qualitatively-similar results are found with the linear trade-off, and for the exponential $b = f(L)$ version of the RM. Right: PIP obtained with the RM using the linear form of the trade-off; the invasion fitness function only changes sign on the $L_M = L_R$ line and, therefore, no singular strategy is possible.




Figure 2: Eco-evolutionary simulation of bacteria-virus interactions for both descriptions. Left: Typical example of evolutionary succession in the DM (exponential trade-off); the dominant phenotype (black) changes with time due to mutation and selection, and with it the population latent period (red). Eventually, a strategy resisting any invasion (ESS_{sim}) is reached. Right: Relative difference between the evolutionarily stationary value of the population latent period in simulations, ESS_{sim} , and the analytic solution for each model, L^* . The evolutionary simulations shown here are those with the DM for exponential (red) and linear (green) trade-offs, the RM with exponential trade-off (blue), and their respective EiE counterparts (pink, cyan and yellow, respectively). The difference with the analytical result is never beyond 4%.




Figure 3: Comparison of stationary observables for the delay (red) and rate (green) lytic models at the ESS. The stationary value for the resources needed by the rate-based population is smaller than that of the delay-based one (left), whereas the population size is larger (right). For these plots, the linear shape of the trade-off $b = f(L)$ has been used, but results with the exponential form are qualitatively indistinguishable.




Figure 4: Relative difference for resources Δ_C (left) and population size Δ_V (right) between the two lytic strategies as a function of L and $b = f(L)$. In these plots, the linear trade-off has been used, but the exponential one offers similar results.




Figure 5: Comparison between models using as a reference the average number of surviving offspring. Left: Relative difference between the number of infected cells using the function Δ_I as defined in the text, with $[I]_{st}$ expressed as a function of $\langle b \rangle$ (see Eq.(7) and (10), and Eq.(15) and (18)). Right: Relative comparison between the surviving offspring per cell using Δ as a function of each model's $\langle b \rangle$.




Figure 6: Left: Viral population size obtained with the DM using the exponential (blue) and linear (orange) forms for the trade-off $b = f(L)$. Although both observables reach a maximum at L^* , the linear trade-off yields a larger population size. Right: Fitness functions for the delay (red) and rate (green) lytic descriptions as a function of the latent period. The DM virus shows a smaller fitness, but a much steeper graph around the ESS than the RM virus. For a meaningful comparison of the fitness, a constant host population size of 10^7 has been assumed.




Figure 7: Left: Comparison of the fitness function obtained with the RM using the exponential (blue) and linear (orange) forms of the trade-off. While the exponential trade-off yields a maximum for fitness at L^* , the fitness associated with the linear trade-off unceasingly grows with L . Right: Dependence of the ESS on w , as a proxy for host quantity, for the DM (red) and RM (green); for both strategies and trade-off forms, an improved host quantity selects for shorter latent periods. The ESS for the RM is larger for any realistic value of w .

References

- 594 [1] C. A. Suttle, Marine viruses – major players in the global ecosystem, *Nat. Rev. Microbiol.* 5 (2007) 801-812.
- 596 [2] J. A. Fuhrman, Marine viruses and their biogeochemical and ecological effects, *Nature* 399 (1999) 541-548.
- 598 [3] C. A. Suttle, The significance of viruses to mortality in aquatic microbial communities. *Microb. Ecol.* 28 (1994) 237-243.
- 600 [4] C. Winter, T. Bouvier, M. G. Weinbauer, and T. F. Thingstad, Trade-offs between competition and defense specialists among unicellular planktonic organisms: the
602 “Killing the Winner” hypothesis revisited. *Microbiol. and Mol. Biol. Rev.*, 74 (2010) 42-57.
- 604 [5] K. E. Wommack and R. R. Colwell, Virioplankton: viruses in aquatic ecosystems. *Microbiol. and Mol. Biol. Rev.* 64 (2000) 69-114.
- 606 [6] S. W. Wilhelm and C.A. Suttle, Viruses as regulators of nutrient cycles in aquatic environments. In *Microbial Biosystems: New Frontiers*, Proceedings of
608 the 8th International Symposium on Microbial Ecology. Bell C.R., Brylinsky M., Johnson-Green P. (ed), Atlantic Canada Society for Microbial Ecology, Halifax, Canada, 1999.
- 610
- [7] M. F. Marston, F. J. Pierciey, Jr., A. Shepard, G. Gearin, J. Qi, C. Yandava, S. C. Schuster, M. R. Henn, and J. B. H. Martiny, Rapid diversification of coevolving marine *Synechococcus* and a virus. *Proc. Natl. Acad. of Sci. USA* 109 (2012)
612 4544-4549.
- 614
- [8] S. T. Abedon, Phage evolution and ecology. *Adv. Appl. Microbiol.* 67 (2009) 1-45.
- 616 [9] R. M. Wilcox and J. A. Fuhrman, Bacterial viruses in coastal seawater: lytic rather than lysogenic production. *Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.* 114 (1994) 35-45.

- 618 [10] M. G. Weinbauer, Ecology of prokaryotic viruses. *FEMS Microbiol. Rev.* 28 (2004)
127-181.
- 620 [11] S. T. Abedon, P. Hyman, and C. Thomas, Experimental examination of
bacteriophage latent-period evolution as a response to bacterial availability. *Appl.*
622 *Environ. Microbiol.* 69 (2003) 7499-7506.
- [12] J. J. Bull, Optimality models of phage life history and parallels in disease evolution.
624 *J. of Theor. Biol.* 241 (2006) 928-938.
- [13] J. J. Bull, J. Millstein, J. Orcutt, and H. A. Wichman, Evolutionary feedback
626 mediated through population density, illustrated with viruses in chemostats. *Am.*
Nat. 167 (2006) E39-E51.
- 628 [14] F. Pelletier, D. Garant, and A.P. Hendry, Eco-evolutionary dynamics. *Philos. Trans.*
R. Soc. Lond. B Biol. Sci. 364 (2009) 1483-1489.
- 630 [15] J .T. Lennon and J. B. H. Martiny, Rapid evolution buffers ecosystem impacts of
viruses in a microbial food web. *Ecol. Lett.* 11 (2008) 1178-1188.
- 632 [16] B. R. Levin, F. M. Stewart, and L. Chao, Resource-limited growth, competition, and
predation: a model and experimental studies with bacteria and bacteriophage. *Am.*
634 *Nat.* 111 (1977) 3-24.
- [17] E. Beretta and Y. Kuang, Modeling and analysis of a marine bacteriophage infection.
636 *Math. Biosci.* 149 (1998) 57-76.
- [18] M. Middelboe, Bacterial growth rate and marine virus-host dynamics. *Microb. Ecol.*
638 40 (2000) 114-124.
- [19] R. J. Weld, C. Butts, and J. A. Heinemann, Models of phage growth and their
640 applicability to phage therapy. *J. Theor. Biol.* 227 (2004) 1-11.
- [20] J. S. Weitz, H. Hartman, and S. A. Levin, Coevolutionary arms races between
642 bacteria and bacteriophage. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* 102 (2005) 9535-9540.

- [21] T. Evans, R. G. Bowers, and M. Mortimer, Adaptive dynamics of temperate phages.
644 *Evol. Ecol. Res.* 12 (2010) 413-434.
- [22] J. E. Pearson, P. Krapivsky, and A. S. Perelson, Stochastic theory of early viral
646 infection: continuous versus burst production of virions. *PLoS Comp. Biol.* 7 (2011)
e1001058.
- 648 [23] M. A. Nowak and C. R. M. Bangham, Population dynamics of immune responses to
persistent viruses. *Science* 272 (1996) 74-79.
- 650 [24] Y. Husimi, K. Nishigaki, Y. Kinoshita, and T. Tanaka, Cellstat: a continuous culture
system of a bacteriophage for the study of the mutation rate and the selection process
652 at the DNA level. *Rev. Sci. Instrum.* 53 (1982) 517-522.
- [25] S. T. Abedon, Selection for bacteriophage latent period length by bacterial density:
654 a theoretical examination. *Microb. Ecol.* 18 (1989) 79-88.
- [26] H. L. Smith and H. R. Thieme, Persistence of bacteria and phages in a chemostat.
656 *J. Math. Biol.* 64 (2012) 951-979.
- [27] F. Dercole and S. Rinaldi, *Analysis of Evolutionary Processes: the Adaptive
658 Dynamics Approach and its Applications*. Princeton University Press, Princeton,
NJ, 2008.
- 660 [28] E. Beretta and Y. Kuang, Modeling and analysis of a marine bacteriophage infection
with latency period. *Nonlinear Anal. Real World Appl.* 2 (2001) 35:74.
- 662 [29] J. S. Weitz and J. Dushoff, Alternative stable states in host-phage dynamics, *Theor.*
Ecol. 1 (2008) 13-19.
- 664 [30] I.- N. Wang, D. E. Dykhuizen, and L. B. S Lobodkin, The evolution of phage lysis
timing. *Evol. Ecol.* 10 (1996) 545-558.
- 666 [31] I.- N. Wang, Lysis timing and bacteriophage fitness. *Genetics* 172 (2006) 17-26.

- 668 [32] R. M. Corless, G. H. Gonnet, D. E. G. Hare, D. J. Jeffrey, and D. E. Knuth, On the Lambert W function. *Adv. Comput. Math.* 5 (1996) 329-359.
- [33] S. A. H. Geritz, E. Kisdi, G. Meszéna, and J. A. J. Metz, Evolutionarily singular strategies and the adaptive growth and branching of the evolutionary tree. *Evol. Ecol.* 12 (1998) 35-57.
- 670 [34] J. J. Bull, D. W. Pfennig, and I.- N. Wang, Genetic details, optimization and phage life histories. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* 19 (2004) 76-82.
- 672 [35] D. N. L. Menge and J. S. Weitz, Dangerous nutrients: evolution of phytoplankton resource uptake subject to virus attack. *J. Theor. Biol.* 257 (2009) 104-115.
- 674 [36] J. Bruggeman and S. A. L. M. Kooijman, A biodiversity-inspired approach to aquatic ecosystem modeling. *Limnol. Oceanogr.* 52 (2007) 1533-1544.
- 676 [37] M. J. Follows, S. Dutkiewicz, S. Grant, S. W. Chisholm, Emergent biogeography of microbial communities in a model ocean. *Science* 315 (2007) 1843-1846.
- 678 [38] D. Tilman, *Resource Competition and Community Structure*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1982.
- 680 [39] N. L. Komarova, Viral reproductive strategies: How can lytic viruses be evolutionarily competitive?, *J. Theor. Biol.* 249 (2007) 766-784.
- 682 [40] L. M. Proctor, A. Okubo, and J. A. Fuhrman. Calibrating estimates of phage-induced mortality in marine bacteria: ultrastructural studies of marine bacteriophage development from one-step growth experiments. *Microb. Ecol.* 25 (1993) 161-182.
- 684 [41] E. L. Litchman, C. A. Klausmeier, O. M. Schofield, and P. Falkowski, The role of functional traits and trade-offs in structuring phytoplankton communities: scaling from cellular to ecosystem level. *Ecol. Lett.* 10 (2007) 1170-1181.
- 688 [42] S. T. Abedon, T. D. Herschler, and D. Stopar, Bacteriophage latent-period evolution as a response to resource availability. *App. Environ. Microbiol.* 67 (2001) 4233-4241.