arXiv:1911.04445v1 [q-bio.PE] 11 Nov 2019

Mechanisms of rapid evolution

Hong-Yan Shih[1,2] **and Nigel Goldenfeld**[1]

[1] Department of Physics and Carl R. Woese Institute for Genomic Biology, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Champaign, Illinois 61801, USA
[2] Institute of Physics, Academia Sinica, Taipei 11529, Taiwan

Status

Evolution is increasingly being recognized as a central component of two of the most urgent societal problems [1]. While the physics of global climate change is relatively well-understood, the response of the biosphere is harder to predict, especially the extent to which microbial evolution can influence the feedback between soil and marine systems to the carbon and other biogeochemical cycles [2, 3, 4]. Even the sign of this feedback effect is hard to assess. The emerging world-wide health crisis due to the unexpectedly rapid evolution and proliferation of antibiotic resistant strains of pathogenic bacteria is our second example, one that underscores how imperfectly we understand the mechanisms of evolution [5]. In fact, it is even the case that climate change can accentuate the problem of antibiotic resistance [1].

Evolution is often thought of as the product of two independent classes of process: (1) The generation of mutations; (2) The dynamics within a fixed environment that selects and ultimately conveys genetic variation to fixation or dominance in a population. This narrative assumes a separation of timescales between (1) and (2) but neglects the fact that many ecosystems, especially those with microbes, show rapid genetic adaptivity through strong selective stress arising either from environmental conditions or antagonistic predation [6, 7]. The resulting phenotypic diversity [6] contains individuals with new traits that in some cases have been documented to further induce new links or forms of interaction with others [8]. For a constant driving force, either a chemical potential difference across the ecosystem, or a constant flux of energy, the resulting long time dynamics is an ecosystem in a non-equilibrium steady state [8], characterized by constant change and the generation of new niches [9], as opposed to one that is in a static equilibrium steady state, characterized by a fixed community structure. In other systems, such as methanogenic bioreactors [10] and the global ocean microbiome [11], it is known that there is a non-equilibrium steady state, characterized by a constant production rate, but constant taxonomic turnover, suggesting the emergence of a collective metabolism for the community. Whether or not there is a phase transition between these two classes of stationary states as a function of driving force is an interesting but unresolved fundamental question. When the interactions between ecology and evolution are strong enough, such that the evolutionary timescale is comparable to the ecological timescale, qualitatively new phenomena arise: rapid and successive emergence of evolved traits interfere with the ecosystem, resulting in significant changes in population dynamics and spatiotemporal patterns.

The purpose of this roadmap article is to draw attention to two recent highly simplified examples of these phenomena, which are sometimes called *rapid evolution*. The first focuses primarily on population dynamics: anomalies in population cycles can reflect the influence of strong selection and the interplay with mutations (standing variation or de novo). The second focuses primarily on the way in which ecological structure can potentially be influenced by what is arguably the most powerful source of genetic novelty: horizontal gene transfer (HGT). Our understanding of the role of HGT in shaping ecosystems, and vice versa, is in its infancy, but we now have the tools to begin to not only understand these phenomena but to ask the pertinent question of how one manages such dynamic ecosystems. It is well-documented that HGT as well as population flow is central to the antibiotic resistance crisis [5] and one would expect that it plays a role in the biological response to climate change. To achieve a full understanding of rapid evolution in all its manifestations will require a concerted experimental and theoretical effort.

Anomalous population dynamics in rapid evolution

The first example focuses on anomalous population dynamics due to rapid evolution. The anomalous dynamics is characterized by abnormal phase relationships and periodicity in population cycles. Certain predator-prey ecosystems systems, such as rotifer-algae [12] and phage-bacteria ecosystems [13], exhibit a π phase difference between the time series of predator and prey populations, together with a longer period for their population cycle, as opposed to the typical predator-prey phase difference of $\pi/2$. This abnormal

phase difference is associated with the emergence of a mutant prey which has a defense against the predator but at some metabolic cost (so-called *evolutionary cycle*). What is more bizarre is that in some systems, following a mutation, the phase difference disappears as the prey population becomes almost constant in time while the predator population still oscillates but with a longer period than before the mutation arose (the so-called *cryptic cycle*). Whether or not the evolutionary cycle or cryptic cycle occurs depends on the metabolic cost of defense [14].

Due to the necessarily small numbers of mutants at least during the initial stages of these processes, one must properly take into account the discreteness of populations and their spatial extent[15]. The mathematical tools to do this properly use stochastic individual-level models to describe the interactions between members of the ecosystem, and statistical mechanics techniques to deduce the resulting dynamics at the population level [16, 17].

By including the trade-off between selection on reproduction and the metabolic cost of defense against predation, a minimal stochastic individual-level model [14] reproduces the rapid evolution that was found in chemostat experiments of rotifer-algae [12] and phage-bacteria ecosystems [13]. Under strong predation selection, a defended prey can arise from mutation, causing the population dynamics to transition from the normal cycle with a $\pi/2$ phase shift to the evolutionary cycle with a π phase shift between the predator and the total prey. The additional $\pi/2$ phase delay comes from the fact that the wild-type prey, which is mostly consumed by the predator, can only grow back after the defended sub-population starts to decrease due to the depletion of food. When the metabolic cost of the defended prey is low enough, the regrowth of the wild-type prey is delayed more. If the delay is so great that the wild-type prey can only resume growth after the defended prey population has decreased sufficiently, the phase delay of the wild-type prey behind the defensive prey can become π so that the total prey population looks almost constant with time, leading to a cryptic cycle.

The individual-level model shows that the anomalous dynamics can arise from demographic noise in rapid evolution, without special assumptions or fine tuning. Deterministic models are problematic, as they can not even capture regular population cycles in a qualitative way without introducing phenomena extra to the Lotka-Volterra description, such as functional response [16]. So far, we have focused primarily on well-mixed systems. However, in practice, one may be interested in invasion fronts, regime shifts or range expansion. In these cases, the need for correct treatment of demographic stochasticity is even greater, because of the presence of fronts where the populations are necessarily small. The study of the potentially interesting spatio-temporal patterns [17] forming in rapid evolution is a rich topic for future work.

Collective rapid evolution

Our second example is from marine microbial ecology, and involves a case where spatio-temporal dynamics emerges from the eco-evolutionary feedback at various scales. In such cases, different evolutionary mechanisms intertwine and lead to scale-dependent feedback, manifested by coevolution from genetic variations, spatio-temporal population dynamics and spatially-varying selection pressure from the environment.

We will focus on a phage-microbe ecosystem, which is usually modeled simply through Lotka-Volterra dynamics. However, in the microbial world, ecological relationships are more complicated than this due to rapid evolution at the genomic scale. In fact, it seems that phage are multifunctional: now only do they exert predation pressure that reduces the bacteria population, but they also transfer genes that can help increase the bacteria population. The way in which this happens in detail is a possible instance of multi-level selection: at the level of the individual bacteria, phage attack is a strong selection pressure. But at the level of the community, there is an emergent fitness benefit which allows the population to grow and even expand its range.

A remarkable example showing the significance of HGT-involved multiscale feedback as a driving force for evolutionary complexity and stability is the most-abundant phototropic organism, *Prochlorococcus spp.* [18]. This marine cyanobacterium experiences predation from cyanophages that, surprisingly, were found to carry photosynthesis genes. Phylogenetic study showed that these genes had been horizontally transferred first from cyanobacteria to cyanophages and back and forth multiple times [19]. Interactions with cyanophage are assumed to be important for the evolutionary pattern and diversity of *Prochlorococcus*. Specifically, *Prochlorococcus* exhibits niche stratification of two dominant ecotypes: the high light-adapted ecotype near the sea surface evolved 150 million years ago from the ancestral low light-adapted ecotype at the lower sea level. Due to the depth-dependent absorbtion spectrum of light, the different ecotypes utilize distinct light intensities and spectra.

What were the environmental and genetic drivers of the evolution of the high light-adapted ecotype? *Prochlorococcus* has a highly streamlined genome, and lives at low density in a nutrient-deficient environment. Thus, the required spatial adaptations were the result of novel genes that presumably were distributed through viral-mediated HGT. Consistent

with this interpretation, *Prochlorococcus* does not possess standard defense mechanisms against phage attack, such as CRISPR or prophages (for restriction-modification, the situation is not clear) [18]. It seems that their principle means of defense against phage is modification of cell surface molecules that prevent phage attachment. These molecules are expressed from genes that have been rapidly modified through mutations and horizontal gene transfer with other bacteria phyla. These genes reside in genomic islands and constitute the majority of the genetic diversity [18].

In recent work, we have performed a calculation from a minimal stochastic model to show how HGT leads to collective coevolution of the bacteria and their phages, leading to the emergence of stratified ecotypes in the euphotic zone [20]. Through HGT from bacteria, phages acquire both beneficial and inferior genes that are responsible respectively for efficient and inefficient photosynthesis in a certain environment. Since phages have a relatively higher mutation rate, they create a rapidly evolving reservoir of genes for the host bacteria. On the other hand, bacteria with highly streamlined genomes create a slowly evolving, stable repository of beneficial genes for phages by filtering out inferior genes under selection. By carrying and transferring beneficial photosynthesis genes, there is evidence that phage improve their fitness, e.g. by optimizing their burst size, by supplementing the host cell's metabolism [21]. In reality most mutations are neutral or deleterious; but HGT is blind to this. Thus in HGT with host bacteria, on a fast time scale, phages evolve deleterious mutations, but can be rescued by bacteria whose genome preserves genes on a longer time scale. Eventually bacteria and phage form a collective state, enabling the rapid adaptation and range expansion to the environment nearer the ocean's surface. This emergent mutualism occurs despite the intrinsic antagonism between bacteria and phages. In short, HGT-driven collective coevolution provides a natural unified explanation for the features of *Prochlorococcus* system, including highly streamlined small genome but huge pan-genome, lack of defense mechanisms against viral attack, niche stratification of ecotypes and phage predator carrying photosynthesis genes. It is expected that this type of mechanism can appear in other spatially-stratified systems, where genes that benefit the evolution of both host and parasite could be present.

Current and future challenges

A generic framework to study rapid eco-evolutionary dynamics with multi-scale feedback requires not only population dynamics and genetic evolutionary mechanisms but also the understanding of the origin of genetic variations. One related long-standing puzzle is: Did the selected phenotypes already pre-exist or were encoded in the phenotypic variation in the ecosystem prior to the selection, or do they arise through stress-induced mutagenesis — de novo mutations induced by strong selection pressure at a higher rate (and perhaps at different loci) [22]? How does stress-induced mutagenesis feed back into niche construction? A crucial role is played by the genotype-phenotype map, but how is it influenced by selection in spatially and temporally varying environments?

Concluding remarks

We have primarily focused on the rapid evolution of microbial ecosystems, which occurs through the interplay between gene flow, spatial variation, and feedbacks between the organisms in the ecosystem and the physical characteristics of the environment. These phenomena are critical to understanding such critical issues as the emergence of antibiotic resistance [5] and the ongoing dynamics of global climate change [2, 3, 4]. Another extreme example of ecological-evolutionary feedback is the growing realization that the cancer tumor microenvironment provides a strong source of heterogeneity that underlies the rapid evolution of chemotherapy resistance [23] and the emergence of collective sensing and decision-making [24]. Theoretical modeling of these important classes of problem requires explicit handling of spatial structure and demographic fluctuations. To understand how scale-dependent ecological-evolutionary feedback drives the spatio-temporal evolution of ecosystem structure is a truly grand challenge that requires a trans-disciplinary approach to be successful.

Acknowledgments

This material is partially supported by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration through the NASA Astrobiology Institute under Cooperative Agreement No. NNA13AA91A issued through the Science Mission Directorate.

[1] R. Cavicchioli, W. J. Ripple, K. N. Timmis, F. Azam, L. R. Bakken, M. Baylis, M. J. Behrenfeld, A. Boetius, P. W. Boyd, A. T. Classen, *et al.*, "Scientists' warning to humanity: microorganisms and climate change," *Nature Reviews Microbiology*, p. 1, 2019.

[2] D. A. Hutchins and F. Fu, "Microorganisms and ocean global change," *Nature microbiology*, vol. 2, no. 6, p. 17058, 2017.

[3] J. G. Monroe, D. W. Markman, W. S. Beck, A. J. Felton, M. L. Vahsen, and Y. Pressler, "Ecoevolutionary dynamics of carbon cycling in the anthropocene," *Trends in ecology & evolution*, vol. 33, no. 3, pp. 213–225, 2018.

[4] E. Abs, S. R. Saleska, and R. Ferriere, "Microbial evolution reshapes soil carbon feedbacks to climate change," *bioRxiv*, p. 641399, 2019.

[5] C. J. von Wintersdorff, J. Penders, J. M. van Niekerk, N. D. Mills, S. Majumder, L. B. van Alphen, P. H. Savelkoul, and P. F. Wolffs, "Dissemination of antimicrobial

resistance in microbial ecosystems through horizontal gene transfer," *Frontiers in microbiology*, vol. 7, p. 173, 2016.

[6] P. B. Rainey and M. Travisano, "Adaptive radiation in a heterogeneous environment," *Nature*, vol. 394, no. 6688, p. 69, 1998.

[7] C. Pal, M. D. Maciá, A. Oliver, I. Schachar, and A. Buckling, "Coevolution with viruses drives the evolution of bacterial mutation rates," *Nature*, vol. 450, no. 7172, p. 1079, 2007.

[8] K. Vetsigian, R. Jajoo, and R. Kishony, "Structure and evolution of streptomyces interaction networks in soil and in silico," *PLoS biology*, vol. 9, no. 10, p. e1001184, 2011.

[9] K. Laland, B. Matthews, and M. W. Feldman, "An introduction to niche construction theory," *Evolutionary Ecology*, vol. 30, no. 2, pp. 191–202, 2016.

[10] A. Fernández, S. Huang, S. Seston, J. Xing, R. Hickey, C. Criddle, and J. Tiedje, "How stable is stable? function versus community composition," *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.*, vol. 65, no. 8, pp. 3697–3704, 1999.

[11] S. Louca, L. W. Parfrey, and M. Doebeli, "Decoupling function and taxonomy in the global ocean microbiome," *Science*, vol. 353, no. 6305, pp. 1272–1277, 2016.

[12] T. Yoshida, L. E. Jones, S. P. Ellner, G. F. Fussmann, and N. G. Hairston, "Rapid evolution drives ecological dynamics in a predator-prey system," *Nature*, vol. 424, no. 6946, pp. 303–306, 2003.

[13] B. J. Bohannan and R. E. Lenski, "Effect of resource enrichment on a chemostat community of bacteria and bacteriophage," *Ecology*, vol. 78, no. 8, pp. 2303–2315, 1997.

[14] H.-Y. Shih and N. Goldenfeld, "Path-integral calculation for the emergence of rapid evolution from demographic stochasticity," *Physical Review E*, vol. 90, no. 5, p. 050702, 2014.

[15] R. Durrett and S. Levin, "The importance of being discrete (and spatial)," *Theoretical population biology*, vol. 46, no. 3, pp. 363–394, 1994.

[16] A. J. McKane and T. J. Newman, "Predator-prey cycles from resonant amplification of demographic stochasticity," *Physical Review Letters*, vol. 94, no. 21, p. 218102, 2005.

[17] T. Butler and N. Goldenfeld, "Robust ecological pattern formation induced by demographic noise," *Physical Review E*, vol. 80, no. 3, p. 030902, 2009.

[18] S. J. Biller, P. M. Berube, D. Lindell, and S. W. Chisholm, "Prochlorococcus: the structure and function of collective diversity," *Nature Reviews Microbiology*, vol. 13, no. 1, pp. 13–27, 2015.

[19] M. Sullivan, D. Lindell, J. Lee, L. Thompson, J. Bielawski, and S. Chisholm, "Prevalence and evolution of core photosystem ii genes in marine cyanobacterial viruses and their hosts.," *PLoS biology*, vol. 4, no. 8, pp. e234–e234, 2006.

[20] H.-Y. Shih and N. Goldenfeld, (in preparation).

[21] D. Lindell, J. D. Jaffe, Z. I. Johnson, G. M. Church, and S. W. Chisholm, "Photosynthesis genes in marine viruses yield proteins during host infection," *Nature*, vol. 438, no. 7064, pp. 86–89, 2005.

[22] D. M. Fitzgerald and S. M. Rosenberg, "What is mutation? a chapter in the series: How microbes jeopardize the modern synthesis," *PLoS genetics*, vol. 15, no. 4, p. e1007995, 2019.

[23] K. S. Korolev, J. B. Xavier, and J. Gore, "Turning ecology and evolution against cancer," *Nature Reviews Cancer*, vol. 14, no. 5, p. 371, 2014.

[24] T. S. Deisboeck and I. D. Couzin, "Collective behavior in cancer cell populations," *Bioessays*, vol. 31, no. 2, pp. 190–197, 2009.