



ELSEVIER

Available online at www.sciencedirect.com

ScienceDirect

Current Opinion in
Insect Science

Diversity begets diversity: do parasites promote variation in protective symbionts?

Nina Hafer¹ and Christoph Vorburger^{1,2}

Insects commonly possess heritable microbial symbionts that increase their resistance to particular parasites. A diverse community of defensive symbionts may thus provide hosts with effective and specific protection against multiple parasites, although costs might constrain the accumulation of many symbionts. In parallel to the allelic diversity in the MHC complex of the vertebrate immune system, parasite diversity could be the driving force behind symbiont diversity. There is indeed evidence that parasites have the ability to drive frequencies of defensive symbionts in their hosts, and that these symbionts influence parasite communities, but direct evidence that parasite diversity can promote symbiont diversity is still lacking. We provide suggestions to investigate this potential link.

Addresses

¹ EAWAG, Swiss Federal Institute of Aquatic Science and Technology & Institute of Integrative Biology, Überlandstrasse 133, 8600 Dübendorf, Switzerland

² Institute of Integrative Biology, ETH Zürich, Universitätsstrasse 16, 8092 Zürich, Switzerland

Corresponding author: Hafer, Nina (nina.hafer@eawag.ch)

Current Opinion in Insect Science 2018, 32:xx–yy

This review comes from a themed issue on **Parasites/parasitoids/biological control**

Edited by **Kerry Oliver**

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cois.2018.08.008>

2214-5745/© 2018 Published by Elsevier Inc.

Introduction

One of the great challenges any living organism faces is how to defend itself against a multitude of parasitic organisms such as parasitoids, macroparasites, fungi, bacteria and viruses. In addition to their own immune system, many organisms rely on microbial symbionts to help them with this challenge. Such defensive symbionts are especially abundant among insects and other arthropods (e.g. [1,2]). Different secondary symbionts, for example, provide aphids with protection against different parasitoid wasps and pathogenic fungi [3–5]. In this paper, we briefly summarize the evidence for the diversity, specificity, and costs of protective symbionts in insects and draw comparisons with the specific protection afforded to

vertebrates by their adaptive immune system. We then go on to discuss the potential role of parasites in shaping and maintaining symbiont diversity.

Properties of defensive symbionts in insects

Symbiont-mediated protection has been reported from a wide variety of insects. Flies can be protected against parasitoid wasps or parasitic nematodes by bacteria of the genus *Spiroplasma* [6–8], and against viral pathogens by *Wolbachia* (e.g. [9–11]). Another example are antibiotic-producing bacteria protecting developing bees (*Phaenocarpa* sp.) or the eggs of Lagriinae beetles against pathogenic fungi [12,13]. Symbiont diversity has been studied most exhaustively in aphids with at least 9 different species of heritable facultative endosymbionts described to date, 7 of which have been shown to confer protection against entomopathogenic fungi or parasitoids [5]. These different symbionts occur in many aphid species [14], and they can co-occur within the same host species, the same host population, or even the same host individual [1,3–5,15,16]. The frequencies of infection with particular symbionts show extensive variation among aphid populations from different sites or different host plants [1,3–5,15,16] as also observed in other groups of insects [17,18]. This variation is ecologically relevant, because symbiont-conferred resistance is strong, often stronger than any innate resistance (reviewed by [3–5,19,20]), and parasite-specific. In *Drosophila*, for example, *Wolbachia* provides protection against different RNA-viruses, but not against DNA-viruses [10,11]. In aphids, the endosymbiont *Hamiltonella defensa* typically provides protection against parasitoids and *Regiella insecticola* protects against fungal pathogens (reviewed e.g. by [3,4]), although notable exceptions exist (e.g. [21,22]). This specificity even extends to variation within species. Particular strains of the symbionts protect well against some parasite genotypes but not against others ($G \times G$ interactions), such that no symbiont offers the best protection against all parasites [22–29].

Symbionts as a modular defence toolbox?

Multiple symbionts might provide a way to overcome the restrictions of this specificity by providing wider or more effective protection. Infections with more than one symbiont are regularly observed in the field (reviewed by [3,5,15,16]) and a recent laboratory study confirmed that they can be stable [30]. Indeed, symbionts seem to maintain their protective effect in the presence of another symbiont species or strain [30,31]. Some studies have even found indications that co-infections can enhance

2 Parasites/parasitoids/biological control

89 protection [26,32,33] or ensure protection even under
 90 adverse condition such as heat stress, which normally
 91 reduces the protective effect of *Hamiltonella* [34], but
 92 see [35]. On the other hand, the possession of multiple
 93 defensive symbionts might be constrained by a reduced
 94 fidelity of vertical transmission [36*,37], or by detrimental
 95 effects of symbiont infection. In flies and aphids, protec-
 96 tive symbionts have repeatedly been found to be associ-
 97 ated with fitness costs such as shorter lifespan or reduced
 98 competitive ability [3,4,23,25,38]. Infection with multiple
 99 symbiont species or strains can have even more severe
 100 fitness costs in aphids [26,30*,31,33], although this might
 101 depend on host genotype [31], host environment [26], and
 102 symbiont-symbiont combination [30*].

103 Parallels and differences between protective 104 symbionts and the vertebrate MHC

105 The defensive symbionts of insects can be seen as a
 106 second line of defence in addition to their innate immu-
 107 nity. With its remarkable diversity and specificity of
 108 action, symbiont-conferred resistance shows some inter-
 109 esting parallels to the vertebrate major histocompatibility
 110 complex (MHC) that are worth exploring (Table 1). The
 111 MHC is part of the adaptive vertebrate immune system
 112 and MHC-encoded proteins (i.e. MHC molecules) are
 113 responsible for the specific recognition of parasites and
 114 pathogens (Box 1). As for protective symbionts, there are
 115 numerous variants of the MHC, which provide effective
 116 and specific protection against different parasites and
 117 pathogens, but each individual can only possess a
 118 limited number of different MHC variants. Their num-
 119 ber, however, is usually higher than the number of
 120 different protective symbionts within a single insect host
 121 and, unlike symbionts, MHC is present in each individ-
 122 ual. Being part of the nuclear genome the MHC can
 123 change only through recombination during reproduction,
 124 albeit immune memory can improve control of familiar
 125 parasites and pathogens during an individual's lifetime.
 126 Protective symbionts, by contrast, remain organisms of
 127 their own that are usually transmitted vertically by the
 128 mother only, but can also be lost or acquired horizontally
 129 [16,36*,39]. Additionally, symbionts can change through
 130 horizontal gene transfer, such as the loss or acquisition of
 131 bacteriophages, which in *Hamiltonella* are responsible for

Box 1 The MHC of vertebrates and parasite driven selection

The major histocompatibility complex (MHC) is a gene region that consists of multiple loci encoding parts of the adaptive immune system of all jawed vertebrates. For each locus there are numerous alleles making the MHC extremely diverse. The MHC molecules, i.e. antigen binding transmembrane proteins encoded by this region, contain a highly variable antigen-binding site capable of the specific recognition of pathogens. In each MHC molecule, this site binds to specific parasite-derived antigenic peptides and presents them on the cell surface where they are recognised by specific T-cells, which then activate a specific immune response. In order to prevent self-reactivity, all T-cells that bind to self-peptides are eliminated during T-cell production (negative T-cell selection). Each individual possesses only a limited number of different MHC alleles and hence is not equally effective in fighting off all parasites. Certain MHC molecules have frequently been found to be associated with resistance to particular parasites and the evidence for some relationship between protection against parasites and individual MHC diversity is convincing, but the exact shape of this relationship is less clear and selection might favour optimal rather than maximal MHC diversity (reviewed by [43,45,47,61]). Such an optimum in MHC diversity would ensue if there were a cost to high MHC diversity. Indeed, individual MHC diversity might be restricted by negative T-cell selection limiting the capability of increasing the number of parasites that can be recognised through increasing MHC diversity and the risk of autoimmune diseases that increases with increasing MHC diversity [43,45,47]. Additionally, certain MHC alleles, in addition to their protective effect, are associated with susceptibility to autoimmune diseases or parasites [43,45,62]. The MHC repertoire and its diversity differs between populations and species [47,63,64]. Frequently, populations or species co-occurring with a more diverse parasite community have a more diverse MHC repertoire [65–69]. It has been the subject of an ongoing debate whether MHC diversity is driven by heterozygote advantage and/ or frequency dependent selection, but in either case it seems clear that parasites are the driving force behind the diversity [43–45,47,61,63].

132 the protection of their aphid hosts against parasitoids [40–
 133 42]. This will also alter their benefits and costs to the host.

134 Diverse parasite communities should favour 135 high symbiont diversity

136 Their many shared properties suggest that the MHC and
 137 protective symbionts are subject to similar selection
 138 pressures. Hence, parasites should be important drivers
 139 in maintaining symbiont diversity akin to the mainte-
 140 nance of MHC diversity (see Box 1). This could occur via
 141 balancing selection in the face of multiple parasites or via

Table 1

Comparison between properties of MHC and symbiont-conferred protection

	Symbionts	MHC
Prevalence	Intermediate, highly variable (encoded by facultative symbionts)	100% (encoded by the host genome)
Diversity between individuals	High	Very high
Differences between Populations/environments	Yes	Yes
Effective protection against pathogens/parasites	Yes	Yes
Specificity	Yes	Yes
Costs	Yes	Yes (depend on individual MHC diversity)

Download English Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/en/article/10223752>

Download Persian Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/article/10223752>

[Daneshyari.com](https://daneshyari.com)