

Misconceptions on the application of biological market theory to the mycorrhizal symbiosis

To the Editor — The symbiosis between plants and arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi has been described as a biological market based on evidence that plants supply more carbohydrates to fungal partners that provide more soil nutrients, and vice versa^{1–4}. A recent paper by Walder and van der Heijden challenges this view⁵. However, their challenge is based on misunderstandings of biological market theory, and evolutionary theory more generally.

First, their claim that biological market theory requires (or assumes) tightly coupled direct resource exchange is incorrect. All that is required is that individuals have a preference, on average, for interacting with more beneficial partners^{6–9}. Biological market theory makes no claim on understanding (proximate) mechanisms of transfer processes. Instead, the aim of biological market theory is to address ultimate questions such as why partnerships remain stable over evolutionary time, even in the presence of less beneficial partners. Its usefulness lies in predicting how these exchanges will be affected by context, such as varying environmental conditions^{7,8,10–12}.

Second, Walder and van der Heijden suggest that the “most prominent fact” challenging a market-based view of the mutualism is the occurrence of antagonistic or parasitic interactions. However, this claim reveals a key misunderstanding of biological market theory and the evolution of mutualisms. The persistence of some parasitism is actually expected under biological market theory, which predicts neither complete disappearance of cheating nor perfect partner choice^{8,9,13,14}. In line with this prediction, we observe that parasitic interactions remain a small, but observable, proportion of global mycorrhizal interactions¹⁵.

Third, the authors claim that plant-derived carbon is available to fungal symbionts as a “public good” (that is, individuals cannot be effectively excluded from its use). Both theory and physiology argue against this. Theory unambiguously

predicts that symbiotic persistence is facilitated by the evolution of adaptations to exclude less beneficial partners, such that free access to resources is restricted^{16–18}. This is backed by physiological evidence of: (1) localized carbon delivery to the fungus, namely the evolution of intracellular structures (for example, arbuscules and coils) that facilitate the directed transfer of nutrients; and (2) knockdown and gene-silencing studies suggesting cell-specific nutrient supply determines arbuscule longevity (reviewed in ref. 19).

Fourth, Walder and van der Heijden claim that the lack of specificity in the mycorrhizal symbiosis is evidence against the existence of partner choice. This claim is based on a misunderstanding of the existing theory, which predicts the opposite. Biological market theory predicts that low specificity, with a higher number of potential partners, facilitates the evolution of stable trading^{6,7,20}. A host can gain more when it has the potential to interact with multiple fungal strains, in contrast to being ‘locked in’ to one partner^{7,20}, as shown by recent empirical work, including that by van der Heijden²¹. This is especially true in variable environmental conditions^{10,11}.

Fifth, the authors argue that in complex networks (that is, multiple plants and multiple fungi), partner choice may be “difficult and less effective”. This claim is likewise based on a misunderstanding of existing theory, which makes the opposite prediction⁷. The authors also argue that “spatial separation [...] may serve as a critical precondition” for discrimination⁵. However, although there are mixed findings on the importance of spatial structure, both experimentally^{1,2,22} and theoretically^{8,22,23}, the variation we find in the precision of partner choice among species^{23,24} and under different conditions^{4,25} is actually expected and, again, consistent with theory⁹.

Sixth, Walder and van der Heijden suggest that it is a problem that partner identity, environmental conditions and available external resources all vary in ways that could affect trading choices. But this

is not a problem — it is how markets work, both in theory and in practice^{6–8,10,11,24}. In contrast to what the authors claim, variable rewards and changing partner preferences are the defining feature of biological markets^{6,7,9}.

The goal of biological market theory is not to draw analogies to human markets. Rather, biological market theory is a tool to analyse exchange patterns. When applied correctly, it allows scientists to make testable predictions about resource exchange patterns and how they vary across species and environment^{10,12,20,21,26}. In the past, mycorrhizal researchers could only vaguely refer to ‘context-dependency’ to explain the variability in their results. Biological market theory now allows us to dissect this variability and generate specific and precise predictions for plant–mycorrhizal outcomes^{7,8,11,12,20}. □

References:

- Bever, J. D., Richardson, S. C., Lawrence, B. M., Holmes, J. & Watson, M. *Ecol. Lett.* **12**, 13–21 (2009).
- Kiers, E. T. *et al. Science* **333**, 880–882 (2011).
- Fellbaum, C. R. *et al. Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **109**, 2666–2671 (2012).
- Fellbaum, C. R. *et al. New Phytol.* **203**, 646–656 (2014).
- Walder, F. & van der Heijden, M. G. A. *Nature Plants* **1**, 15159 (2015).
- Noë, R. & Hammerstein, P. *Behav. Ecol. Sociobiol.* **35**, 1–11 (1994).
- Wyatt, G. A. K., Kiers, E. T., Gardner, A. & West, S. A. *Evolution* **68**, 2603–2618 (2014).
- Bever, J. D. *New Phytol.* **205**, 1503–1514 (2015).
- Steidinger, B. S. & Bever, J. D. *Am. Nat.* **183**, 762–770 (2014).
- Werner, G. D. A. *et al. Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **111**, 1237–1244 (2014).
- Werner, G. D. A. & Kiers, E. T. *New Phytol.* **205**, 1437–1442 (2015).
- Johnson, N. C. *New Phytol.* **185**, 631–47 (2010).
- Song, Z. & Feldman, M. W. *Theor. Popul. Biol.* **88**, 20–30 (2013).
- Foster, K. R. & Kokko, H. *Proc. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci.* **273**, 2233–2239 (2006).
- Hoeksema, J. D. *et al. Ecol. Lett.* **13**, 394–407 (2010).
- Frank, S. A. *J. Evol. Biol.* **23**, 1245–1250 (2010).
- West, S. A., Griffin, A. S. & Gardner, A. *Curr. Biol.* **17**, R661–R672 (2007).
- Ghoul, M., Griffin, A. S. & West, S. A. *Evolution* **68**, 318–331 (2014).
- Gutjahr C. & Parniske M. *Annu. Rev. Cell Dev. Biol.* **29**, 593–617 (2013).
- Kummel, M. & Salant, S. W. *Ecology* **87**, 892–902 (2006).
- Argüello, A. *et al. Ecol. Lett.* <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/ele.12601> (2016).
- Verbruggen, E. *et al. Am. Nat.* **179**, E133–E146 (2012).
- Steidinger, B. S. & Bever, J. D. *Proc. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci.* **283**, 20152428 (2016).

24. Grman, E. *Ecology* **93**, 711–718 (2012).
25. Zheng, C., Ji, B., Zhang, J., Zhang, F. & Bever, J. D. *New Phytol.* **205**, 361–368 (2015).
26. Schwartz, M. W. & Hoeksema, J. D. *Ecology* **79**, 1029–1038 (1998).

Acknowledgements

We thank M. Rillig (Freie Universität Berlin, Germany) for useful discussion. Financial support was provided by European Research Council ERC Grant Agreement 335542

(E.T.K.), NSF-IOS award 10513997 (H.B) and Natural Environment Research Council NE/K009524/1 (A.G.).

E. Toby Kiers^{1*}, Stuart A. West², Gregory A. K. Wyatt², Andy Gardner³, Heike Bücking⁴ and Gijsbert D. A. Werner¹

¹Department of Ecological Sciences, Vrije Universiteit, De Boelelaan 1085, 1081 HV

Amsterdam, The Netherlands, ²Department of Zoology, University of Oxford, South Parks Road, Oxford OX1 3PS, UK, ³School of Biology, University of St Andrews, Dyers Brae, St Andrews KY16 9TH, UK, ⁴Biology and Microbiology Department, South Dakota State University, Brookings, South Dakota 57007, USA.
*e-mail: toby.kiers@vu.nl