## Local host specialization, host-switching, and dispersal shape the regional distributions of avian haemosporidian parasites

Vincenzo A. Ellis<sup>a,b,1</sup>, Michael D. Collins<sup>c</sup>, Matthew C. I. Medeiros<sup>a</sup>, Eloisa H. R. Sari<sup>b</sup>, Elyse D. Coffey<sup>a</sup>, Rebecca C. Dickerson<sup>a,d</sup>, Camile Lugarini<sup>a,e</sup>, Jeffrey A. Stratford<sup>f</sup>, Donata R. Henry<sup>g</sup>, Loren Merrill<sup>h</sup>, Alicenzo A. Ellis



across eastern North America and related the distributions of individual parasite lineages to regional climate variation and to the distributions and abundances of their avian hosts. Community dissimilarities between sampling locations based on host assemblage structure (i.e., the relative abundances of potential host species) were positively correlated with those based on parasite Table 1. Results of partial Mantel tests comparing hypothesized relationships between space (i.e., geographic distance between sites), the environment (climate differences between sites), birds (host community dissimilarity between sites), and parasites (parasite community dissimilarity between sites) identified in Fig. 2

Rel ‡ionship between	And	Controlling for	r <sub>p</sub>	Р
Sp çe	Environment	None	0.595	0.005
Birds	Environment	P r sites	0.772	< 0.001
Birds	Sp <u>ç</u> e	Prisites	0.504	0.012
Birds	Environment	Spige	0.720	< 0.001
Birds	Sp <u>ç</u> e	Environment	0.185	0.137
P sites	Environment	Birds	0.117	0.277
Pgsites	Sp <u>ç</u> e	Birds	0.097	0.302
Pŗşites	Environment	Sp çe	0.303	0.076
P sites	Sp <u>ç</u> e	Environment	0.101	0.300
Birds	Pຼຼັsites	Environment	0.191	0.144
Birds	P ှ  şites	Sp <sub>f</sub> e	0.335	0.027

We report the p sti  $\downarrow$  M stel correl sion coefficient ( $r_p$ ) and ssoci sted P v lue. The rel storship between sp se and environment w stated with a st and st M stel test. Bolded v lues of

similarity does not decline with distance [i.e., parasite distributions were not spatially restricted (35) when controlling for hosts], suggesting that parasites disperse readily across the region within their host populations. These results generally held when the parasite genera were analyzed separately (*SI A* e *di*, Table S5) and when using an alternative statistical approach (*SI A e di*, Table S6).

The host-breadth of a parasite may vary geographically or temporally, and may also be limited by the phylogenetic relatedness of potential host species (13). For example, in the Chicago location, each *Pla* di parasite lineage was associated with a single host taxon at the superfamily level (23). To determine the importance of host phylogeny on parasite distributions across the region, we created a phylogenetic distance matrix for all hosts infected at least once by any of the 33 parasite lineages sampled 10 or more times (60 host species). We then calculated a second matrix by computing Bray-Curtis dissimilarities between those hosts based on the number of times each host species was infected with each of the 33 parasite lineages. A Mantel test comparing these two matrices showed a weak, but significant, correlation (= 0.28, P = 0.002), indicating that parasite host distribution is constrained to more closely related hosts than expected by chance. Interestingly, this effect varied across locations in the region (SI A e di, Table S7).

To quantify the host-breadth of each parasite, we used the Gini–Simpson index (36), which accounts for the number of infections recorded for each host species (13). We weighted the index by the phylogenetic distance between hosts using the formula for Rao's quadratic entropy [Rao's *QE* (37, 38); see *Ma e ial a d Me h d* for formula; results did not change qualitatively if phylogenetic distances were not included in these analyses]. Although ecologists often distinguish generalist and specialist parasites, hostbreadth in the 33 parasite lineages sampled 10 or more times was continuously distributed (*SI A e di*, Fig. S2) and did not differ statistically from a unimodal distribution [Hartigan's dip test:  $D_{33} = 0.047$ , P = 0.87 (39)]. Furthermore, we found no difference in the host-breadth of individual parasite lineages between the parasite genera ( $_{31} = -1.1$ , P = 0.28).

When all years were pooled, parasite lineages recovered at least four times from each of at least four community sampling locations exhibited variation in local host-breadth across the region (Fig. 3). A linear mixed-effects model with parasite lineage as a random effect showed no influence of local phylogenetically weighted bird diversity (Rao's QE, using host species infected at least once in the region) on parasite host-breadth ( $F_{1,21,4} = 1.26, P =$ 0.27), suggesting that variation in host-breadth is not simply attributable to the diversity of available hosts. Furthermore, local parasite diversity did not influence parasite host-breadth ( $F_{1,21,2}$  = 2.41, P = 0.14). For example, parasite lineage LA01 (*Hae* sp.) was recovered exclusively from D e ella ca li e i in Chicago, IL (23/157 D. ca li e i hosts infected; years sampled 2006 and 2007); Connecticut (4/45; 2002 and 2003); and Michigan (11/94; 2012). However, in the 2013 Tennessee sample, LA01 was recovered from the hosts Mi l gl (like D. ca li e i, in the family Mimidae; 2/9 infected), Ca di ali ca di ali (1/36), and S i i i (1/19), whereas the two D. ca li e i hosts sampled in Tennessee were both uninfected. We also recovered LA01 from *D. ca li e i* in the western Chicago location (6/7) in 2014 and from *D*. *ca* li e i (2/6) and *T* a f (also in the family Mimidae; 1/7) in Champaign, IL, in the same year (although those were not community samples).

To determine whether local host-breadth differed from a random expectation, we restricted our dataset to infected individuals of those five potential host species of LA01. We then shuffled all parasite lineages infecting those hosts within sampling locations and recalculated randomized host-breadths for LA01 (9,999 randomizations) and compared observed hostbreadths to the distribution of randomized host breadths. In Chicago, the host-breadth of LA01 was lower than expected by chance (P < 0.001), whereas in Tennessee, this lineage's hostbreadth was higher than expected by chance (P = 0.019). The host-breadth of LA01 did not differ from random in Connecticut and Michigan because there were no potential alternative hosts in either location. Lineage Ozarks 06 (OZ06) (Pla di sp.) also varied with respect to host-breadth (Fig. 3). The hostbreadth of OZ06 was lower than expected based on a random distribution (again shuffling infections among potential hosts) in Michigan (P = 0.003), Indiana (P < 0.001), and Tennessee (P =0.030) but did not differ from random in Chicago (P = 0.76) and the Ozarks (P = 0.94).

Because locations were sampled in different years, some variation in host-breadth between localities might reflect temporal change within localities. Within particular years, parasite lineages sampled more than three times at multiple locations mostly showed little variation in host-breadth. However, in 2013, OZ14 (*Pla di sp.*) infected three hosts in Pennsylvania (6/12 *Mel i a el dia* infected, also 1/3 *Pi il e h h hal*, and 1/1 *Phe c ic l d icia*) but infected a larger variety of species in Tennessee (6/50 *Pa e i a c a ea* individuals infected and 12



importance of host-switching in determining parasite distributions across the region.

Finally, although theoretical (48) and empirical (49) studies suggest that parasites may often limit host population size, the distributions of correlations between host and parasite populations across the region did not differ from random, suggesting that haemosporidian parasites do not impact the population densities of their hosts in eastern North America. Our analyses suggest that populations of haemosporidian parasites are largely structured by populations of their hosts, although parasite lineages change between nearby localities within host species distributions and over short intervals within localities.

We c ptured birds with mist-nets  $\pm$  13 loc  $\pm$  fions gross e stern North Americ <sub>a</sub>(Fig. 1) during summer months (prim gily I  $\pm$  M y to August, with minim  $\pm$  s mpling in April <sub>n</sub>d September; remov  $\pm$  of April <sub>n</sub>d September s mples did not qu it  $\pm$  gively ch nge results) from 1999 to 2014 (SI Appendix, T  $\pm$  2). We took  $\pm$  sm  $\pm$  ( pproxim  $\pm$  10- $\mu$ L) blood s mple from the br ghi  $\pm$  vein of e gh bird nd stored the blood in Puregene or Longmire's (50) lysis buffer. We collected  $\pm$  s mples under ppropri  $\pm$  st  $\pm$ nd feder  $\pm$  permits nd Institution  $\pm$  Anim  $\pm$  C  $\pm$  nd Use Committee (IACUC) protocols.

We extr fred DNA from blood s mples using n mmonium free free-isoprop nol precipit from protocol (51). We screened DNA s mples for h emosporidi n p f sites using PCR protocol designed to mplify as m l section of p f site mitochondri DNA (52). We then mplified portion of the cytochrome b gene in positive s mples using sever l primer p irs nd protocols (15, 40, 53, 54). We identified unique p f site line ges b ged on their cytochrome b sequences nd on their host nd geogr phic distributions (55, 56). Multiple infections were sep f fed by ph sing (57) where possible. GenB nk Accession numbers for all line ges c n be found in SI Appendix, T ble S1.

All a lyses were performed in R v3.1.2 (58), and we report two-t jied P v jues for all tests. We c leul ted Br y-Curtis dissimil rities between loc tions with the "vegdist" function in the veg an p ck ge (59). Br y-Curtis dissimil rity between two s mpling loc tions (1, 2) is c d-cul ted by

$$D = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{p} |y_{1j} - y_{2j}|}{\sum_{j=1}^{p} (y_{1j} + y_{2j})},$$

where y represents the number (or frequency) of individu s s mpled of species j, and p represents the tot  $\frac{1}{4}$  number of species s mpled over both loc tions (34).

We cre ted a geogr phic dist note m trix between loc tions with the "rdist.e th" function in the fields p the ge (60) in R. We compared dist note m trices with M notel and p to take the tests using functions "m notel" and "m notel.p to take the test matching functions the test matching functions for the test matching function for the test matching for test matching for the test matchi

- Ricklefs RE (2010) Host-p thogen coevolution, second y symp try and species diversific tion. Philos Trans R Soc Lond B Biol Sci 365(1543):1139–1147.
  Combes C (2001) Parasitism: The Ecology and Evolution of Intimate Interactions (Univ of Chic go Press, Chic go).
  Poulin R, Kr gnov BR, Mouillot D (2011) Host specificity in phylogenetic and geogr phic sp ge. Trends Parasitol 27(8):355–361.