1

Urban living can rescue Darwin's finches from the

lethal effects of invasive vampire flies

Authors: Sarah A. Knutie[1,2,‡*], Cynthia N. Webster[1‡], Grace J. Vaziri[1], Lauren Albert[1],

Johanna A. Harvey[1,3], Michelle LaRue[4], Taylor B. Verrett[1], Alexandria Soldo[1],

Jennifer A.H. Koop[5], Jaime A. Chaves[6,7], Jill L. Wegrzyn[1,2]

Affiliations:

[1]Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology, University of Connecticut, Storrs, CT USA.

[2]Institute for Systems Genomics, University of Connecticut, Storrs, CT USA.

[3]Department of Science and Technology, University of Maryland, College Park, MD USA

[4]School of Earth and Environment, University of Canterbury, NZ

[5] Department of Biological Sciences, Northern Illinois University, DeKalb, IL USA.

[6]Department of Biology, San Francisco State University, San Francisco, CA USA.

[7]Colegio de Ciencias Biológicas y Ambientales, Universidad San Francisco de Quito, Quito,

Ecuador

[*]Corresponding author: saknutie@gmail.com

[‡]co-first authors

Abstract

Human activity changes multiple factors in the environment, which can have additive or

neutralizing effects on organisms. However, few studies have explored the causal effects of

multiple anthropogenic factors, such as urbanization and invasive species, on animals, and the

mechanisms that mediate these interactions. This study examines the influence of urbanization

on the detrimental effect of invasive avian vampire flies (*Philornis downsi*) on endemic Darwin's

finches in the Galápagos Islands. We experimentally manipulated nest fly abundance in an urban

and non-urban area and then characterized nestling health, survival, diet, and gene expression

patterns related to host defense. Survival of non-parasitized nestlings from urban (85%) and non-

urban (78%) nests did not differ significantly. However, parasitized, non-urban nestlings lost

more blood and had lower survival (7%) compared to urban nestlings (50%). Stable isotopic

values (δ^{15}N) from nestling feces revealed that diet differed between urban and non-urban

nestlings. δ^{15}N values correlated negatively with parasite abundance, which suggests that diet

might influence host defenses (e.g., tolerance and resistance). Parasitized urban nestlings

differentially expressed genes within pathways associated with red blood cell production

(tolerance) and pro-inflammatory response (innate immunological resistance), compared to

parasitized non-urban nestlings. In contrast, parasitized non-urban nestlings differentially

expressed genes within pathways associated with immunoglobulin production (adaptive

immunological resistance). Our results suggest that urban nestlings are investing more in pro-

inflammatory responses to resist parasites, but also recovering more blood cells to tolerate blood

loss. Although non-urban nestlings are mounting an adaptive immune response, it is likely a last

effort by the immune system rather than an effective defense against avian vampire flies since

few nestlings survived.

Introduction

Emerging diseases are a major global threat to biodiversity (Daszak et al., 2000; Keesing et al., 2010). Naïve hosts who cannot effectively defend themselves against novel disease-causing parasites may risk population declines or even extinction (van Riper III & van Riper, 1986; Frick et al., 2010). However, not all hosts are susceptible to introduced parasites. The fitness of some host species is clearly reduced, while the fitness of other hosts is relatively unaffected. Less affected hosts may alleviate parasite damage with defense mechanisms, such as tolerance and resistance (Read et al., 2008). Tolerance mechanisms, such as tissue repair or recovery of blood loss due to parasites, minimize the damage that parasites cause without reducing parasite fitness (Miller et al., 2006; Råberg et al., 2007; Read et al., 2008; Medzhitov et al., 2012). For example, parents from parasite-infested nests reduce the cost of parasitism by feeding their offspring more than parents from non-parasitized nests (Christe et al., 1996; Tripet & Richner, 1997; Knutie et al., 2016). Consequently, despite increasing parasite loads, offspring do not suffer a high cost of parasitism because they are able to compensate for resources lost to the parasites.

Resistance, as a defense mechanism, minimizes the damage that parasites cause by reducing parasite fitness (Read et al., 2008). The immune system is an example of a resistance mechanism that includes the innate and adaptive immune responses. The innate immune response acts as the front line of defense because it is a rapid, non-specific response to an antigen. Key innate immune molecules include natural killer cells and signaling proteins (e.g., interleukins [IL] and interferons [IFN]). The adaptive immune response is a slower, more specific, response to antigens but has "memory" and can more rapidly initiate during subsequent antigen exposure. The key adaptive immune molecules are T helper cells (e.g., CD4+) and B cells, which are involved in pathways that produce antibodies (e.g., Ig). Both innate and adaptive

immune responses are initiated when a host is bitten by an ectoparasite, such as a nest fly (Owen

et al., 2010). The innate immune response is activated first with the release of pro-inflammatory

cytokines (e.g., IL-6, IL-1β, and IL-17 involved in the Th1-directed pathway, IL-12, and IFNs).

Helper T lymphocytes (T_H) of the adaptive immune response then recognize and are activated by

the antigen-MHC complex on these antigen-presenting cells, which then induce the production

of antigen-specific antibodies by B lymphocytes. Phagocytic and granulocytic cells are then

recruited to the wound by T_H cells, which induce an increase in size or number of normal cells

and fluid at the wound site, causing inflammation. The immune cascade described above can

decrease ectoparasite fitness by causing edema (tissue swelling), which prevents the parasites

from feeding from capillaries, and can damage the parasite's tissue with proteolytic molecules

(Owen et al., 2010). The innate and adaptive host responses to ectoparasites can vary across

individual hosts and populations, which is often affected by environmental factors, such as food

availability (Knutie, 2020).

Humans in urban environments can increase food availability and reliability for animals

with the establishment of wild animal feeders or the impartial disposal of human trash. Due to

the high energetic cost of defense mechanisms, only hosts with sufficient food resources, such as

in these urban areas, may be able to invest in defenses (Sheldon & Verhulst, 1996; Svensson et

al., 1998; Lochmiller & Deerenberg, 2000; Sternberg et al., 2012; Cornet et al., 2014; Howick &

Lazzaro, 2014; Knutie, 2020). These extra nutrients, such as protein, can directly increase the

production of immune cells (Coop & Kyriazakis, 2001; Strandin et al., 2018). Consequently,

individuals with less effective defenses, but better access to resources, might be better equipped

to resist the negative effects of parasites. Alternatively, the lower nutritional quality of the

human-supplemented food could decrease the hosts' ability to produce an effective immune

response to parasites. Without the development or evolution of resistance and tolerance defenses,

hosts can face a reduction in population size or even extinction and this effect might be

especially apparent in the context of human-influenced environments (van Riper III & van Riper,

1986; Atkinson & Lapointe, 2009). Understanding the effects of these complex, non-mutually

exclusive interactions is critical because the movement of parasites around the world is only

increasing, and the urban ecosystem is one of the few that is rapidly expanding (Birch &

Wachter, 2011; Verrelli et al., 2022).

The effects of urbanization on host defenses against parasites might be particularly

pronounced on islands where population sizes are small, genetic diversity is relatively low, and

where species have evolved in the absence of introduced parasites (e.g., Hawaiian honeycreepers

and malaria; Atkinson & Lapointe, 2009). The Galápagos Islands of Ecuador are relatively

pristine but face increasing changes as a result of a growing human presence. Ecotourism and the

permanent resident human population have grown exponentially in the Galápagos over several

decades with nearly 225,000 visiting tourists each year and 30,000 permanent residents (Walsh

& Mena, 2016). The introduction of parasites to the Galápagos is also relatively recent, such as

the avian vampire fly (*Philornis downsi*), which was introduced within the past few decades.

This nest fly dramatically reduces nestling survival of endemic Darwin's finches, and in some

years, can cause up to 100% mortality (Koop et al., 2013, O'Connor et al., 2014). Compared to

non-urban areas, finches have higher fledging success in urban areas (Harvey et al., 2021), which

is likely related to food availability (De León et al., 2018). Because food availability can alter the

host's ability to defend themselves against parasites (Knutie 2020), urban areas could amplify or

dampen host defense strategies against this parasitic fly.

This study examines the effect of urbanization on the interactions between Darwin's

finches and invasive avian vampire flies. For our first objective, we investigated whether the

effect of the flies on finch nestlings differed in an urban and non-urban area. We experimentally

removed vampire flies from or allowed for natural parasitism in the nests of small ground finches

(*Geospiza fuliginosa*; a species of Darwin's finch) in an urban (Puerto Baquerizo Moreno) and

non-urban area (Jardín de las Opuntias) on San Cristóbal Island, Galápagos. We then quantified

nestling morphometrics, blood loss, and survival in response to parasitism across treatments and

locations. Relative diets were compared between urban and non-urban nestlings using stable

isotope analyses of feces ($\delta^{13}C$, $\delta^{15}N$, and C:N). Stable isotope analyses of adult flies were also

conducted to determine whether nestling diet had lasting effects on the flies into adulthood.

Because urban birds have better access to resources, which could positively affect immune

development, we expect that urban finches will be more resistant to vampire flies than non-urban

birds. Urban nestlings with better access to resources might also be able to recover blood loss the

parasites more efficiently and thus be more tolerant to parasitism. However, because urban birds

prefer human junk food (De León et al., 2018), which lacks many nutritional qualities required

for an active immune system, urban nestlings might not be well defended against the parasite.

Spatial variation of urban parasite abundance was also examined to determine whether parasite

load had spatial structure within the town or was associated with various environmental features

(e.g., restaurants).

Our second objective examined the molecular mechanisms that underlie the defense

response to flies in urban and non-urban nestlings. We characterized gene expression in the

blood of ~8 day old nestlings across parasite treatments and locations. Gene expression is the

process in which gene information is turned into a functional product, which can affect

phenotypes. For example, nestlings might have more relative expression of genes in a pathway

that affects erythrocyte production, which could account for higher tolerance to flies. Co-

expression profiles were also used to compare gene expression with organismal traits in the

nestlings. If urban nestlings are better defended against flies, we expect to observe increased

expression of genes related to innate and adaptive resistance and/or tolerance to blood loss

compared to non-urban nestlings. Consequently, urban parasitized nestlings are expected to have

better health and survival as compared to non-urban parasitized nestlings. Our study is one of the

first to provide insight into the mechanisms by which urbanization positively or negatively

influences host-parasite interactions.

Methods

Study system

We conducted our study between February–May 2019 in an urban and non-urban area in

the dry lowland climatic zone of San Cristóbal (557 km^2) in the Galápagos Islands. The urban

area encompasses the only city on San Cristóbal Island, Puerto Baquerizo Moreno (hereon, urban

area) (-0.9067715°, -89.6061678°). This capital city is the second largest city in the Galápagos

archipelago with a human population of 7,199 (INEC, 2016) and measures 0.79 km^2 (~1.2 km by

0.62 km), which includes tourist and residential areas (Harvey et al., 2021). The urban area is

almost entirely consumed by human infrastructure, which primarily consists of impermeable

concrete or stone surfaces and human built structures, but also includes native plants, such as

matazárno (*Piscidia cathagenensi*), Galápagos acacia (*Acacia rorudiana*), and prickly pear

cactus (*Opuntia megasperma*), and ornamental non-native plants established by humans.

The non-urban area is in Jardín de las Opuntias (hereon, non-urban area), which is a

protected Galápagos National Park site located eight km southeast of the urban area (-

0.9491651°, -89.5528454°). Our non-urban study area measured 0.21 km^2 and covered 1.4 km of

the main trail and 0.15 km to each side (Harvey et al., 2021). The non-urban location did not

contain any unnatural, human-built impermeable surfaces, and includes native plants, such as

matazárno, acacia, and cacti. The non-urban area receives very low human visitation due to the

difficult terrain; however, local residents occasionally transect through the location to access the

beach.

Small ground finches commonly nest in both the urban and non-urban area, generally

between February–May (Harvey et al., 2021). Finches build their nests in matazárno, acacia, and

cacti in both locations, but urban finches occasionally nest in human built structures such as

gutters and building signs. Finches use coarse grasses and small twigs to build the outer structure

of the nest, and finer, softer grasses and plants to construct the inner layer and nest liner. In urban

areas, finches frequently incorporate trash and human hair into the construction of their nests

(Theodospoulos & Gotanda 2018, Harvey et al., 2021). San Cristóbal small ground finches

produce clutches between 1-5 eggs and females incubate the eggs for around 15 days (Harvey et

al., 2021). After hatching, nestlings fledge when they are 12-16 days old. Although females are

primarily involved in parental care, both males and females feed nestlings via regurgitation.

Nest parasite manipulation

Both field sites were searched daily or every other day for evidence of nest-building

activity by small ground finches. Once a nest was located, it was checked every other day until

eggs were laid in the nest. To check the nests, we used a small camera (Contour LLC), attached

to an extendable pole, which transmitted video (via Bluetooth) to an iPhone.

Since avian vampire flies can lay their eggs during the finches' egg incubation stage, the

nests were assigned to a control (naturally parasitized) or experimental (parasites removed)

treatment after a full clutch of finch eggs was laid. We applied a 1% solution of controlled-

release permethrin (Permacap: BASF Pest Control Solutions) to experimental nests and water to

control nests. Permethrin has been used extensively by Galápagos researchers to experimentally

remove vampire flies from nests (Fessl et al., 2006; Koop et al. 2013a, 2013b; Knutie et al.,

2014; Kleindorfer & Dudaniec, 2016; Knutie et al., 2016; McNew et al., 2019; Addesso et al.,

2020) and is approved for use by the Galápagos National Park. We treated nests twice with their

respective treatments: 1) during the egg stage, and 2) when nestlings hatched. During the first

treatment, 3 mL of treatment was injected beneath the nest liner with a sterile blunt syringe.

During the second treatment, the nest liner and nestlings were removed from the nest and the

treatment was applied by spraying the treatment (10 times) into the base of the nest with a travel-

sized spray bottle. The treatments were applied below the nest liner to ensure that the eggs and

nestlings did not directly contact the treatment. While hatchlings were outside the nest during

nest treatment, they were checked for signs of vampire fly infestation (black or enlarged nares,

blood on legs, wings, or feather pores). The nest liner and nestlings were then returned to the

nest. Julian hatch day and a GPS coordinate were recorded for each nest.

Nestling health and sample collection

We returned to the nest when nestlings were 7-8 days old to measure their body mass (to

the nearest 0.1 g) with a portable digital scale balance (Ohaus CL2000) and morphometrics, such

as tarsus, bill length, bill width, and bill depth (to the 0.01 mm) with analog dial calipers from

Avinet. During this visit we opportunistically collected fecal samples from the nestlings. Briefly,

a nestling was held approximately 10 cm over a sterile plastic weigh boat until it defecated (<10

seconds). We then transferred the fecal sac into a sterile 2 mL tube. The fecal sample was

transferred to a 2mL tube and kept at 4°C in a portable insulin refrigerator until we returned from

the field. Samples were stored in a -20°C freezer while in the Galápagos and then transferred to

the University of Connecticut where they were stored at -80°C until processed for stable isotope

analysis.

For up to three nestlings per nest, we also collected a small blood sample (<20 µL) from

the brachial vein using a 30-gauge sterile needle and heparinized capillary tube. Since nestlings

are being fed upon by a hematophagic ectoparasite, we wanted to collect the smallest blood

sample possible from each nestling. Therefore, we use a blood sample from each nestling within

a nest for a different assay. One sample was used to quantify hemoglobin levels (g/dL) with a

HemoCue® HB +201 portable analyzer (Hemocue America, USA) and one sample was used to

quantify glucose levels (mg/dL) with a glucometer (OneTouch, USA). The third sample of whole

blood was preserved in 180 µL of RNAlater; this preserved blood was kept at 4°C in a portable

insulin refrigerator until we returned from the field. The sample was then vortexed and stored at

4°C for 24 h before being placed in a -20°C freezer while in the Galápagos. The samples were

then transported to the University of Connecticut where they were stored at -80°C until extracted

for RNA sequencing.

We also banded nestlings with an individually numbered metal band and a unique

combination of three colored bands. When nestlings were approximately 12 days old, we

observed the nest with binoculars from a distance of approximately 5 m to prevent premature

fledging. Successful fledging was confirmed by identifying individual birds once they left the

nest.

Quantifying parasite abundance

After nestling birds fledged or died, the nest was collected and placed in a sealed, gallon-

sized plastic bag within two days of fledging. Nests were transported from the field and dissected

by hand to collect all stages of vampire flies present in the nest within 8 h. All larvae (1st, 2nd,

and 3rd instars), pupae, and pupal cases were identified and counted to determine total parasite

abundance for each nest. The length and width (0.01 mm) of up to ten pupae were haphazardly

measured with digital calipers. These measurements were used to calculate pupal volume ($V =$

$\pi*[0.5*width]^2*length$). Third instar larvae were placed in ventilated 50 mL Falcon tubes with

their home nest material until pupation. Pupae were also placed in 50 mL Falcon tubes (without

material) until they eclosed and could be identified. Up to ten adult flies were collected and

preserved in 95% ethanol for stable isotope analysis (see below for methods).

Stable isotope analyses

We quantified $\delta^{13}C$ (^{13}C:^{12}C), $\delta^{15}N$ (^{15}N:^{14}N), and the carbon to nitrogen (C:N) ratio of

finch feces and adult fly bodies. $\delta^{13}C$ helps explain the differences in C4 vs. C3 plants consumed,

$\delta^{15}N$ helps explain the amount of dietary protein consumed (and infers trophic level), and C:N

helps explain the relative lipid consumption. Stable isotope analysis was used for flies to

examine whether nutritional differences were detectable in the vampire flies parasitizing the

finches. Feces were dried in an oven at 60°C for 24 h. Fly samples were rinsed three times in a

2:1 (vol/vol) chloroform/methanol mixture to remove surface oils, then rinsed with sterile water,

and dried at 60°C for 24 h. After drying, samples were ground to a fine powder using a mortar

and pestle. Up to 1 mg of each dried, homogenized sample was weighed into a tin capsule

(Costech Analytical Technologies, Inc., USA). Capsules were folded and placed into a 96-well

plate, then sent to the University of New Mexico Center for Stable Isotope Ratio Analysis

(SIRA). The samples were run as duplicates on a Thermo Delta V mass spectrometer connected

with a Costech 4010 Elemental Analyzer.

Effect of location and landmarks on nesting and parasite abundance

To explore whether location or landmarks (i.e., food markets, bakeries, benches and

restaurants) are associated with parasite abundance and fledging success, we conducted an

optimized hotspot analysis in ArcGIS 10.8.1 (ESRI 2020). First, a minimum convex polygon

(MCP) was created to serve as our study area for spatial analysis and included all landmarks

within the urban area. Nesting hotspots were then determined based exclusively on spatial

location of nests (i.e., clusters of finch nests rather than any other features on the landscape),

which resulted in a grid of cells that were characterized as hotspots or not within the MCP-

derived study area. To learn about the characteristics of these nests, the Near Tool was used to

identify and calculate the distance to the nearest landmark for all urban nest locations that were

within the nesting hotspots. Specifically, we were interested in all landmarks associated with

food, which was 190 records of 303 landmarks available. We then extracted the locations of

nests within hotspot locations and reviewed landmark types associated with these nests. Finally,

we conducted hotspot analyses based on parasite load (i.e., is there a hotspot of nest parasites?)

and also based on fledging (i.e., is there a hotspot of fledging success?). The hotspot analysis

uses the Getis Ord-Gi statistic (Getis & Ord, 1992), which determines spatial clusters with either

high or low values for the statistic (Fisher & Getis, 2010), corresponding to hot or cool spots,

respectively.

RNA extractions, sequencing, and bioinformatics

Total RNA was extracted from 100 µL of the whole blood and RNAlater solution using a

modified Tri-Reagent (Ambion, Invitrogen, USA) and Direct-zol RNA Miniprep Plus Kit (Zymo

Research, USA) protocol (Harvey & Knutie, 2022). The samples were incubated at room

temperature for 2 min and then centrifuged for 1 min at 8,000 x g to lightly pellet the blood.

Preservation fluid (RNAlater, Ambion, Invitrogen, USA) was pipetted off leaving no more than

~15 µL of preservative and 500 µL of Tri-Reagent were added along with a sterile 5 mm

stainless steel bead (Thomson, USA) the samples were then vortexed for 30 seconds before

adding an additional 500 µL of Tri-Reagent. The sample was then vortexed for 10 min at room

temperature. The phase separation portion of the Tri-Reagent protocol was then followed, and

the upper aqueous phase (500 µL) was transferred to new microcentrifuge tubes. We then

followed the manufacturer's protocol for the Direct-zol RNA Kit beginning with the RNA

purification step. We eluted total RNA using 50 µL of RNA/DNA free water. We used a 4200

TapeStation and High Sensitivity RNA ScreenTape assays (Agilent, USA) to quantify total RNA

concentration (ng/µL) and RNA integrity numbers (RIN^e) (Schroeder et al., 2006). RNA extracts

were then stored at -80 °C until sequencing. The mean RNA concentration was 74.62 ng/µL

(range: 15.2-246.0) and mean RIN^e was 9.33 (range: 7.8-10), with all samples above the

minimum RIN^e cutoff (= 7.0) for successful sequencing.

A poly-A tail binding bead-based approach was used to reduce ribosomal RNA

contamination. First- and second-strand cDNA was synthesized using the Illumina TruSeq

Stranded mRNA Sample preparation kit and dual indexing was used to multiplex sequencing of

samples. Library quality was assessed on the Agilent Tapestation D1000 DNA High Sensitivity

assay and quantified using the Qubit 3.0 High Sensitivity dsDNA assay to ensure equimolar

pooling. A total of 42 libraries were sequenced across two (75bp PE) Illumina NextSeq500 High

Output sequencing runs.

Quality control was applied to paired-end libraries via Trimmomatic (v.0.39) (minimum

quality score 20 and minimum length 45bp) (Bolger et al., 2014). The trimmed reads were

aligned to the reference genome, *Geospiza fortis* (GeoFor_1.0, INSDC Assembly

GCA_000277835.1, Jul 2012), utilizing HISAT2 (v.2.2.1) (Kim et al., 2015). Read counts were

extracted from each alignment file via HTSeq (v.0.13.5) with the published reference annotation

(Anders et al., 2015).

Read counts and corresponding treatment and location assignments were imported into

RStudio (Bioconductor), and DESeq2 (v.1.32.0) was used to identify differentially expressed

genes among nestling groups (Soneson et al., 2015; Love et al., 2014). The factorial design with

an interaction term (~location + treatment + location:treatment) compared urban and non-urban

locations and parasite treatments (Fig. S2). *P*-values derived from the Wald test were corrected

for multiple testing using the Benjamini and Hochberg method (Love et al., 2014). We selected

genes with an adjusted *P*-value less than 0.1. Initial functional annotations were imported via

biomaRt (v.2.48.3) with Ensembl (bTaeGut1_v1.p) (Durinck et al., 2009). An enrichment and

depletion (two-sided hypergeometric test) *immune system process* Gene Ontology (GO)

enrichment analysis was performed on differentially expressed genes of sham-fumigated urban

and non-urban nestlings to predict potential immune function pathways. *Taeniopygia guttata*

(zebra finch) GO annotations were sourced from UniProt GOA and referenced within ClueGO

(v.2.5.9) and CluePedia (v.1.5.9), plug-ins for Cytoscape (v.3.8.2) (Shannon et al., 2003; Bindea

et al., 2009; Bindea et al., 2013). Terms with a *P*-value < 0.1 were considered significantly

enriched.

A co-expression analysis was conducted using WGCNA (v.1.71) in RStudio (Langfelder

& Horvath 2008). Binary and quantitative trait information was imported along with normalized

RNA-Seq counts. A soft-thresholding power of six was chosen based on the criterion of

approximate scale-free topology and sample size, and eigengene significance was calculated for

each module. Within Cytoscape, a ClueGO network (referencing zebra finch) was constructed to

visualize key drivers in the context of immune response.

Statistical analyses

Statistical analyses on field data (i.e., non-gene expression data) were conducted in R

(2021, v.1.4.1103) and figures were created in Prism (2021, v.9.2.0). All dependent variables

were tested for normality using Shapiro-Wilks tests. If variables did not pass normality ($P >$

0.05), they were $\log_{10}$ transformed to pass normality, as denoted below. Because mass and tarsus

were highly correlated ($R^2 = 0.74$, $P < 0.0001$), we calculated the scaled mass index, which is a

standardized metric of body condition (Peig & Green, 2009). Bill surface area was also

calculated from bill length, width, and depth using a modified equation for the surface area of a

cone (LaBarbera et al., 2017).

Linear mixed effects models (LMMs) with nest as a random effect were used to analyze

the effect of location on parasite size, effect of parasite intensity on parasite size, and effect of

Julian hatch day on parasite size. LMMs were used to determine the effect of location, treatment,

and their interaction on scaled mass index, bill shape, hemoglobin levels, and glucose levels,

with nest as a random effect. Nestling age (i.e., days old) and Julian hatch day were included as

covariates when they contributed significantly ($P < 0.05$) to the model (age only: bill shape;

Julian hatch day only: glucose; neither: scaled mass index, hemoglobin levels). LMMs were also

used to determine the effect of location and sample type (nestling feces vs. fly) on $\delta^{15}N$, $\delta^{14}C$,

and C:N, with sample replicate as a random effect.

Generalized linear models (GLMs) were used to analyze the effect of location on parasite

abundance (Poisson), the effect of location on Julian hatch day (log transformed; Gaussian), the

effect of location and Julian hatch day on brood size (log transformed; Gaussian), and effect of

Julian hatch day on parasite abundance (Poisson). GLMs were also used to determine the effect

of location, treatment, and their interaction on fledging age for the nest (log transformed;

Gaussian). A GLM with binomial errors for proportional data (i.e., a logistic regression) was

used to determine the effect of location, treatment, and their interaction on fledging success with

Julian hatch day as a covariate.

Analyses were conducted with the lmer function (LMMs) and glm function (GLMs)

using the lme4 package in R (Bates et al., 2015). Probability values were calculated using log-

likelihood ratio tests using the Anova function in the car package (Fox & Weisberg 2019). For

one-way and two-way ANOVAs, we used type II and type III sum of squares, respectively.

Results

Effect of parasite treatment and urbanization on parasite load

Urban and non-urban finches initiated breeding in early February 2019. The first urban

nests hatched approximately seven days before the first non-urban nest. Although Julian hatch

day was, on average, earlier for urban nests (mean $\pm$ SE: 86.24 $\pm$ 3.99 days) compared to non-

urban nests (94.17 $\pm$ 4.07 days), Julian hatch day did not differ significantly between locations

($\chi^2 = 2.23$, $P = 0.14$). Furthermore, location, Julian hatch day, and their interaction did not

significantly affect brood size (urban: 2.66 $\pm$ 0.18 nestlings, $n = 38$ nests; non-urban: 2.87 $\pm$ 0.17,

$n = 30$ nests; location: $\chi^2 = 0.36$, $P = 0.55$; hatch day: $\chi^2 = 0.77$, $P = 0.38$; interaction: $\chi^2 = 1.09$,

$P = 0.30$). Eight nests were classified as depredated, either due to direct evidence of depredation

(e.g., body parts found) or because they were likely depredated (e.g., all nestlings disappeared

over a short period of time and prior to the typical fledging window). Three non-urban and five

urban nests were depredated, which were both permethrin-treated (three nests) and water-treated

(five nests).

The experimental treatment of nests with a mild insecticide was nearly 100% effective at

removing parasites (Fig. 1A; non-urban: $n = 13$ nests, urban: $n = 16$ nests); only one permethrin-

treated urban nest had eight parasites after the treatment. Since one permethrin-treated nest was

parasitized, nests from this treatment will be referred to as "fumigated". Water-treated nests

(hereafter, "sham-fumigated") were naturally parasitized by 27.00 ($\pm$ 5.20) parasites in the non-

urban area ($n = 17$ nests) and 15.95 ($\pm$ 3.15) parasites in the urban area (Fig. 1A; $n = 21$ nests).

One water-treated nest disappeared due to predation after the nestlings were banded and

therefore, we could not quantify parasitism. Fourteen of 17 (82.35%) non-urban nests and 17 of

21 (80.95%) urban nests contained at least one parasite. Within the sham-fumigated treatment,

non-urban nests had significantly fewer parasites than urban nests ($\chi^2 = 54.49$, $P < 0.0001$).

Julian hatch day did not significantly predict nest parasite abundance ($\chi^2 = 1.58$, $P = 0.21$).

385   The volume (i.e., size) of 93 pupae from 13 urban nests and 90 pupae from 14 non-urban

nests was calculated for comparison. Parasite size, which is a measure of virulence in

ectoparasites, was larger in urban nests compared to non-urban nests (Fig. 1B; $\chi^2 = 5.85$, $P =$

0.02). Urban parasites were, on average, 26% larger than non-urban parasites (urban: $100.30 \pm$

7.62 mm^3, non-urban: 81.61 ± 9.29 mm^3). This difference was not related to competition among

parasites within the nest because parasite intensity was not related to parasite size ($\chi^2 = 0.01$, $P =$

0.97). Rather, the nest hatch day predicted parasite size, with earlier nests having larger parasites

compared to later nesters (Fig. 1C; $\chi^2 = 11.01$, $P < 0.001$).

Effect of location and landmarks on nesting and parasite abundance

395   Of all urban nests (sham-fumigated and fumigated), one nesting hotspot was identified

within the urban area ($n = 37$ total nests; $n = 19$ hotspot nests), which was at the airport (Fig. S1).

The hotspot grid resulted in 14 cells (78 m x 78 m) with 90% confidence of being a hotspot, with

Z-scores ranging between 2.90 and 6.02. The remaining cells in the study area were not

identified as significant nesting hot- or cool-spots. Of the 19 nests within the nesting hotspot,

seven contained parasites, and all but one of these was located near a bench. Hotspots were not

identified for fledging success, nor did we identify parasite hotspots among sham-fumigated

nests only.

Effect of parasitism and urbanization on nestling health

Nestlings from sham-fumigated nests had, on average, lower body condition (i.e., scaled

mass index) than nestlings from fumigated nests (Table S1; $\chi^2 = 4.01$, $P = 0.045$). Location and

the interaction between location and treatment did not significantly affect body condition

(location: $\chi^2 = 0.36$, $P = 0.55$; interaction: $\chi^2 = 2.20$, $P = 0.14$). Treatment and location did not

significantly affect bill surface area (location: $\chi^2 = 0.13$, $P = 0.72$; treatment: $\chi^2 = 0.71$, $P = 0.40$).

The interaction between treatment and location had a marginally non-significant effect on bill

surface area ($\chi^2 = 3.09$, $P = 0.08$); fumigated nestlings from non-urban areas had larger bill

surface area than nestlings from urban areas but the bill surface area for sham-fumigated

nestlings from urban and non-urban nests did not differ significantly. Most nestlings from non-

urban, sham-fumigated nests died before they could be measured; only 13 non-urban nestlings

from six sham-fumigated nests survived to be measured.

Location alone did not significantly affect nestling hemoglobin levels (Fig. 2; Table S1;

$\chi^2 = 1.06$, $P = 0.30$). Overall, sham-fumigated nestlings had lower hemoglobin levels than

fumigated nestlings ($\chi^2 = 18.82$, $P < 0.0001$). The interaction between treatment and location

affected hemoglobin levels ($\chi^2 = 6.16$, $P = 0.01$), with nestlings from sham-fumigated nests in

the non-urban area having, on average, 32% lower levels than nestlings from the other treatments

(i.e., sham-fumigated urban, fumigated urban, and fumigated non-urban nestlings).

Overall, nestlings from fumigated nests had higher glucose levels than nestlings from

sham-fumigated nests (Table S1; $\chi^2 = 9.75$, $P = 0.002$) and non-urban nestlings had higher

glucose levels than urban nestlings ($\chi^2 = 6.87$, $P = 0.009$). Additionally, the interaction between

treatment and location had an effect on nestling glucose levels ($\chi^2 = 9.34$, $P = 0.002$), with urban

nestlings from fumigated and sham-fumigated nests maintaining similar levels but non-urban

nestlings from fumigated nests having higher levels than sham-fumigated nestlings. Nestlings

from sham-fumigated nests in the non-urban area had, on average, 26% lower glucose levels than

nestlings from the other treatments (i.e., sham-fumigated urban, fumigated urban, and fumigated

non-urban nestlings).

Fledging success of urban and non-urban nestlings did not differ significantly ($\chi^2 = 0.67$,

$P = 0.41$), but overall, parasitism reduced fledging success (Fig. 1A; Table S1; $\chi^2 = 44.30$, $P <$

0.0001). The interaction between treatment and location affected fledging success ($\chi^2 = 8.28$, $P =$

0.004); survival of fumigated nestlings did not differ between locations (urban: 85%, non-urban

78%) but survival of sham-fumigated nestlings was lower in non-urban areas (7%), compared to

urban areas (48%). Age at fledging did not differ significantly between treatments ($\chi^2 = 0.20$, $P =$

0.66) but differed between locations ($\chi^2 = 3.71$, $P = 0.05$); urban nestlings left the nest

approximately one day later than non-urban nestlings. The interaction between treatment and

location did not significantly affect fledging age ($\chi^2 = 0.10$, $P = 0.75$).

Effect of urbanization on finch and parasite diet

Flies were enriched in $\delta^{15}N$ compared to nestling feces ($\chi^2 = 164.94$, $P < 0.0001$) and all

urban samples were enriched in $\delta^{15}N$ compared to non-urban samples ($\chi^2 = 108.13$, $P < 0.0001$;

Fig. 3A). However, the interaction between sample type and location did not significantly affect

$\delta^{15}N$ ($\chi^2 = 0.00$, $P = 0.99$). Nest parasite abundance correlated negatively with $\delta^{15}N$ values ($\chi^2 =$

5.69, $P = 0.02$; Fig. 3B). Nestling feces were enriched in $\delta^{13}C$ compared to flies ($\chi^2 = 11.21$, $P =$

0.0008). However, location or the interaction between sample type and location did not affect

$\delta^{13}C$ (location: $X^2 = 0.43$, $P = 0.51$; interaction: $\chi^2 = 1.16$, $P = 0.28$). Nestling feces had a higher

carbon to nitrogen ratio (C:N), compared to flies ($\chi^2 = 21.60$, $P < 0.0001$). However, location and

the interaction between sample type and location did not affect C:N (location: $\chi^2 = 2.04$, $P =$

0.15; interaction: $\chi^2 = 0.74$, $P = 0.39$).

Sequencing, Quality Control, and Alignment

In total, 42 paired-end nestling libraries were constructed for nestlings from sham-

fumigated urban nests ($n = 11$), sham-fumigated non-urban nests ($n = 5$), fumigated urban nests

($n = 14$), and fumigated non-urban nests ($n = 12$). The total paired-reads post-QC ranged

between 15.86 M and 42.16 M and alignment rates against the *Geospiza fortis* genome ranged

from 80.74% to 91.81% (Table S2).

Differentially Expressed Genes

A pairwise differential expression analysis observing two sites (urban and non-urban) and

two treatments (sham-fumigated and fumigated) with an interaction produced four gene-sets

(File S1). A total of 5,123 genes (*P-adj* < 0.1) were differentially expressed in sham-fumigated

nestlings across the urban (up-regulated) and non-urban (down-regulated) sites - of which, 2,521

were up-regulated and 2,602 were down-regulated. Altogether, 57 genes demonstrated strong

expression patterns (± 4-fold change), including frizzled class receptor 10 FZD10 (16.20-fold

change), a primary receptor for Wnt signaling, leucine rich repeat and Ig domain containing 3

LINGO3 (5.35-fold change), which has been shown to regulate mucosal tissue regeneration in

humans and promote wound healing, adenosine deaminase ADA (-8.17-fold change), associated

with hemolytic anemia, and hepatic leukemia factor HLF (-5.64-fold change), known to

influence the renewal of hematopoietic stem cells (Wang et al., 2016; Zullo et al., 2021; Chen &

Mitchell, 1994; Komorowska et al., 2017). In fumigated nestlings, only two genes were up-

regulated in the urban site, bisphosphoglycerate mutase BPGM (3.23-fold change), a regulator of

erythrocyte metabolism and hemoglobin in red blood cells, and zinc finger protein GLIS1 (3.40-

fold change), which has been significantly associated with bill length (Xu et al., 2020;

Lundregan et al., 2018). There were no significantly down-regulated genes in fumigated urban

nestlings. When comparing sham-fumigated vs. fumigated nestlings in the urban site, a total of

768 genes were differentially expressed - with 570 being up-regulated in sham-fumigated

nestlings, and 198 down-regulated. The vast majority of genes showed moderate fold-change

patterns, with only three exhibiting strong expression patterns: inorganic pyrophosphate transport

regulator ANKH (4.43-fold change), prokineticin 2 PROK2 (4.38-fold change) and plexin A2

PLXNA2 (-4.08-fold change). By comparison, the non-urban site yielded 7,064 genes, 3,709

expressed in sham-fumigated nestlings, and 3,355 in fumigated nestlings. Of those, 314

displayed strong expression patterns, including assembly factor for spindle microtubules ASPM

(7.94-fold change), which has an apparent role in neurogenesis and neuronal development (Nam

et al., 2010) (Fig. S3-S4).

Gene enrichment related to host defense mechanisms

Gene enrichment of sham-fumigated nestlings from the urban and non-urban location

was compared to identify potential host defense mechanisms to explain the expression patterns

observed. Analysis of enriched *immune system process* Gene Ontology (GO) terms revealed 21

significant ($P < 0.05$) up-regulated terms (urban) and 12 significant down-regulated terms (non-

urban) categorized by resistance (adaptive and innate) and tolerance (File S2).

First, we examined enrichment patterns related to *adaptive immunological resistance*

(Fig. 4A). The sham-fumigated urban nestlings exhibited strong enrichment of lymphocyte

differentiation ($P < 0.02$) and T-cell pathways related to regulation of CD4-positive, alpha-beta T

cell activation ($P < 0.01$) and natural killer T-cell differentiation ($P < 0.05$). By comparison,

sham-fumigated non-urban nestlings yielded 21 significant adaptive immunity terms. Of those,

ten terms were related to Ig antibodies, including positive regulation of isotype switching to IgG

isotypes ($P < 0.001$) and somatic hypermutation of immunoglobulin genes ($P < 0.001$). The

other 11 terms were related to B cell proliferation ($P < 0.01$) and activation ($P < 0.05$), leukocyte

differentiation ($P < 0.04$) and proliferation ($P < 0.05$), regulation of antigen receptor-mediated

signaling pathways ($P < 0.04$), and germinal center formation ($P < 0.01$).

We next examined enrichment patterns related to *innate immunological resistance* (Fig.

4B). Sham-fumigated urban nestlings were enriched for both type I interferon mediated signaling

($P < 0.03$) and toll-like receptor 9 signaling ($P < 0.05$). Among the sham-fumigated non-urban

nestlings, only negative regulation of innate immune response ($P < 0.07$) was enriched.

Finally, we examined enrichment related to *tolerance* (Fig. 4C). Sham-fumigated urban

nestlings had three significantly enriched terms specific to red blood cells, including erythrocyte

differentiation ($P < 0.001$) and development ($P < 0.001$), as well as enucleate erythrocyte

differentiation ($P < 0.01$). Among non-urban nestlings, regulation of megakaryocyte

differentiation yielded a *P*-value less than 0.07.

Co-expression Analysis

A differential co-expression analysis was conducted to provide novel insights on other

traits that may explain gene expression patterns in nestling finches. Correlations in transcript

levels across 12 traits (urban, sham-fumigated, hemoglobin concentration, glucose concentration,

survival ("alive"), deltaC, deltaN, C:N, days old, number of parasites in nest, bill surface area,

and scaled mass index) introduced 44 modules (File S3; Fig. S5-S8). Nestling survival ("alive"

trait) presented the most significant correlations across the gene set, as illustrated by module A (*r*

= 0.67, $P < 0.0001$) and module B ($r = -0.82$, $P < 0.0001$) respectively (Fig. 5). From the 2,338

total genes included in module A, 43 yielded 19 significantly enriched *immune system process*

terms related to T-cell activation, lymphocyte differentiation, and negative regulation of

hemopoiesis. Comparatively, 55 of the 3,422 genes in module B activated 21 immune pathways

related to somatic hypermutation of immunoglobulin genes, leukocyte mediated cytotoxicity and

interestingly, erythrocyte differentiation.

Apart from mortality, other traits were strongly correlated with module A and B.

Specifically, module A was negatively correlated with parasitism ($r = -0.59$, $P < 0.0001$) and

nest parasite abundance ($r = -0.74$, $P < 0.0001$), and positively correlated with hemoglobin level

($r = 0.66$, $P < 0.0001$), glucose level ($r = 0.48$, $P < 0.001$), and deltaC ($r = 0.32$, $P < 0.04$).

Specifically, module B was positively correlated with parasitism ($r = 0.57$, $P < 0.0001$) and nest

parasite abundance ($r = 0.62$, $P < 0.0001$), and negatively correlated with hemoglobin level ($r =$

-0.52, $P < 0.0004$), glucose level ($r = -0.55$, $P < 0.0002$), deltaC ($r = -0.34$, $P < 0.03$) and scaled

mass ($r = -0.45$, $P < 0.003$). By comparison, although there were no notable correlations to

urbanization in the described modules, the enriched immune pathways better explain patterns of

expression observed in urban and non-urban sham-fumigated finches.

Discussion

Our study found that urban living partially rescues nestling small ground finches from the

lethal effects of parasitism by invasive avian vampire flies. Survival of sham-fumigated nestlings

did not differ significantly, which suggests that urbanization alone does not affect fledging

success. Urban nests had significantly fewer parasites than non-urban nests, but even highly

parasitized urban nestlings survived. These results indicate that urban nestlings have effective

resistance and tolerance mechanisms to deal with avian vampire flies. Differences in diet

(measured using stable isotopes) between locations could explain why urban nestlings are less

affected by parasites, but these results are correlative. Gene expression analyses revealed that

resistance and tolerance mechanisms might underlie differences in parasite effects. Sham-

fumigated urban nestlings differentially expressed genes within pathways associated with red

blood cell production (tolerance) and interferon type 1 activity (innate immunological

resistance), compared to sham-fumigated non-urban nestlings. In contrast, sham-fumigated non-

urban nestlings differentially expressed genes within pathways associated with immunoglobulin

production (adaptive immunological resistance). Both urban and non-urban nestlings expressed

different pathways related to T- and B-cell responses (adaptive immunological resistance).

However, urban nestlings also expressed pathways to downregulate T-cell production, which

might explain why immunoglobulin production genes were less expressed compared to non-

urban nestlings. The gene expression results suggest that non-urban nestlings are investing in

adaptive immunity, but that this type of response is not an effective defense mechanism against

the parasite since few nestlings survived.

Overall, our field data suggest that the urban finch population is investing in resistance

over tolerance because urban nests had 40% fewer parasites and higher nestling survival than

non-urban nests. Gene expression profiles showed that urban nestlings differentially express

innate immune genes associated with pro-inflammatory cytokines, specifically type-1 interferons

(IFNs), compared to non-urban nestlings. When larval flies chew through the skin of their hosts,

effective inflammation by the host (thickening the skin and restricting blood flow) can prevent

ectoparasite feeding (reviewed in Owens et al., 2010). Although other avian urbanization studies

have not observed changes in IFNs, they have found other enhanced innate immune responses

within urban populations. For example, Watson et al., (2017) observed overrepresented genes

involved in the secretion and receptor-binding of cytokines in urban great tits (*Parus major*)

compared to non-urban tits. Additionally, urban nestling black sparrowhawks (*Accipiter*

melanoleucus) had a stronger innate response to an immune challenge compared to non-urban

nestlings (Nwaogu et al., 2023). Although these studies were unable to link the heightened innate

immune response in urban nestlings to parasite resistance, they provide evidence that urban

living could confer an advantage against parasitism.

Most studies suggest that IFNs are largely involved in resistance to viruses (Katze et al.,

2002; Fensterl & Sen, 2009). An experimental study (e.g., with avian vampire fly-specific

vaccination challenges) is still needed to determine whether IFNs are specifically involved in the

inflammatory response to avian vampire flies because it is possible that finches are actually

responding to a virus. For example, adult finches in Puerto Baquerizo Moreno, San Cristóbal

Island, are susceptible to infection by the invasive avian pox virus (Lynton-Jenkins et al., 2021).

A recent study suggests that pox-infected adult finches upregulate expression of interferon

pathways (McNew et al., 2022), which could explain the expression of IFN seen in urban sham-

fumigated nestlings. One interesting possibility is that infection by pox could also be conferring

resistance to avian vampire flies. This potential explanation requires further study but could

provide insight into the disease dynamics of co-infecting invasive parasites of Galápagos birds

(Wikelski et al., 2004).

Although sham-fumigated non-urban nestlings did not exhibit significantly enriched

innate immune pathways, they did differentially express genes involved in pathways related to

the adaptive immune response. Specifically, T-cell, B-cell, and Ig pathways were expressed, but

without successfully conferring resistance since almost all of the nestlings died. This

upregulation could be the final effort by the finches' immune system to deal with the parasite

before it becomes physiologically costly. In contrast, urban finch nestlings expressed more

adaptive immune pathways related to lymphocyte and T-cell differentiation, compared to non-

urban nestlings. One explanation for why urban nestlings had higher survival compared to non-

urban nestlings is that resistance is heightened when the innate and adaptive immune system are

activated simultaneously (Palm & Medzhitov, 2007).

Regardless of the mechanism, a central question is why urban finches are more resistant

to avian vampire flies than non-urban finches? Immunological resistance can be conditionally

dependent and only hosts in good condition might be able to resist parasites (Sheldon &

Verhulst, 1996; Svensson et al., 1998; Lochmiller & Deerenberg, 2000; Sternberg et al., 2012;

Cornet et al., 2014; Howick & Lazzaro, 2014; Knutie, 2020). In a native host-parasite system,

eastern bluebirds (*Sialia sialis*) are both tolerant and resistant to nest flies and the investment in

defenses depends on whether supplemental food is available (resistance) or not (tolerance;

Knutie, 2020). Urban areas in the Galápagos provide a reliable source of human food for

animals, including finches (De León et al., 2018). For example, some restaurants have outdoor

dining, where food falls off tables and finches feed on the tables (Fig. S9). Our stable isotope

results corroborate the idea that diet differs between urban and non-urban nestlings. In fact,

higher δ^{15}N values suggest a diet rich in meat, such as chicken, beef, fish, which can be found at

outdoor restaurants in town. Higher δ^{15}N values also correlated with lower parasite abundances,

which supports the idea that diet might influence host defenses. For example, meat has higher

protein concentrations than plants and insects and supplemented protein can increase the

concentration of cellular immune cells (e.g., eosinophils, globule leukocytes and mast cells)

(reviewed in Coop & Kyriazakis, 2001).

Some urban nests had 100% nestling survival despite high parasite abundances (up to 48

parasites), indicating that these urban nestlings are tolerant of parasites. Studies have

demonstrated that low finch survival in response to vampire flies is likely related to

exsanguination (i.e., high blood loss) (Koop et al., 2013; Knutie et al., 2016). One explanation

for increased tolerance is that urban nestlings have effective blood recovery when parasitized and

thus tolerate parasitism. This hypothesis is corroborated with our results that urban finches have

more hemoglobin (oxygenated blood) when parasitized compared to non-urban birds. Gene

expression profiles suggest that urban nestlings differentially expressed genes within pathways

associated with red blood cell production compared to non-urban nestlings when parasitized.

Furthermore, nestlings that survived had higher gene expression of blood cell production than

nestlings that died, which was observed across urban and non-urban locations. Galápagos

mockingbirds are also relatively tolerant of avian vampire flies (Knutie et al., 2016), but this

tolerance is lost during dry years with low food availability (McNew et al., 2019). The working

hypothesis is that mockingbirds are a larger-bodied species and that larger hosts might be more

tolerant of avian vampire flies (McNew & Clayton, 2018). However, our study suggests that

even smaller-bodied hosts can tolerate avian vampire flies, and there is likely an alternative

explanation. The hormone erythropoietin is produced primarily by the kidneys and works

together with iron to induce erythropoiesis, which is the production of red blood cells. One

explanation for the lack of tolerance in non-urban nestlings is that these nestlings are not

receiving sufficient amounts of iron or are not producing enough erythropoietin. Urban nestlings

have higher $\delta^{15}N$ values, which is likely because they are feeding on more iron-rich meat

products, than non-urban birds. Thus, this difference in diet could explain the increased tolerance

related to red blood cell recovery but requires further studies on iron and nestling endocrinology.

Finally, although non-urban nestlings did not exhibit any significantly enriched pathways related

to tolerance, we found that adenosine deaminase (ADA) was significantly up-regulated.

Interestingly, overexpression of this gene in red blood cells has been shown to cause hemolytic

anemia (Chen & Mitchell, 1994), which could be additionally responsible for non-urban finch

mortality.

Although survival of urban nestlings in response to parasites is higher than non-urban

nestlings, some nests still failed due to parasitism. Therefore, not all urban finches have effective

defenses against avian vampire flies. Our urban field site is environmentally heterogeneous with

nests found in areas of high tourist activity, residential areas, a naval base, and the airport. Our

spatial analysis did not find any distinct patterns for parasite abundance or fledging success.

Thus, host-parasite dynamics could be related to the small radius (i.e., territory) around the nest,

which might not contribute to a larger spatial pattern. Alternatively, human food type,

abundance, and reliability vary based on tourist activity, which can change weekly depending on

whether cruise ships or other major tours are present. This activity can affect whether restaurants

are open and how much outdoor dining occurs, which can influence food availability for finches.

Naïve hosts are thought to lack defenses against novel parasites, which can cause species

declines and extinctions (Daszak et al., 2000; Keesing et al., 2010; Atkinson & Lapointe, 2009).

Over the past decade, studies have found that invasive avian vampire flies can cause up to 100%

mortality in Darwin's finch species across islands in the Galápagos (O'Connor et al., 2010; Koop

et al., 2010; Koop et al., 2013; O'Connor et al., 2014; Kleindorfer & Dudaniec 2016; Knutie et

al., 2016; McNew & Clayton, 2018; Addesso et al., 2021). If humans cannot effectively control

the fly (e.g., Knutie et al., 2014) or host species do not evolve or develop defenses, some species

might even go extinct (Fessl et al., 2010; Koop et al., 2013b). However, our study provides

evidence that urban finches can be relatively well-defended against avian vampire flies. We are

not suggesting that the Galápagos Islands should be urbanized to increase defense against

parasites. Instead, the goal of our study is to demonstrate that some finches can defend

themselves against the flies through various mechanisms, which can provide insight into

management strategies (Ohmer et al., 2021). One next step is to determine whether urban finches

have evolved defenses against the flies, which could be explored with a common garden

experiment (Lindström, 1999; Slagsvold et al., 2002; Schluter & Gustafsson, 2006). To

determine whether food availability is responsible for enhanced host defenses, researchers could

manipulate food availability then quantify its effect on finch health and defenses to parasitism.

One method could be to install feeders for adults, who would use the food to feed their nestlings

(Knutie, 2020). However, this method could benefit invasive predators of finches, such as cats or

rats in the area (Phillips et al., 2012; Gotanda, 2021). Alternatively, nestlings could be directly

supplemented with food, which would help control the amount of food provided to the birds.

Overall, the results of our study present a potentially positive future for Darwin's finches in the

face of a virulent invasive parasite and inspires the next step to understanding this dynamic

system.

Acknowledgements: We would like to thank the Galápagos Science Center and the Galápagos

National Park for support. Specifically, we thank Karla Vasco from the Galápagos Science

Center for her assistance and logistical support in the laboratory. We thank Bo Reese for

assistance at the UConn Center for Genomic Innovation and Corrine Arthur for help with field

work. The work was supported by start-up funds and an Institute for Systems Genomics grant

from the University of Connecticut, a National Science Foundation (NSF) Grant (DEB-

1949858), and a National Geographic Grant to SAK, an NSF grant to JW (DBI-1943371), an

Explorers Club Mamont Scholar Grant, an Animal Behavior Society Student Research Grant, a

Whetten Travel award from El Instituto at the University of Connecticut, and a University of

Connecticut Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology Zoology 2019 Award to GJV. All

bird handling and work was conducted according to approved University of Connecticut IACUC

(Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee) protocols (No. A17-044). Our work was done

under GNP permits PC 28-19 and Genetic Access permit MAE-DNB-CM-2016-0041. Authors

declare that they have no competing interests.

Data Availability Statement: Details of full analysis, including intermediate files and

supporting scripts, are publicly available at: https://gitlab.com/PlantGenomicsLab/galapagos-

finch-rna-seq. All raw data are available on FigShare (DOI: available upon acceptance), with

individual-level nestling data in Table S1, and sequences have been uploaded to GenBank

(BioProject accession number: PRJNA930453).

Author contributions: Conceptualization: SAK; Methodology: SAK, CW, GJV, JLW;

Analyses: SAK, CW, GJV, ML, JLW; Investigation: SAK, CW, GJV, LA, CA, TBV, AS, JAH,

JLW; Visualization: SAK, CW, ML, JLW; Funding acquisition: SAK, GJV, JLW; Project

administration: JC, SAK; Supervision: SAK, JLW; Writing – original draft: SAK, CW, GJV,

ML, JLW; Writing – review & editing: All authors.

Literature Cited

Addesso, A. M., Harvey, J. A., Vaziri, G. J., Verrett, T. B., Albert, L., Arthur, C., ... & Knutie, S.

A. (2020). Effect of introduced parasites on the survival and microbiota of nestling cactus

finches (*Geospiza scandens*) in the Galápagos Islands. *Journal of Ornithology*, *161*,

1011-1019.

Anders, S., Pyl, P. T., & Huber, W. (2015). HTSeq—a Python framework to work with high-

throughput sequencing data. *Bioinformatics*, *31*(2), 166-169.

Langfelder, P., & Horvath, S. (2008). WGCNA: an R package for weighted correlation network

analysis. *BMC bioinformatics*, *9*(1), 1-13.

Atkinson, C. T., & LaPointe, D. A. (2009). Introduced avian diseases, climate change, and the

future of Hawaiian honeycreepers. *Journal of Avian Medicine and Surgery*, *23*(1), 53-63.

Bates, D., Mächler, M., Bolker, B., & Walker, S. (2014). Fitting linear mixed-effects models

using lme4. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1406.5823*.

Bindea, G., Mlecnik, B., Hackl, H., Charoentong, P., Tosolini, M., Kirilovsky, A., ... & Galon, J.

(2009). ClueGO: a Cytoscape plug-in to decipher functionally grouped gene ontology and

pathway annotation networks. *Bioinformatics*, *25*(8), 1091-1093.

Bindea, G., Galon, J., & Mlecnik, B. (2013). CluePedia Cytoscape plugin: pathway insights

using integrated experimental and in silico data. *Bioinformatics*, *29*(5), 661-663.

Birch, E. L., & Wachter, S. M. (Eds.). (2011). *Global urbanization*. University of Pennsylvania

Press.

Bolger, A. M., Lohse, M., & Usadel, B. (2014). Trimmomatic: a flexible trimmer for Illumina

sequence data. *Bioinformatics*, *30*(15), 2114-2120.

Chen, E. H., & Mitchell, B. S. (1994). Hereditary overexpression of adenosine deaminase in

erythrocytes: studies in erythroid cell lines and transgenic mice. *Blood*, *84*(7), 2346-2353.

Christe, P., Richner, H., & Oppliger, A. (1996). Begging, food provisioning, and nestling

competition in great tit broods infested with ectoparasites. *Behavioral Ecology*, *7*(2), 127-

131.

Coop, R. L., & Kyriazakis, I. (2001). Influence of host nutrition on the development and

consequences of nematode parasitism in ruminants. *Trends in Parasitology*, *17*(7), 325-

330.

Cornet, S., Bichet, C., Larcombe, S., Faivre, B., & Sorci, G. (2014). Impact of host nutritional

status on infection dynamics and parasite virulence in a bird-malaria system. *Journal of*

Animal Ecology, *83*(1), 256-265.

Danecek, P., Bonfield, J. K., Liddle, J., Marshall, J., Ohan, V., Pollard, M. O., ... & Li, H.

(2021). Twelve years of SAMtools and BCFtools. *Gigascience*, *10*(2), giab008.

Daszak, P., Cunningham, A. A., & Hyatt, A. D. (2000). Emerging infectious diseases of wildlife-

-threats to biodiversity and human health. *Science*, *287*(5452), 443-449.

De León, L. F., Sharpe, D. M., Gotanda, K. M., Raeymaekers, J. A., Chaves, J. A., Hendry, A.

P., & Podos, J. (2019). Urbanization erodes niche segregation in Darwin's finches.

Evolutionary Applications, *12*(7), 1329-1343.

Durinck, S., Spellman, P. T., Birney, E., & Huber, W. (2009). Mapping identifiers for the

integration of genomic datasets with the R/Bioconductor package biomaRt. *Nature*

Protocols, *4*(8), 1184-1191.

Esri Inc. (2020). ArcGIS Pro (Version 2.5). Esri Inc. https://www.esri.com/en-

us/arcgis/products/arcgis-pro/overview.

Fensterl, V. and Sen, G.C. 2009. Interferons and viral infections. *BioFactors* 35: 14-20.

Fessl, B., Sinclair, B. J., & Kleindorfer, S. (2006). The life-cycle of Philornis downsi (Diptera:

Muscidae) parasitizing Darwin's finches and its impacts on nestling survival.

Parasitology, *133*(6), 739-747.

Fessl, B., Young, G. H., Young, R. P., Rodríguez-Matamoros, J., Dvorak, M., Tebbich, S., & Fa,

J. E. (2010). How to save the rarest Darwin's finch from extinction: the mangrove finch

on Isabela Island. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological*

Sciences, *365*(1543), 1019-1030.

Getis, A., & Ord, J. K. (1992). The analysis of spatial association by use of distance

statistics. *Geographical analysis*, *24*(3), 189-206.

Fischer, M. M., & Getis, A. (Eds.). (2010). *Handbook of applied spatial analysis: software tools,*

methods and applications (pp. 125-134). Berlin: Springer.

Fox, J., & Weisberg, S. (2019). An {R} companion to applied regression 3rd ed Sage Thousand

Oaks.

Frick, W. F., Pollock, J. F., Hicks, A. C., Langwig, K. E., Reynolds, D. S., Turner, G. G., ... &

Kunz, T. H. (2010). An emerging disease causes regional population collapse of a

common North American bat species. *Science*, *329*(5992), 679-682.

Getis, A., & Ord, J. K. (1992). The analysis of spatial association by use of distance statistics.

Geographical Analysis, *24*(3), 189-206.

Gotanda, K. M. (2020). Human influences on antipredator behaviour in Darwin's finches.

Journal of Animal Ecology, *89*(2), 614-622.

Harvey, J. A., Chernicky, K., Simons, S. R., Verrett, T. B., Chaves, J. A., & Knutie, S. A.

(2021). Urban living influences the nesting success of Darwin's finches in the Galápagos

Islands. *Ecology and Evolution*, *11*(10), 5038-5048.

Harvey, J. A., & Knutie, S. A. (2021). Effect of RNA preservation methods on RNA quantity

and quality of field collected avian whole blood. *bioRxiv*, 2021-11.

Howick, V. M., & Lazzaro, B. P. (2014). Genotype and diet shape resistance and tolerance

across distinct phases of bacterial infection. *BMC evolutionary biology*, *14*(1), 1-13.

Katze, M. G., Y. He, & M. Gale. 2002. Viruses and interferon: a fight for supremacy. *Nature*

Reviews Immunology, 2:675–687.

Keesing, F., Belden, L. K., Daszak, P., Dobson, A., Harvell, C. D., Holt, R. D., ... & Ostfeld, R.

S. (2010). Impacts of biodiversity on the emergence and transmission of infectious

diseases. *Nature*, *468*(7324), 647-652.

Kim, D., Langmead, B., & Salzberg, S. L. (2015). HISAT: a fast spliced aligner with low

memory requirements. *Nature Methods*, *12*(4), 357-360.

Kleindorfer, S., & Dudaniec, R. Y. (2016). Host-parasite ecology, behavior and genetics: a

review of the introduced fly parasite *Philornis downsi* and its Darwin's finch hosts. *BMC*

Zoology, *1*(1), 1-19.

Knutie, S. A., McNew, S. M., Bartlow, A. W., Vargas, D. A., & Clayton, D. H. (2014). Darwin's

finches combat introduced nest parasites with fumigated cotton. *Current Biology*, *24*(9),

R355-R356.

Knutie, S. A., Owen, J. P., McNew, S. M., Bartlow, A. W., Arriero, E., Herman, J. M., ... &

Clayton, D. H. (2016). Galápagos mockingbirds tolerate introduced parasites that affect

Darwin's finches. *Ecology*, *97*(4), 940-950.

Knutie, S. A. (2020). Food supplementation affects gut microbiota and immunological resistance

to parasites in a wild bird species. *Journal of Applied Ecology*, *57*(3), 536-547.

Komorowska, K., Doyle, A., Wahlestedt, M., Subramaniam, A., Debnath, S., Chen, J., ... &

Magnusson, M. (2017). Hepatic leukemia factor maintains quiescence of hematopoietic

stem cells and protects the stem cell pool during regeneration. *Cell Reports*, *21*(12),

3514-3523.

Koop, J. A., Huber, S. K., Laverty, S. M., & Clayton, D. H. (2011). Experimental demonstration

of the fitness consequences of an introduced parasite of Darwin's finches. *PLoS One*,

6(5), e19706.

Koop, J. A., Owen, J. P., Knutie, S. A., Aguilar, M. A., & Clayton, D. H. (2013). Experimental

demonstration of a parasite-induced immune response in wild birds: Darwin's finches and

introduced nest flies. *Ecology and Evolution*, *3*(8), 2514-2523.

Koop, J. A., Le Bohec, C., & Clayton, D. H. (2013). Dry year does not reduce invasive parasitic

fly prevalence or abundance in Darwin's finch nests. *Reports in Parasitology*, *3*, 11-17.

Koop, J. A., Kim, P. S., Knutie, S. A., Adler, F., & Clayton, D. H. (2016). An introduced

parasitic fly may lead to local extinction of Darwin's finch populations. *Journal of*

Applied Ecology, *53*(2), 511-518.

LaBarbera, K., Hayes, K. R., Marsh, K. J., & Lacey, E. A. (2017). Complex relationships among

environmental conditions and bill morphology in a generalist songbird. *Evolutionary*

Ecology, *31*, 707-724.

Langfelder, P., & Horvath, S. (2008). WGCNA: an R package for weighted correlation network

analysis. *BMC Bioinformatics*, *9*(1), 1-13.

Lindström, J. (1999). Early development and fitness in birds and mammals. *Trends in Ecology*

and Evolution, *14*(9), 343-348.

Lochmiller, R. L., & Deerenberg, C. (2000). Trade-offs in evolutionary immunology: just what is

the cost of immunity? *Oikos*, *88*(1), 87-98.

Love, M. I., Huber, W., & Anders, S. (2014). Moderated estimation of fold change and

dispersion for RNA-seq data with DESeq2. *Genome Biology*, *15*(12), 1-21.

Lundregan, S. L., Hagen, I. J., Gohli, J., Niskanen, A. K., Kemppainen, P., Ringsby, T. H., ... &

Jensen, H. (2018). Inferences of genetic architecture of bill morphology in house sparrow

using a high-density SNP array point to a polygenic basis. *Molecular Ecology*, *27*(17),

3498-3514.

Lynton-Jenkins, J. G., Russell, A. F., Chaves, J., & Bonneaud, C. (2021). Avian disease

surveillance on the island of San Cristóbal, Galápagos. *Ecology and Evolution*, *11*(24),

18422-18433.

McNew, S. M., & Clayton, D. H. (2018). Alien invasion: biology of *Philornis* flies highlighting

Philornis downsi, an introduced parasite of Galápagos birds. *Annual Review of*

Entomology, *63*, 369-387.

McNew, S. M., Knutie, S. A., Goodman, G. B., Theodosopoulos, A., Saulsberry, A., Yépez R, J.,

... & Clayton, D. H. (2019). Annual environmental variation influences host tolerance to

parasites. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B*, *286*(1897), 20190049

McNew, S. M., Loyola, D. C., Yepez, J., Andreadis, C., Gotanda, K., Saulsberry, A., & Fessl, B.

(2022). Transcriptomic responses of Galápagos finches to avian poxvirus infection.

Molecular Ecology, *31*(21), 5552-5567.

Medzhitov, R., Schneider, D. S., & Soares, M. P. (2012). Disease tolerance as a defense strategy.

Science, *335*(6071), 936-941.

Miller, M. R., White, A., & Boots, M. (2006). The evolution of parasites in response to tolerance

in their hosts: the good, the bad, and apparent commensalism. *Evolution*, *60*(5), 945-956.

Nam, K., Mugal, C., Nabholz, B., Schielzeth, H., Wolf, J. B., Backström, N., ... & Ellegren, H.

(2010). Molecular evolution of genes in avian genomes. *Genome Biology*, *11*(6), 1-17.

Nwaogu, C. J., Amar, A., Nebel, C., Isaksson, C., Hegemann, A., & Sumasgutner, P. (2023).

Innate immune function and antioxidant capacity of nestlings of an African raptor covary

with the level of urbanisation around breeding territories. *Journal of Animal Ecology*,

92(1), 124-141.

O'Connor, J. A., Sulloway, F. J., Robertson, J., & Kleindorfer, S. (2010). Philornis downsi

parasitism is the primary cause of nestling mortality in the critically endangered Darwin's

medium tree finch (*Camarhynchus pauper*). *Biodiversity and Conservation*, *19*(3), 853-

866.

O'Connor, J. A., Robertson, J., & Kleindorfer, S. (2014). Darwin's finch begging intensity does

not honestly signal need in parasitised nests. *Ethology*, *120*(3), 228-237.

Ohmer, M. E., Costantini, D., Czirják, G. Á., Downs, C. J., Ferguson, L. V., Flies, A., ... &

Cramp, R. L. (2021). Applied ecoimmunology: using immunological tools to improve

conservation efforts in a changing world. *Conservation Physiology*, *9*(1), coab074.

Owen, J. P., Nelson, A. C., & Clayton, D. H. (2010). Ecological immunology of bird-

ectoparasite systems. *Trends in Parasitology*, *26*(11), 530-539.

Palm, N. W., & Medzhitov, R. (2007). Not so fast: adaptive suppression of innate immunity.

Nature Medicine, *13*(10), 1142-1144.

Peig, J., & Green, A. J. (2009). New perspectives for estimating body condition from

mass/length data: the scaled mass index as an alternative method. *Oikos*, *118*(12), 1883-

1891.

Phillips, R. B., Wiedenfeld, D. A., & Snell, H. L. (2012). Current status of alien vertebrates in

the Galápagos Islands: invasion history, distribution, and potential impacts. *Biological*

Invasions, *14*, 461-480.

Råberg, L., Sim, D., & Read, A. F. (2007). Disentangling genetic variation for resistance and

tolerance to infectious diseases in animals. *Science*, *318*(5851), 812-814.

Read, A. F., Graham, A. L., & Råberg, L. (2008). Animal defenses against infectious agents: is

damage control more important than pathogen control. *PLoS Biology*, *6*(12), e1000004.

Reimand, J., Kull, M., Peterson, H., Hansen, J., & Vilo, J. (2007). g: Profiler—a web-based

toolset for functional profiling of gene lists from large-scale experiments. *Nucleic acids*

Research, *35*, W193-W200.

Schluter, D., & Gustafsson, L. (1993). Maternal inheritance of condition and clutch size in the

collared flycatcher. *Evolution*, *47*(2), 658-667.

Schroeder, A., Mueller, O., Stocker, S., Salowsky, R., Leiber, M., Gassmann, M., ... & Ragg, T.

875   (2006). The RIN: an RNA integrity number for assigning integrity values to RNA

876   measurements. *BMC Molecular Biology*, *7*(1), 1-14.

877   Shannon, P., Markiel, A., Ozier, O., Baliga, N. S., Wang, J. T., Ramage, D., Amin, N.,

878   Schwikowski, B., & Ideker, T. (2003). Cytoscape: a software environment for integrated

879   models of biomolecular interaction networks. *Genome Research*, *13*(11), 2498–2504.

880   Sheldon, B. C., & Verhulst, S. (1996). Ecological immunology: costly parasite defences and

881   trade-offs in evolutionary ecology. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution*, *11*(8), 317-321.

882   Slagsvold, T., Hansen, B. T., Johannessen, L. E., & Lifjeld, J. T. (2002). Mate choice and

883   imprinting in birds studied by cross-fostering in the wild. *Proceedings of the Royal*

884   *Society of London B: Biological Sciences*, *269*(1499), 1449-1455.

885   Soneson, C., Love, M. I., & Robinson, M. D. (2015). Differential analyses for RNA-seq:

886   transcript-level estimates improve gene-level inferences. *F1000Research*, *4*.

887   Sternberg, E. D., Lefèvre, T., Li, J., de Castillejo, C. L. F., Li, H., Hunter, M. D., & de Roode, J.

888   C. (2012). Food plant derived disease tolerance and resistance in a natural butterfly-plant-

889   parasite interactions. *Evolution*, *66*(11), 3367-3376.

890   Strandin, T., Babayan, S. A., & Forbes, K. M. (2018). Reviewing the effects of food provisioning

891   on wildlife immunity. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological*

892   *Sciences*, *373*(1745), 20170088.

893   Svensson, E., Råberg, L., Koch, C., & Hasselquist, D. (1998). Energetic stress,

894   immunosuppression and the costs of an antibody response. *Functional Ecology*, *12*(6),

895   912-919.

896   Szklarczyk, D., Gable, A. L., Lyon, D., Junge, A., Wyder, S., Huerta-Cepas, J., ... & Mering, C.

897   V. (2019). STRING v11: protein–protein association networks with increased coverage,

supporting functional discovery in genome-wide experimental datasets. *Nucleic acids*

research, *47*(D1), D607-D613.

Theodosopoulos, A. N., & Gotanda, K. M. (2018). Death of a Darwin's Finch: a consequence of

human-made debris?. *The Wilson Journal of Ornithology*, *130*(4), 1023-1028.

Tripet, F., & Richner, H. (1997). Host responses to ectoparasites: food compensation by parent

blue tits. *Oikos*, 557-561.

Van Riper III, C., Van Riper, S. G., Goff, M. L., & Laird, M. (1986). The epizootiology and

ecological significance of malaria in Hawaiian land birds. *Ecological Monographs*, *56*(4),

327-344.

Verrelli, B. C., Alberti, M., Des Roches, S., Harris, N. C., Hendry, A. P., Johnson, M. T., ... &

Ziter, C. (2022). A global horizon scan for urban evolutionary ecology. *Trends in*

Ecology and Evolution.

Walsh, S. J., & Mena, C. F. (2016). Interactions of social, terrestrial, and marine sub-systems in

the Galapagos Islands, Ecuador. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*,

113(51), 14536-14543.

Wang, Y., Chang, H., Rattner, A., & Nathans, J. (2016). Frizzled receptors in development and

disease. *Current Topics in Developmental Biology*, *117*, 113-139.

Watson, H., Videvall, E., Andersson, M. N., & Isaksson, C. (2017). Transcriptome analysis of a

wild bird reveals physiological responses to the urban environment. *Scientific Reports*,

7(1), 1-10.

Wickham, H. (2016). ggplot2: Elegant graphics for data analysis Springer Cham.

Wikelski, M., Foufopoulos, J., Vargas, H., & Snell, H. (2004). Galápagos birds and diseases:

invasive pathogens as threats for island species. *Ecology and Society*, *9*(1).

Xu, G., van Bruggen, R., Gualtieri, C. O., Moradin, N., Fois, A., Vallerand, D., ... & Gros, P.

(2020). Bisphosphoglycerate Mutase Deficiency Protects against Cerebral Malaria and

Severe Malaria-Induced Anemia. *Cell Reports*, *32*(12), 108170.

Zullo, K. M., Douglas, B., Maloney, N. M., Ji, Y., Wei, Y., Herbine, K., ... & Herbert, D. B. R.

(2021). LINGO3 regulates mucosal tissue regeneration and promotes TFF2 dependent

recovery from colitis. *Scandinavian Journal of Gastroenterology*, *56*(7), 791-805.

 Figure legends

Fig. 1. A) The influence of urbanization on mean (±SE) nest parasite abundance (number of

parasites per nest) and % fledging success. Fledging success did not differ for fumigated nests in

the urban and non-urban area. In sham-fumigated nests, urban nests had on average, fewer

parasites and higher fledging success compared to non-urban nests. Each point represents an

individual nest and darker points indicate higher sample sizes. Diamonds represent the fumigated

treatment and squares represent the sham-fumigated treatment. **B)** Parasite (pupal) volume (mm^3)

was larger in the urban area compared to the non-urban area. Each point represents a mean (±

SE) volume for a nest. **C)** Parasite volume decreased throughout the nesting season in both

locations. Means and standard error bars are represented in panels A and B.

Fig. 2. Effect of parasitism and urbanization on mean (±SE) blood loss (hemoglobin) in nestling

finches. Nestlings from sham-fumigated nests had lower hemoglobin levels than nestlings from

fumigated nests. Non-urban nestlings from sham-fumigated nests had lower hemoglobin levels

than nestlings from the other treatments and locations.

Fig. 3. A) Mean (±SE) $\delta^{15}N$ and $\delta^{13}C$ values of nestlings and flies in the urban and non-urban

area. Urban individuals were enriched with $\delta^{15}N$ compared to non-urban individuals. Overall,

flies were enriched with $\delta^{15}N$ compared to nestlings and nestlings were enriched with $\delta^{13}C$

compared to flies. **B)** Nest parasite abundance (number of parasites per nest) was correlated

negatively with $\delta^{15}N$ values. Each point represents an individual.

Fig. 4. *Immune system process* Gene Ontology enrichment analysis of sham-fumigated urban

(up-regulated) and non-urban (down-regulated) differentially expressed genes utilizing ClueGO.

A) Adaptive Immune Response functional categories shown in purple were partitioned into

seven sub-categories: B Cell, Ig Antibodies, Leukocyte, Receptor, Structure, T Cell and Other.

(B) Innate Immune Response categories, shown in red, were divided into four sub-categories:

Lymphocyte, Pattern Recognition, Pro-Inflammatory and Other. (C) Tolerance categories, shown

in orange, were split into two sub-categories: Erythrocyte and Hematopoietic. Log10 (*P*-value)

significance of unique and shared terms is depicted a color saturation gradient (** = *P*-value <

0.05), and number of genes supporting each ontology term is represented by circle size.

Fig. 5. *Immune system process* Gene Ontology enrichment network of co-expression module A

(top) and B (bottom). WGCNA trait correlation is depicted on a scale from 0 (white) to 1 (red),

and negative trait correlation significance from 0 (white) to -1 (blue). WGCNA *P*-values are

shown in parentheses. The co-expressed genes are represented with ClueGO in pathway form.

The significance of enriched Gene Ontology terms is represented by the gray gradient. The size

of the circle represents the number of genes associated with the enriched term.

Fig 1.

Fig. 2.

Fig. 3.

 Fig. 4.

(A) Adaptive Immune Response

(B) Innate Immune Response

(C) Tolerance

    Fig. 5