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 fumigated nestlings from urban and non-urban nests did not differ significantly. However, sham-fumigated, non-urban nestlings lost more blood and few nestlings survived compared to urban nestlings. Stable isotopic values (δ^{15}N) from urban nestling feces were higher than non-urban nestlings, suggesting that urban nestlings are consuming more protein. 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 sham-fumigated non-urban nestlings. In contrast, sham-fumigated 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 and 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 to the host without reducing parasite fitness (Medzhitov, Schneider, & Soares, 2012; Miller, White, & Boots, 2006; Råberg, Sim, & Read, 2007; Read, Graham, & Råberg, 2008). For example, parents from ectoparasite-infested nests reduce the cost of parasitism by feeding their offspring more than parents from fumigated nests (Christe, Richner, & Oppliger, 1996; Knutie et al., 2016; Tripet & Richner, 1997). Consequently, despite infestation, offspring do not suffer a high cost of parasitism because they are able to compensate for resources lost to the parasites. Alternatively, but not mutually exclusive, resistance, such as the immune response, minimizes the damage that parasites cause to the host by reducing parasite fitness (Read et al., 2008). The presence and effectiveness of host defenses to invasive parasites is highly variable among individuals and populations and can depend on how quickly they can evolve these responses or whether specific environmental factors are available to facilitate them (Feis et al. 2016, McNew et al. 2019).

Humans in urban environments can increase anthropogenic food availability and reliability for animals with the establishment of wild animal feeders or the incomplete 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 (Cornet, Bichet,

Larcombe, Faivre, & Sorci, 2014; Howick & Lazzaro, 2014; Lochmiller & Deerenberg, 2000;

Sheldon & Verhulst, 1996; Sternberg et al., 2012; Svensson, Råberg, Koch, & Hasselquist, 1998;

Knutie 2020). Extra nutrients obtained from human-derived food, such as protein, can directly

increase the production of immune cells (Coop & Kyriazakis, 2001; Strandin, Babayan, &

Forbes, 2018). Consequently, individuals with less effective defenses but better access to

resources might be better equipped to resist the negative effects of parasites. Alternatively,

human-supplemented food may be of lower nutritional quality, which could decrease the hosts'

health (Catto et al. 2021) and therefore their ability to produce an effective immune response to

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

population size can decrease or even go extinct, and this effect might be especially apparent in

the context of human-influenced environments (van Riper III and van Riper 1986, Atkinson and

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 and Wachter 2011, Zhou et al. 2015,

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). The Galápagos Islands of Ecuador are relatively pristine but face an increasing rate

of change 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 and Mena 2016). The

introduction of novel parasites to the Galápagos is also relatively recent, such as the avian

vampire fly (*Philornis downsi*). The adult fly was first collected in the Galápagos in 1964

(Causton et al. 2006), but the first sign of parasitism in nests was in 1997 (Fessl and Tebbich

2002). Adult flies are non-parasitic but lay their eggs in the nests of birds. Once hatched, fly

larvae feed on the blood of nestling and brooding female birds (Fessl and Tebbich 2002, Koop et

al. 2013). This fly dramatically reduces nestling survival of endemic Darwin's finches, and in

some years, can cause up to 100% mortality of infested nestlings (Koop et al. 2013, O'Connor et

al. 2014). However, some endemic Galapagos species, such as the Galapagos mockingbird

(*Mimus parvulus*), are able to tolerate the effect of the fly because parents of parasitized nests

feed their nestlings more than parents of non-parasitized nests to compensate for energy lost to

the flies. Because urban areas offer more consistent food, though likely of lower quality, (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 (Jardin de las Opuntias) on San Cristóbal Island, Galápagos. We then quantified

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

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

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

conducted to determine whether nestling isotope values were reflected in the flies. 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. However,

because urban birds prefer human-processed 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 urban area 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 in urban areas may 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 of

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, sham-fumigated nestlings are expected

to have better health and survival as compared to non-urban, sham-fumigated 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 kilometers southeast of the urban area (-

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

the main trail and 0.15 km to each side. The non-urban site does 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 site to access the beach.

Small ground finches on San Cristóbal 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 and Gotanda 2018, Harvey et al. 2021). 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. Observations were made primarily through binoculars to minimize

nest disturbance. When adults were not at the nest, we used a small camera (Contour LLC),

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

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

were assigned to a control (hereon, sham-fumigated) or experimental (hereon, fumigated)

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 avian vampire flies from nests (Fessl et al. 2006, Koop et al. 2013a,b, Knutie et al. 2014,

Kleindorfer and 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 permethrin or water 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 permethrin

or water was applied by spraying (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 permethrin or water. While hatchlings were outside the nest during nest

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

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

nest, Julian hatch day was recorded, and a GPS coordinate was taken 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 weighboat 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 used 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). The second 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, according to manufacturer's protocol, before being placed in

a -20°C freezer while in the Galápagos (up to two months). The samples were then transported

on ice packs (20 h) to the University of Connecticut where they were stored for two months at -

80°C until extracted for RNA sequencing.

We 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 every two days 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

Within two days of all nestling birds either fledging or dying, the nest was collected and

placed in a sealed, gallon-sized plastic bag. 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. Once they eclosed, 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 parasite abundance and fledging success

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 flies?) and

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

Getis Ord-Gi statistic (Getis and Ord 1992), which determines spatial clusters with either high or

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

respectively.

RNA extractions, sequencing, and bioinformatics

Total RNA was extracted from 20 µL of peripheral whole blood using a modified Tri-

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

USA) protocol (Harvey and 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/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 (~site + treatment + site:treatment) compared urban and non-urban sites, and

sham-fumigated and fumigated 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)

(Bindea et al. 2009; Bindea et al. 2013; Shannon et al. 2003). Terms with a *P*-value < 0.1 were

considered significantly enriched.

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

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

normalized RNA-Seq counts. A soft-thresholding power of 6 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 of 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). For dependent variables

with continuous data, we used a Shapiro-Wilk test for normality then chose the appropriate

distribution for the analysis. Since 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 and 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 (Greenberg et al. 2012).

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

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

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

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

nest as a random effect. Age and Julian hatch day were included as covariates when they

contributed significantly ($P < 0.05$) to the model (age only: bill size; Julian hatch day only:

glucose; neither: scaled mass index, hemoglobin levels). LMMs were also used to determine the

effect of site and sample type (nestling feces vs. fly) on δ^{15}N, δ^{14}C, and C:N, with sample

replicate as a random effect.

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

abundance (Poisson distribution), the effect of location on Julian hatch day (Gamma

distribution), the effect of location and Julian hatch day on brood size (Gamma distribution), and

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

the effect of site, 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 site, treatment, and their interaction on fledging success with

Julian hatch day as a covariate.

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

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

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

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

349 **Results**

350 *Effect of parasite treatment and urbanization on parasite load*

351    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 sites (χ^2 =

1.85, $P = 0.17$). Furthermore, site, 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; site: $\chi^2 = 0.44$, $P = 0.51$; hatch day: $\chi^2 = 0.68$, $P = 0.41$; interaction: $\chi^2 = 1.12$, $P = 0.29$).

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; Table 1).

The experimental treatment of nests with permethrin was nearly 100% effective at

removing flies (Fig. 1A; Table 1); only one permethrin-treated urban nest had eight flies after the

treatment. Water-treated nests were naturally parasitized by 27.00 ($\pm$ 5.20) flies in the non-urban

area and 15.95 ($\pm$ 3.15) flies in the urban area (Fig. 1A; Table 1). 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 flies than urban nests (χ^2 = 54.49, P < 0.0001). Julian hatch day did not

significantly predict nest parasite abundance (χ^2 = 1.58, P = 0.21).

Parasite volume was larger in urban nests compared to non-urban nests (Fig. 1B; χ^2 =

5.85, P = 0.02; Table 1). Urban fly pupae were, on average, 26% larger than non-urban fly

pupae(urban: 100.30 $\pm$ 7.62 mm^3, non-urban: 81.61 $\pm$ 9.29 mm^3). This difference was not related

to competition among flies within the nest because parasite intensity was not related to parasite

size (χ^2 = 0.01, P = 0.97). Rather, the nest hatch day predicted parasite size, with earlier nests

having larger flies compared to later nests (Fig. 1C; χ^2 = 11.01, P < 0.001).

Effect of location and landmarks on nesting and parasite abundance

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 sham-fumigated nests within the

nesting hotspot, seven contained flies, 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.

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; $\chi^2 = 4.01$, $P = 0.045$). Site and the

interaction between site and treatment did not significantly affect body condition (site: $\chi^2 = 0.36$,

$P = 0.55$; interaction: $\chi^2 = 2.20$, $P = 0.14$). Treatment and site did not significantly affect bill

surface area (site: $\chi^2 = 0.13$, $P = 0.72$; treatment: $\chi^2 = 0.71$, $P = 0.40$). The interaction between

treatment and site 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 significantly differ. Most nestlings from non-urban, sham-fumigated nests died

before they could be measured; only 13 (of 44) non-urban nestlings from six sham-fumigated

nests survived to be measured.

Site 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 ($\chi^2 = 18.82$, $P < 0.0001$). Furthermore, the interaction between treatment and site

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 site 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 site affected fledging success ($\chi^2 = 8.28$, $P =$

0.004); survival of fumigated nestlings did not differ between sites but survival of sham-

fumigated nestlings was lower in non-urban areas, compared to urban areas (Table 1). 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 site 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 site 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, site or the interaction between sample type and site did not affect $\delta^{13}C$ (site:

$\chi^2 = 0.43$, $P = 0.51$; 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, site and the

interaction between sample type and site did not affect C:N (site: $\chi^2 = 2.04$, $P = 0.15$; interaction:

$\chi^2 = 0.74$, $P = 0.39$).

Sequencing, Quality Control, and Alignment

In total, 42 paired-end nestling libraries were constructed, including 11 urban sham-

fumigated, five non-urban sham-fumigated , 14 urban fumigated, and 12 non-urban sham-

fumigated nestlings (1 nestling per nest). Altogether, the paired-reads post-QC ranged between

15.86M and 42.16M 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 (fumigated and sham-fumigated), with an interaction, was conducted (File S1). A

total of 5,123 genes (*P-adj* < 0.1) were differentially expressed in sham-fumigated finches 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 finches, only two genes were up-regulated in the

urban site, bisphosphoglycerate mutase BPGM (+3.24 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.

When comparing sham-fumigated versus fumigated finches in the urban site, a total of

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

and 198 down-regulated. The vast majority of genes showed moderate-to-low 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, sham-fumigated versus fumigated finches in the non-urban site yielded

7,064 differentially expressed genes, 3,709 of which were up-regulated in sham-fumigated birds,

and 3,355 down-regulated. Again, the majority of genes exhibited moderate-to-low fold-change,

with only 314 displaying strong expression patterns. This included an assembly factor for spindle

microtubules ASPM (+6.34 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 site 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 urban sham-fumigated 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 NK T cell differentiation ($P < 0.05$). By comparison, non-urban

sham-fumigated nestlings yielded 21 significant adaptive immunity terms. Of those, ten 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 rest 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). Urban sham-fumigated nestlings were enriched for both type I interferon mediated signaling

($P < 0.03$) and toll-like receptor 9 signaling ($P < 0.05$). Among the non-urban nestlings, only

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

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

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 level, glucose level, alive, δ^{13}C,

δ^{15}N, C:N, days old, number of flies in nest, bill surface area and scaled mass) 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 δ^{13}C ($r = 0.32$, $P < 0.04$).

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 ($r = -0.55$, $P < 0.0002$), δ^{13}C ($r = -0.34$, $P < 0.03$) 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 between areas, which suggests that urbanization alone does not affect

fledging success. Urban nests had significantly fewer flies than non-urban nests, such that even

sham-fumigated 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 see

fewer negative fitness consequences, but these results are correlative. Gene expression analyses

revealed that resistance and tolerance mechanisms might underlie differences in parasite effects.

Parasitized urban nestlings differentially expressed genes within pathways associated with

tolerance and innate immunological resistance, compared to sham-fumigated non-urban

nestlings. In contrast, sham-fumigated non-urban nestlings differentially expressed genes within

pathways associated with adaptive immunological resistance. 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

because urban nests had 40% fewer flies 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). These studies provide evidence that urban living could confer an

advantage against parasitism. Our study further supports this idea, as shown by the heightened

innate immune response in urban nestlings, and also links this response with a decrease in

parasite abundance.

Most studies suggest that IFNs are largely involved in resistance to viruses (Fensterl &

Sen, 2009; Katze et al. 2002). 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 another parasite or pathogen (e.g., 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 may be able to resist parasites (Cornet, Bichet,

Larcombe, Faivre, & Sorci, 2014; Howick & Lazzaro, 2014; Lochmiller & Deerenberg, 2000;

Sheldon & Verhulst, 1996; Sternberg et al., 2012; Svensson, Råberg, Koch, & Hasselquist,

1998). 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 of 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 $\delta^{15}N$ values suggest a diet rich in protein, which could

include food items such as chicken and fish, found at outdoor restaurants in town. Higher $\delta^{15}N$

values also correlated with lower parasite intensities, which supports the idea that diet might

influence host defenses. For example, meat has higher protein concentrations than plants and

supplemented protein can increase the concentration of cellular immune cells (e.g., eosinophils,

globule leukocytes and mast cells) (reviewed in Coop and Kyriazakis, 2001). Although our

results suggest that urban finches are more physiologically resistant to the flies than non-urban

finches, another potential explanation is that nest material affects the survival of flies. For

example, urban Darwin's finches incorporate cigarette butts into their nests (Harvey et al. 2021),

which can affect parasite abundance in other systems (Suarez-Rodriguez et al. 2013). Future

studies could explore the idea that nest material could contribute to increased resistance in urban

finches.

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

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

low finch survival in response to vampire flies is likely related to exsanguination (i.e., high blood

loss) (Fessl et al. 2006). One explanation for increased tolerance is that urban nestlings have

effective blood recovery when sham-fumigated and thus tolerate parasitism. This hypothesis is

corroborated with our results that urban finches have more hemoglobin (oxygenated blood) when

sham-fumigated 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 sham-fumigated. Furthermore, nestlings that

survived had higher gene expression of blood cell production than nestlings that died, which was

observed across urban and non-urban sites. 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 and

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 ADA 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 flies is higher than non-urban

nestlings, some urban nests still failed. Therefore, not all urban finches have effective defenses

against avian vampire flies. Our urban field location is environmentally heterogeneous with nests

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

analysis did not find any distinct patterns for parasite abundance or fledging success related to

these landmarks. However, human food type, abundance, and reliability vary across these

locations and over time. Future research should consider how the heterogeneity in urban areas

may favor more phenotypic plasticity in effective defenses and/or hinder adaptations in the

population.

Heterogeneity across different urban areas could also impact finch-fly interactions on

other islands in the Galapagos. Due to logistical limitations, replication of sites was not possible

across islands. However, site replication would be helpful to understand whether context

dependency exists across different urban areas. The Galapagos Islands have two other major

towns, including Puerto Ayora of Santa Cruz Island with approximately 12,000 human residents

and Puerto Villamil of Isabela Island with approximately 2,000 human residents (Memoria

Estadística Galápagos 2017). Human population size often scales with anthropogenic features

(e.g., artificial light at night, density of restaurants, number of vehicles) in urban areas, which

can proportionally affect bird species (reviewed in Isaksson 2018). Thus, replicating our study in

towns on other islands in the Galapagos could provide insight into whether the scale of

urbanization impacts finch-fly interactions differently.

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 and 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; Klendorfer and Dudaniec 2016; Knutie et al.

2016, McNew and 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 may

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

evidence that an urban population of finches is relatively well-defended against avian vampire

flies. Indeed, additional studies of urban and non-urban populations across years are needed to

determine the magnitude of the urban effect, but preliminary data from other years (2022, 2023)

and populations (Puerto Chino, San Cristobal) suggests that this pattern is observed beyond our

study (SAK prelim. data). To be clear, we are not suggesting that the Galápagos Islands should

be urbanized to increase defense against flies. 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).

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: Supplemental files 1-3 and 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) 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.

Catto, S., Sumasgutner, P., Amar, A., Thomson, R. L., & Cunningham, S. J. (2021). Pulses of

anthropogenic food availability appear to benefit parents, but compromise nestling

growth in urban red-winged starlings. *Oecologia*, *197*(3), 565-576.

Causton, C. E., Peck, S. B., Sinclair, B. J., Roque-Albelo, L., Hodgson, C. J., & Landry, B.

(2006). Alien insects: threats and implications for conservation of Galápagos Islands.

Annals of the Entomological Society of America, *99*(1), 121-143.

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

erythrocytes: studies in erythroid cell lines and transgenic mice. In *Blood* (Vol. 84, Issue

7, pp. 2346–2353). https://doi.org/10.1182/blood.v84.7.2346.bloodjournal8472346

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.

Feis, M. E., Goedknegt, M. A., Thieltges, D. W., Buschbaum, C., & Wegner, K. M. (2016).

Biological invasions and host–parasite coevolution: different coevolutionary trajectories

along separate parasite invasion fronts. *Zoology*, *119*(4), 366-374.

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., & Tebbich, S. (2002). *Philornis downsi*–a recently discovered parasite on the

Galápagos archipelago–a threat for Darwin's finches? *Ibis*, *144*(3), 445-451.

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.

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.

Greenberg, R., Cadena, V., Danner, R. M., & Tattersall, G. (2012). Heat loss may explain bill

size differences between birds occupying different habitats. *PLoS One*, *7*(7), e40933.

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.

Isaksson, C. (2018). Impact of urbanization on birds. In: D.T. Tietze (Eds.), Bird Species: How

They Arise, Modify, and Vanish (pp. 235-257). Fascinating Life Sciences. Springer,

Cham.

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: D arwin'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.

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.

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.

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.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sciences, *373*(1745), 20170088.

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

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

912-919.

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

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 flies 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 flies 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) 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 flies 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:

939 Lymphocyte, Pattern Recognition, Pro-Inflammatory and Other. C) Tolerance categories, shown

940 in orange, were split into two sub-categories: Erythrocyte and Hematopoietic. Log10 (*P*-value)

941 significance of unique and shared terms is depicted a color saturation gradient (** = *P*-value <

942 0.05), and number of genes supporting each ontology term is represented by circle size.

943 **Fig. 5.** *Immune system process* Gene Ontology enrichment network of co-expression module A

944 (top) and B (bottom). WGCNA trait correlation is depicted on a scale from 0 (white) to 1 (red),

945 and negative trait correlation significance from 0 (white) to -1 (blue). WGCNA *P*-values are

946 shown in parentheses. The co-expressed genes are represented with ClueGO in pathway form.

947 The significance of enriched Gene Ontology terms is represented by the gray gradient. The size

948 of the circle represents the number of genes associated with the enriched term.

Table 1. Sample sizes for the effect of location (non-urban or urban) and parasite treatment (fumigated or sham-fumigated) on nest, parasite, and nestling variables.

Sample sizes	Non-urban		Urban	
	Fumigated	Sham-fumigated	Fumigated	Sham-fumigated
# nests in experiment	13	17	16	22
# nests with fledging age	12	2	14	11
Individual fly sample sizes: # flies (# nests)				
Pupal size	NA	90 (14)	NA	93 (13)
Adult fly stable isotope values	NA	11 (11)	NA	7 (7)
Individual nestling sample sizes: # nestlings (# nests)				
Scaled mass index	27 (12)	13 (6)	37 (15)	31 (12)
Bill surface area	27 (12)	13 (6)	37 (15)	31 (12)
Hemoglobin levels	10 (10)	6 (6)	18 (14)	11 (9)
Glucose levels	16 (12)	6 (4)	18 (12)	15 (9)
Stable isotope values	11 (11)	2 (2)	12 (11)	9 (8)
Gene expression	14 (14)	5 (5)	12 (12)	11 (11)
Fledging success				
# nests depredated/total # of nests	1/13 (8%)	2/17 (12%)	2/16 (13%)	3/22 (14%)
# nests with at least one fledgling /total # of nests	12/13 (92%)	2/17 (12%)	14/16 (88%)	11/22 (50%)
# fledglings/total # of hatchlings	27/36 (75%)	4/50 (8%)	34/43 (79%)	29/58 (50%)

954 **Fig 1.**

956 **Fig. 2.**

959   **Fig. 3.**

961   **Fig. 4.**

Fig. 5