Host-pathogen-vector continuum in a changing landscape: Drivers of

***Bartonella* prevalence and evidence of historic spillover in a tropical multi-**

host community

B.R. Ansil[1,2*], Ashwin Viswanathan[3], Vivek Ramachandran[1], H.M. Yeshwanth[1], Avirup

Sanyal[1,4], Uma Ramakrishnan[1,*]

[1] National Centre for Biological Sciences, Tata Institute of Fundamental Research, Bangalore,

Karnataka, India, 560065

[2] Manipal Academy of Higher Education, Manipal, Karnataka, India, 576104

[3] Nature Conservation Foundation, Mysore, Karnataka, India, 570017

[4] Trivedi School of Biosciences, Ashoka University, Sonipat, Haryana, 131029

* Corresponding author: ansilbr@ncbs.res.in, uramakri@ncbs.res.in

Keywords: Spillover, *Bartonella*, multi-host communities, vector-borne pathogens

Abstract

Our understanding of pathogen spillover is largely based on viral systems associated with

bats. Bacterial infections of zoonotic origin also pose a significant public health burden,

many of which are associated with small mammals like rodents that live abundantly among

humans. When ecologically different species of small mammals are brought in contact with

each other due to various factors, including habitat modification, there is potential for

bacterial spillover within the host community and subsequently to humans. Small mammals

and their ectoparasite communities present a unique system to investigate the eco-

epidemiology of multi-host pathogens, which can inform specific bacterial spillover

determinants and their interplay. In a rainforest-human-use mosaic, we applied ecological

and evolutionary analysis to investigate *Bartonella* spp. across small mammal and

ectoparasite communities.

We observed substantial overlap among small mammal communities in different habitat

types, predominantly driven by habitat generalists. Most ectoparasites were generalists,

infecting multiple hosts, and several host species displayed polyparasitism, i.e., they were

infected by multiple ectoparasites. We observed high *Bartonella* prevalence at both study

sites – a forest-plantation mosaic (47.4%) and a protected area (28.8%). Seven of the ten

ectoparasite morphotypes sampled were also positive for *Bartonella*, following the

prevalence trend in their hosts. A Generalised Linear Model (GLM) revealed an independent

association between aggregated ectoparasite load in species and *Bartonella* prevalence,

implicating ectoparasites in transmission. *Bartonella* lineages from small mammals were

host-specific, while ectoparasites showed no host-specific associations. They carried

Bartonella associated with other hosts, indicating the potential for cross-species

transmission. Phylogenetic ancestral trait reconstruction of *Bartonella* haplotypes suggests

historic spillover events in the small mammal community, validating the potential for

contemporary spillover. These results highlight infection risk from such underdiagnosed

agents in the landscape, and the necessity to disentangle complex multi-host multi-vector

systems to understand their epidemiological consequences.

1. Background

Large-scale modification of natural habitats is associated with biodiversity loss and ecosystem services [1]. Other unexpected consequences, such as an elevated risk of zoonotic infections, are poorly acknowledged and understood, especially in biodiverse tropical systems. Both theoretical and empirical studies demonstrate that land-use change and associated habitat perturbations can result in modified communities of zoonotic hosts as a result of animals moving across habitat boundaries [2,3]. As a consequence, there is potential for pathogen spillover between animals did not previously co-occur, i.e. from reservoir hosts to incidental hosts, directly or indirectly through intermediate hosts and vectors [4,5].

Spillover between wildlife can lead to the emergence of several zoonoses [4], and has been implicated in several past epidemics, including SARS-CoV-1 [6]. Pathogen sharing between animal host communities can lead to the recombination and evolution of new variants with altered host ranges, vector specificities, and pathogenic potential [7]. A spillover event, however, is a complex and non-frequent process with numerous ecological and evolutionary filters that vary in space and time, including the distribution of reservoir hosts, pathogen prevalence, and infection intensity [8]. For example, a high density of reservoir hosts elevates direct interactions, leading to density-dependent transmission among the reservoir population and to the other susceptible members of the community [9]. Additionally, in the case of vector-borne pathogens, ectoparasites also respond to host densities and influence pathogen prevalence in reservoirs and incidental hosts [10].

Bats and small mammals (rodents and shrews) are the best-known reservoir taxa for

zoonotic pathogens [11]. Small mammals, however, carry especially high numbers of

pathogens [12,13] because they are disproportionately diverse within mammalian

communities [14], even more so than bats. Small mammals also differ from bats in that they

often increase (rather than decrease) in abundance in a modified landscape, resulting in the

elevated prevalence and transmission risk of associated zoonoses in the landscape [15,16].

Small mammal densities are known to locally increase, for example, when large herbivore

densities decrease [17], leading in turn to an increase in pathogen prevalence [18]. In

addition, small mammals with generalist natural histories (often reservoirs) tend to move

across habitat boundaries where they interact with incidental hosts [4,19], thereby moving

pathogens across these boundaries. We expect such processes to be especially prevalent in

tropical regions, as they harbour some of the richest small mammal communities [20], the

highest rates of habitat modification [21,22], and therefore the highest predicted risk of

zoonotic infections [23,24].

To understand the zoonotic consequence of small mammals and their ectoparasites in

changing landscapes, we must first understand how their communities are structured and

how they have responded (and continue to respond) to land-use change and habitat

modification. In this study, we characterize differences in host community structure,

ectoparasite community structure, and pathogen prevalence in a human-dominated

rainforest-plantation landscape in South India, part of the Western Ghats biodiversity

hotspot. We used *Bartonella*, a generalist zoonotic bacterial pathogen, as a model system to

understand variation in prevalence and transmission dynamics in the landscape. We

sampled small mammal communities and their ectoparasites in a forest-plantation mosaic

and a relatively undisturbed protected area in the landscape to address the following

questions – i) How are small mammal communities structured in a forest-plantation mosaic

and relatively less disturbed protected area? ii) Is there any difference in *Bartonella*

prevalence between these two communities? iii) What are the main drivers of *Bartonella*

prevalence and transmission in the landscape? (iv) and finally, do we find evidence for

spillover, detected as shared *Bartonella* haplotypes between members of these

communities? We began with the expectation that the forest-plantation mosaic would have

higher small mammal densities and *Bartonella* prevalence than the protected area [9,15].

We also expected that *Bartonella* haplotypes would be specific to host species [25] while

limited spillover (vector-mediated spillover) among hosts that occupy the same habitats

[26].

2. Methods

(a) Field sampling

We carried out this study in two sites in the central Western Ghats: i) Kadamane, a mixed-

use, forest-plantation mosaic in the Karnataka state in India and ii) Kudremukh National

Park, a relatively less disturbed protected area in the same state **(Figure 1)**. We sampled

small mammals (rodents and shrews) from different land-use types in Kadamane and

Kudremukh between 2016 and 2021. Kadamane was sampled three times during this period

(2016, 2017 and 2018) and Kudremukh was sampled once in 2021. In Kadamane, we

sampled in forest fragments, grasslands, tea plantations, abandoned plantations (cardamon

and coffee) and human habitation. In Kudremukh, we sampled forests, grasslands, and

human habitation (a partially occupied township adjacent to Kudremukh National Park). In

both sites, sampling was conducted during dry months between January- April.

We used medium-sized Sherman traps in a grid framework to capture small mammals. A

trapping grid consisted of 10 trapping lines, each line consisting of 10 traps separated by 10

metres, covering one hectare in total. An additional 20 traps were placed on trees to

capture arboreal species in forests and abandoned plantations. Trapping efforts were

proportionately divided based on the area occupied by each land-use type. Each grid was

sampled for four consecutive days during each trapping session. All traps were baited using

peanut butter and locally available seeds. Traps were checked twice a day (morning and

evening) for captured individuals. Captured individuals were anesthetised using Isoflurane

for collecting measurements and samples. Small mammal species were first identified in

field with the help of taxonomic keys and field guides [27–29]. In addition, ear clippings

were collected to confirm species identification through molecular methods. We collected

dried blood spots from every captured individual in 2018 and 2021 to screen for pathogens.

To detect and collect ectoparasites, captured individuals were combed on a white paper for

2-3 minutes. All individuals were marked and released at the site of capture after sample

collection (except in 2018; individuals were sacrificed for harvesting organs to screen for

various pathogens).

Figure 1: Map of the study area. A) India with Western Ghats and the Karnataka state

boundary marked. (B) Land-use map of Kadamane forest-plantation mosaic with sampling

locations marked. (C) Land-use map of Kudremukh National Park with sampling locations

marked.

(b) Small mammal community

DNA was extracted from ear clippings using DNeasy Blood & Tissue Kit (Qiagen), following

which 1140 bp of Cytochrome b (Cytb) gene was amplified and sequenced [30]. Maximum

likelihood phylogenetic trees were constructed to identify cryptic *Mus* species and validate

morphological species identification. All the other species were identified morphologically

and validated using BLAST (blast.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov) similarity scores of Cytb sequences.

Based on species identification, we created a species abundance matrix for each land-use

type, followed by a distance matrix using the Morisita-Horn index, a standard beta diversity

measure to calculate dissimilarity [31]. The beta diversity index was plotted following

hierarchical clustering to visualise the dissimilarly between small mammal communities in

different land-use types and sampling grids. We also calculated the relative abundance of

each small mammal species in each land-use type to understand species-habitat

associations. The community ecology package Vegan [32] in R was used for this analysis.

We used a Capture-Mark-Recapture approach [33] to estimate densities of the four most

common small mammals by creating individual capture histories in forest and grassland.

Since abandoned plantations and forests had similar vegetation structure and small

mammal communities, we grouped them under 'forests' for this analysis (to obtain

adequate sample size). We assumed a closed population with varying capture probability to

estimate population size following a customised log-linear model [34]. Density (number of

individuals per hectare) for each species was estimated after accounting for the number of

grids sampled in each habitat. We used R package *Rcapture* for this analysis [34].

(c) Ectoparasite community

Ectoparasites were brought back to the laboratory in 100% ethanol. Mites, ticks, and fleas

were segregated using a stereo-zoom microscope. We identified ticks and fleas to the genus

level under a high-resolution microscope with the help of taxonomic keys and monographs

[35–37]. Mites were mounted on a slide for observation under the microscope and

identified through descriptions in a monograph [38]. We serially named and counted

individual ectoparasites that belonged to the same morphotypes (potentially species).

We constructed a distance matrix based on ectoparasite abundance per individual small

mammal species [39]. We used this matrix for a Principal Coordinate Analysis (PCoA) in R

[40], and plotted the clustering using ggplot2 [41] to understand overlap in ectoparasite

communities between small mammal species (the first two PCoA axes). We also estimated

ectoparasite density, or the mean number of each morphotype per host species in forests

(including abandoned plantations), grasslands, and built-up areas. The infestation rate, i.e.,

frequency of ectoparasite (mites, ticks, and fleas) occurrence in each host species and

habitat, was recorded as aggregated ectoparasite load.

(d) *Bartonella* screening and prevalence estimation

To detect *Bartonella* in small mammals, DNA was extracted using QIAamp DNA Mini Kit

(Qiagen) from the dried blood spots (DBS) collected in 2018 (Kadamane) and 2021

(Kudremukh), and screened for *Bartonella* specific *rpoB* gene (825 bp) using conventional

PCR [42]. *Bartonella* prevalence in the Kadamane samples was reported previously [43].

To detect *Bartonella* in ectoparasites, ectoparasite were pooled, mechanically

homogenised, and DNA was extracted using DNeasy Blood & Tissue Kit (Qiagen). A pool

contained 1-10 individual ectoparasites (mean = 3.06) belonging to same morphotype

collected from the same individual small mammal. We used PCR reagents as follows- 25 µl

reaction mixture composed of 6 µl of template DNA, 12.5 µl of 1X HotStarTaq Master Mix

(Qiagen), 1 µl each of 5 µM primers and 4.5 µl of nuclease-free water. PCR products were

visualized on a 1.5% agarose gel stained with GelRed Nucleic Acid Gel Stain (Biotium Inc)

with reference to negative and positive controls set along the test samples. Positive samples

were purified using AMPure XP magnetic beads (Beckman Coulter) and sequenced.

Sequences were verified for *Bartonella* after comparing with the reference database (NCBI)

using BLAST [44]. All *Bartonella* sequences generated in this study have been deposited in

GenBank under accession number OR574780-OR574826.

Prevalence was calculated as the proportion of positive individuals against the number of

individuals tested. Small mammal species with low sample sizes were grouped as 'others' in

the prevalence calculation. While calculating the overall prevalence, we included two forest

grids from Kudremukh twice (randomly selected) to compensate for additional trapping

effort in Kadamane (abandoned plantations) and make it comparable to Kudremukh. We

calculated 95% confidence intervals (Wilson interval) associated with the prevalence using

the R package *Hmisc* [45]. Prevalence in ectoparasite pools was represented as the

proportion of positive pools among the total number of ectoparasite pools tested.

(e) Ecological correlates of *Bartonella* prevalence

We used a Generalized Linear Model (GLM) to understand drivers of *Bartonella* prevalence

among small mammals in the landscape. We modelled prevalence as the incidence of

Bartonella (presence/absence) in each individual small mammal as a function of the

sampling site, aggregated ectoparasite load (the proportion of all individuals of the species

with any ectoparasite presence - mites, ticks, and fleas - within the relevant habitat-site

combination), and the density of the small mammal species itself. We assumed a binomial

error distribution as our response consisted of 0s and 1s. We restricted this analysis to the

10 species-habitat-site combinations that contained data from more than three individuals

of the species, together comprising 196 individuals of five species. We also examined host

species identity and habitat type as covariates but dropped them because the models did

not converge. The covariate 'aggregated ectoparasite load' is the frequency of ectoparasite

occurrence in each species and habitat, and is not ectoparasite density per individual small

mammal. We considered this a more reliable measure than raw ectoparasite densities since

it is possible to occasionally encounter individuals with heavy infestation in the community

and this might potentially influence our inference.

(f) Phylogenetic analysis

We generated a consensus of forward and reverse sequences for the partial *rpoB* sequence.

These sequences were aligned with known *Bartonella* species sequences from the NCBI

database, and sequences reported in Ansil et al 2021 (accession number MT787671-

MT787733) [43]. A 773 bp alignment was created using MUSCLE in MEGA 7.0.26 [46].

Sequences generated from the ectoparasites were also included in this alignment.

Alignment was codon-optimized and tested for the appropriate nucleotide substitution

models using PartitionFinder 2.1.1 [47]. We performed a Bayesian phylogenetic analysis

using this alignment in BEAST 1.8.4 [48]. The phylogeny was run for 10^8 Markov Chain

Monte Carlo (MCMC) cycles. Effective sample sizes (ESS) and parameter convergence of

MCMC sampling were assessed using Tracer 1.6.0 [49]. The resulting trees were summarised

into a consensus tree after 25% burnin, and were visualized and annotated using FigTree

1.4.4 [50]. Internal nodes of the tree are marked and coloured based on the Posterior

Probability (PP).

(g) Host-*Bartonella* association

We also constructed a tanglegram using sequence data from the hosts (Cytb) and *Bartonella*

(*rpoB*) in TREEMAP [51] to understand host- *Bartonella* haplotype association. We visually

analysed the resulting co-phylogeny for potential host switching (spillover) events.

A separate alignment was constructed using unique *Bartonella* haplotypes and considered

for a Bayesian phylogenetic ancestral trait reconstruction. We restricted this analysis to

unique haplotypes recovered from each host species. We included one additional sequence

from *Mus cf. fernandoni* to avoid over-representation and subsequent biases from *Rattus*

satarae sequences. We used six identified host states as traits to estimate host probabilities

for all ancestral nodes in BEAST 1.8.4 [48]. The resultant phylogeny was summarised and

annotated as described before.

3. Results

(a) Small mammal community assembly

We recorded 11 small mammal species, of which nine were rodents, and two were shrews

(Table S1). The rodent species were *Rattus satarae*, *Rattus rattus*, *Mus cf. fernandoni*, *Mus*

cf. famulus, *Mus cf. terricolor*, *Golunda ellioti*, *Vandeleuria nilagirica*, *Platacanthomys*

lasiurus, and *Funambulus tristriatus*. The two shrew species were *Suncus niger* and

Crocidura horsfieldii. The three *Mus* species were morphologically similar and could only be

differentiated using their phylogenetic clustering **(Figure S1)**. The average genetic distances

(p distances) for *M. cf. fernandoni*, *M. cf. famulus*, and *M. cf. terricolor* from their respective

parent species, for example *M. cf. fernandoni* vs *M. fernandoni*, were 0.05, 0.07 and 0.09,

respectively.

Among the land-use types sampled, five species of small mammals were observed in forests

in Kadamane, and grasslands in Kadamane and Kudremukh. Three species were observed in

forests in Kudremukh and in built-up habitats at both sites. Tea plantations were the most

species-poor land-use type, with only one species (*M. cf. famulus*) captured once in 2016.

Based on the hierarchical clustering of beta diversity, forests (FR16, FR17, FR18 and FR21)

and abandoned plantations (AP16, AP17 and AP18) showed similar community assemblages

with minimal dissimilarity (<20%); the forest community from Kudremukh (FR21) was also a

part of this cluster **(Figure 2A)**. The grassland cluster altogether showed 40% dissimilarity

with the forest-abandoned plantation cluster while maintaining moderate dissimilarity

(<20%) between years (GL16, GL17, GL18) and sites (GL21). Built-up habitats were the most

dissimilar (60%) to other land-use types, although they retained two species (*S. niger* and *M.*

cf. famulus) detected in the other land-use types. We were able to estimate densities for

four (of eleven) common small mammal species (*Rattus satarae*, *M. cf. fernandoni*, *M. cf.*

famulus and *M. cf. terricolor*). These densities are reported in Supplementary results and in

Figure S2.

Figure 2: Community structure of small mammals and their ectoparasites. A) Community dissimilarity based on beta diversity and relative abundance. Left: a dendrogram showing dissimilarity index between land-use types during different sampling years. Abbreviations; FR- Forest, GL-Grassland, AP-Abandoned plantations, TP-Tea plantations, and BT-Built-ups. Right: Relative abundance of different species captured in different land-use types. B) Principal Coordinate (PCoA) plot showing ectoparasite community structure across different small mammals and habitats.

(c) Ectoparasite assemblage

Ten ectoparasite species were recorded from the small mammal community; two species of mites belonging to the genus *Laelaps*, three species of ticks belonging to the genus *Rhipicephalus*, *Ixodes* and *Haemaphysalis* and five species of fleas belonging to the genus *Xenopsylla* **(Table S2)**. Since more than one species was detected under *Laelaps*

(mites) and *Xenopsylla* (fleas), these morphotypes were named serially *(e.g. Xenopsylla sp 1,*

Xenopsylla sp 2 and so on). Only one morphotype each was identified from three tick

genera. Interestingly, six ectoparasites species (60%) were detected in multiple hosts

(generalists) and six of eight small mammals sampled (75%) were polyparasitic (infested

with two or more ectoparasite species).

Our principal coordinate analysis (PCoA) revealed significant overlap and variation in

ectoparasite communities hosted by small mammals (**Figure 2B**). *R. satarae* showed

significant variation in ectoparasite community along the PCoA axis 1 and 2 (13.67 % and

10.68 % explained, respectively), while *M. cf.* fernandoni predominantly displayed identical

ectoparasite community. However, Individuals from *R. rattus*, *F. tristriatus*, *M. cf.*

fernandoni, *M. cf. terricolor*, and *S. niger* also had similar ectoparasite communities to *R.*

satarae. We also estimated the mean density of each ectoparasite morphotype recovered

from each small mammal species per habitat and this is presented in Supplementary results

and in **Figure S2**.

(d) *Bartonella* prevalence in small mammals

We detected *Bartonella* in five species of small mammals in the community: *R. satarae*, *R.*

rattus, *M. cf. fernandoni*, *M. cf. famulus,* and *S. niger* (**Table 1**) with varying prevalence (0-

75.8%). In both sites, *R. satarae* showed high prevalence (75.8% in Kadamane and 72% in

Kudremukh). *M. cf. fernandoni* showed 54.5% (n=22) in Kadamane and 40% (n=5) in

Kudremukh. One individual of *M. cf. famulus* was positive in Kadamane (3.8%, n=26), while

Kudremukh individuals were negative (n=3). We did not observe any significant site level

difference in prevalence for common species (*R. satarae* and *M. cf. fernandoni*) and overall

community **(Figure 3A)**. Other species, such as *R. rattus* and *S. niger* had low prevalence, but

also low sample sizes, hence we have minimal confidence in their prevalence estimates.

Interestingly, despite sufficient sample size, all the *M. cf. terricolor* were negative for

Bartonella. Pooled ectoparasite positivity was largely correlated with prevalence in small

mammals, albeit was slightly lower in every case. Positivity in specific ectoparasite

morphotypes are provided in **Table S3.**

Table 1: Prevalence of *Bartonella* in small mammal blood and ectoparasites collected from

Kadamane and Kudremukh. Positivity reported here for ectoparasites is not true prevalence

since individual ectoparasites are pooled for screening.

	Bartonella prevalence; number of positives / number of samples tested (%)			
	Dried blood spot (DBS)		Pooled ectoparasites	
	Kadamane	Kudremukh	Kadamane	Kudremukh
Rattus satarae	50/66 (75.8)	18/25 (72)	24/71 (33.8)	6/24 (25)
Rattus rattus	0/10 (0)	1/4 (25)	-	0/3 (0)
Mus cf. fernandoni	12/22 (54.5)	2/5 (40)	9/29 (31)	0/6 (0)
Mus cf. famulus	1/26 (3.8)	0/3 (0)	0/1 (0)	-
Mus cf. terricolor	0/6 (0)	0/37 (0)	-	0/7 (0)
Platacanthomys lasiurus	-	0/1 (0)	-	0/1 (0)
Funambulus tristriatus	-	0/1 (0)	0/2 (0)	0/2 (0)
Suncus niger	0/2 (0)	2/4 (50)	0/1 (0)	1/2 (50)
Total	63/132 (47.4)	23/80 (28.8)	33/102 (32.4)	7/45 (15.6)

Figure 3: (A) *Bartonella* prevalence in small mammal hosts in Kadamane and Kudremukh. 'Other hosts' include small mammal species showed low *Bartonella* positivity and had low sample sizes. (B) *Bartonella* prevalence positively correlated with aggregated ectoparasite densities within a species at each habitat site. The trend line indicates predicted *Bartonella* prevalence with respect to aggregated ectoparasite load. The shaded area represents the confidence intervals of the predicted prevalence estimate.

(e) Factors affecting *Bartonella* prevalence

Bartonella prevalence within a population was proportional to aggregated ectoparasite load within a species at each habitat site (mites, ticks, and fleas; GLM, $p<0.05$**, Figure 3B**). Surprisingly, host densities and sampling locations were poorly correlated with *Bartonella* prevalence (**Table 2**). A second GLM with host species identity and habitat type as additional covariates did not converge; hence we tested these variables separately and found them not significant.

352 **Table 2:** Results of Generalised Linear Model (GLM) examining drivers of *Bartonella*

353 prevalence. Significant variables are marked with (*)

	Estimate	Std. Error	Z value	Pr(>|z|)
Intercept	-1.633595	1.05266	-1.554	0.120
Host density	-0.07574	0.06711	-1.129	0.259
Site	-0.47880	0.72288	-0.662	0.508
Aggregated ectoparasite load	5.10933*	0.96562	5.291	1.21e-07 **

(f) Phylogenetic analysis

Phylogenetic analysis (*rpoB*) revealed eight distinct *Bartonella* lineages (BL1-BL8) from small

mammals and ectoparasites. We found that five lineages among them (BL1-BL5) were

phylogenetically related to known zoonotic *Bartonella* species (**Figure 4A**). We observed

three lineages in *R. satarae* (BL1, BL6 and BL7) and two lineages in *M. cf. fernandoni* (BL4

and BL8). BL1 included *Bartonella* sequences from *R. satarae* and ectoparasites (*Laelaps sp*

1, Rhipicephalus sp, Ixodes sp, Xenopsylla sp 1, and Xenopsylla sp 5). Interestingly,

sequences from *Laelaps sp 1* and *Xenopsylla sp 5* in this lineage were not collected from *R.*

satarae but *M. cf. fernandoni* and *S. niger* respectively. BL2 consisted of a single sequence

collected from *R. rattus*, and closely related to BL1. These two lineages were

phylogenetically related to *B. queenslandensis*. BL3 consisted of two sequences, one from *S.*

niger and the other from *Laelaps sp 1* collected from *M. cf. fernandoni*. This lineage was

related to *B. tribocorum*. BL4 consisted of *Bartonella* sequences from *M. cf. fernandoni*, *M.*

cf. famulus, and ectoparasites (*Laelaps sp 1, Rhipicephalus sp, Ixodes sp, Haemaphysalis sp,*

and Xenopsylla sp 3). In this lineage, the *Haemaphysalis sp* was recovered from *R. satarae*

and not from any of the *Mus* species. BL5 was a single sequence from *F. tristriatus* (reported

in Ansil et al. 2021, accession number- MT787671), forming a sister lineage to BL4. We

included this sequence in our analysis since it was collected during our study in Kadamane.

The remaining lineages (BL6-BL8) were related to non-pathogenic *Bartonella* species. BL6

comprised sequences from *R. satarae* (second lineage from *R. satarae*) and *Ixodes sp*

recovered from them. This lineage was related to *B. phoceensis*. BL7 and BL8 were two

distinct lineages from *R. satarae* (third lineage from *R. satarae*) and *M. cf. fernandoni*

(second lineage from *M. cf. fernandoni*), respectively. Both these lineages were

phylogenetically related to *B. thailandensis*.

(g) Host-*Bartonella* association and historic spillover

The co-phylogeny of small mammals and *Bartonella* predominantly displayed host-specific

lineages **(Figure S4)**. However, one *Bartonella* lineage from *M. cf. fernandoni* was observed

to be phylogenetically related to *Bartonella* sequences from *R. satarae*. Our phylogenetic

ancestral trait reconstruction revealed a high probability (0.87) of *R. satarae* being the host

state of the common ancestor of these lineages **(Figure 4B)**, suggesting a potential past

spillover event. Similarly, we also observed a moderately high probability (0.73) of *R.*

satarae being the host state for the *Bartonella* sequence from *R. rattus* and the remote

common ancestor (0.8) of the *Bartonella* community level phylogeny. We found no

evidence for contemporary *Bartonella* spillover or sharing between small mammal hosts.

Figure 4: A) Bayesian phylogenetic inference of *Bartonella* based on 773 bp of *rpoB*

sequences. Nodes are coloured based on posterior probability, and monophyletic clades are

collapsed for easy visualization. B) Bayesian phylogenetic inference showing ancestral host

state of different *Bartonella* haplotypes. Each colour represents a specific host, and the

number at the common ancestor nodes indicates the probability for the corresponding host

state.

4. Discussion

We characterized small mammal communities, their ectoparasites, and their links with *Bartonella* at two contrasting sites in the Western Ghats. We demonstrated that different small mammal host species and ectoparasites, with specific *Bartonella* lineages, often co-occur. We also show that ectoparasites can be vectors for multiple *Bartonella* lineages, as the *Bartonella* prevalence in the community was driven by aggregated ectoparasite load in small mammals. Additionally, we present evidence of a historic *Bartonella* spillover event between two abundant hosts in the community and substantiate the potential for *Bartonella* sharing between hosts, possibly through their ectoparasites.

(a) Host communities are largely similar across land-use types

Our results revealed a substantial similarity in host communities between different land-use types. This similarity was predominantly driven by a few species that occur in multiple land-use types within the landscape in varying densities [52]. Species such as *M. cf. famulus* and *S. niger* were recorded in multiple land-use types (forests, grassland, and built-up), indicating their potential for being habitat generalists [53] hence driving similarities between communities. Such generalist invasions are observed in many tropical communities [54,55]. For example, *M. musculus*, a common small mammal that inhabits human habitation, has been observed to colonize forest fragments next to plantations in the southern Western Ghats [56]. Such colonization is potentially due to high densities of the colonizing species [57], possibly because of favourable eco-climatic variables (e.g. lack of competition) in native habitats [58] and habitat edges, leading to further homogenised species assemblages [59].

Surprisingly, small mammal communities in forests (protected area and forest-plantation

mosaics) showed no significant difference. Similarly, forests and abandoned plantations in

Kadamane also had similar community, dominated by *R. satarae*, an endemic small

mammal, and known *Bartonella* host. [43]. Because of their community similarity, we

treated these two habitats as the same, and were able to use small mammal density

estimates to better understand prevalence. Other species in forests/abandoned plantations

(e.g. *M. cf. fernandoni*) exhibited lower densities, potentially due to the over-dominance

of *R. satarae* in these land-use types. Comparable trends in small mammal abundance was

observed in human-use habitats [54,60], where species with generalist life history adapt

well to habitat changes and achieve high densities, while driving inferior competitors to

lower densities [61]. Such communities in tropical systems are also observed to have low

species diversity [54,61].

Despite species overlap in community, we observed significantly high densities of specific

species in specific land-use types (e.g. *R. satarae* in forests and *M. cf. terricolor* in

grasslands) indicating their preferred land-use types, similar to that observed in many other

ecological communities [62]. We found that grasslands were dominated by *Mus* species; *M.*

cf. fernandoni, *M. cf. famulus* and *M. cf. terricolor*. Previous studies from the landscape

morphologically identified *M. cf. fernandoni* as *M. musculus* and the latter two as *M.*

booduga [43]. Phylogenetic analysis suggests that they are distinct lineages related to *M.*

fernandoni (a Sri Lankan species), *M. famulus* and *M. terricolor*, respectively. Their high

genetic distances with their potential parent species (see results) suggest that these three

Mus species could be new lineages in the Western Ghats.

Interestingly, all these three *Mus* species showed variation in annual densities, potentially a

signature of annual population oscillations [63,64]. Long-term studies with multiple spatial

replicates are required to better understand signals of annual or multiannual population

dynamics, which can be further correlated with eco-climatic variables in the region to

understand drivers of variation in small mammal populations at a local scale. Such intra- and

inter-annual variations in host densities are important determinants of 'zoonotic hazard',

which contributes to spillover risk through its overlap with exposure and vulnerability [65].

This reiterates the importance of detailed ecological studies to understand spillover

dynamics.

(b) Diverse ectoparasites are shared among small mammals in the community

Our results show that ectoparasite diversity and density in the landscape are centred

around abundant, large-bodied and synanthropic species. Specifically, *R. satarae* and *R.*

rattus were large-bodied small mammals with high richness of ectoparasites, consistent

with the positive correlation observed between body size and parasitism [66]. Similarly, *R.*

satarae and *M. cf. fernandoni* (two abundant species) were also detected with multiple

ectoparasites (polyparasitism), often with high densities supporting density dependent

parasite transmission and uptake [67]. Earlier studies from south India also observed high

diversity of ectoparasites, predominantly from synanthropic and habitat generalist small

mammals [68]. Broadly, our results strongly imply that specific host traits [69] affect

ectoparasite distributions, including diversity and polyparasitism. Additionally, the large

distribution ranges of these species provide opportunities to acquire new ectoparasites

(through horizontal transmission) from other overlapping small mammals [70], driving

ectoparasite richness on them [71]. In addition to polyparasitism, our results revealed some

broad ectoparasite-host association patterns. Mites (*Laelaps sp 1*) were predominantly

associated with *M. cf. fernandoni*, while ticks (*Rhipicephalus sp, Ixodes sp*, and

Haemaphysalis sp) were associated with *R. satarae* and other *Mus* species. In contrast to

these group-specific generalities, fleas were relatively species-rich and detected in most

small mammals, possibly due to their ability to move from one host to another [72].

Several ectoparasites (e.g. *Rhipicephalus sp, Xenopsylla sp 1*) showed a wider host range,

presumably due to their ability to infect multiple locally available hosts [73]. As observed

elsewhere [74], host sharing was the predominant pattern observed in the community. Such

generalist ectoparasites can facilitate the transmission of pathogens between hosts [75],

making their ecology a crucial part of vector-borne pathogen dynamics. Additionally, known

reservoir hosts such as *R. rattus* with multiple fleas (as demonstrated in this study) imply

potential for spillover and risks of vector-borne diseases to humans and other wildlife in the

landscape [76].

(c) Aggregated ectoparasite load drives *Bartonella* prevalence in the small mammal

community

Corroborating with the earlier findings [26,77], we observed a high *Bartonella* prevalence in

the small mammal community with *R. satarae* and *M. cf. fernandoni* as two primary hosts in

both sites. All three ectoparasite groups (mites, ticks and fleas) collected from these primary

hosts displayed similar prevalence trends, suggesting *Bartonella* transmission between hosts

and ectoparasites. Lower habitat heterogeneity and higher ungulate density should lead to

low host density and pathogen prevalence in Kudremukh (see Faust et al., 2018; Young et

al., 2014), but this prediction is not evident in our data.

While we expected host density and ectoparasitism to drive prevalence [9,78], we found

only aggregated ectoparasite load per species explains *Bartonella* prevalence. High vector

densities in the environment (not on a specific host) are known to elevate pathogen

transmission (density-dependent transmission), impacting prevalence and risk of infection

[79]. Our results spotlight ectoparasite communities and their dynamics, which are even less

known than host dynamics. Unfortunately, ecological drivers of aggregated ectoparasite

load remain poorly understood. Longitudinal sampling targeting larger sample size from

each representative species in combination with ecological models incorporating additional

appropriate variables, e.g. host traits, season, etc., might help explain variance in

aggregated ectoparasite load. We caution that other variables previously shown to

influence pathogen prevalence, like seasonality [9] and environmental stressors [80] were

unavailable in our study.

(d) Evidence of historic spillover in the community provides clues to potential

future *Bartonella* spillover.

Characterizing *Bartonella* diversity in small mammals is crucial from a public health

perspective, as small mammals maintain several zoonotic species from these genera [81].

For example, endemic *Bartonella* variants such as *B. bacilliformis* (carrion's disease) are fatal

and cause serious mortality [82]. Five *Bartonella* lineages from this study showed

phylogenetic affinity to known zoonotic species such as *B. queenslandensis* and *B.*

tribocorum. Additionally, presence of these lineages in ectoparasites suggest possible

transmission of *Bartonella* among hosts, and potentially to humans. Interestingly, while

hosts carried single *Bartonella* lineages, ectoparasites (on a given host) carried a higher

diversity of *Bartonella* (e.g. *Xenopsylla sp* 5 carried *Bartonella* associated with *S. niger* and *R.*

satarae), enhancing probability for cross-species transmission, given vector competency.

Cross-species pathogen transmission, especially vector-borne pathogens, among wildlife is

more common than previously thought [83]. Our ancestral trait reconstruction for

each *Bartonella* lineage suggests *R. satarae* as the ancestral host for several lineages with a

medium to high probability. In fact, two lineages (BL7 and BL8), are consistent with spillover

occurred in the past from *R. satarae* to *M. cf. fernandoni*. Interestingly, these two species

are the major *Bartonella* carriers (high prevalence) and harbour multiple haplotypes

indicating they could be potential reservoirs. We did not identify instances of contemporary

spillover. However, evidence of potential historic spillover suggests that species that share

habitat and other resources could be particularly vulnerable [84]. The communities we

studied include many small mammals and their ectoparasites that overlap between

habitats, increasing the likelihood of such inter-species transmission [85]. In addition,

generalist hosts move across multiple habitats, also carrying generalist ectoparasites likely

to further drive pathogen spillover in the landscape [86]. Such pathogen movement

between host species could provide an opportunity for the evolution of new virulent

variants through recombination [4], similar to those observed in other pathogens [6].

Conclusion

We used an ecological and evolutionary approach to disentangle the complex relationship

between small mammal hosts, their ectoparasites, and pathogens in a tropical rainforest-

plantation landscape. Using systematic and tiered sampling, we determined factors that

influence *Bartonella* prevalence and transmission at a local scale. Our results indicate

overlap in small mammal communities across different land-use types, predominantly

driven by habitat generalists. These small mammals hosted a diverse ectoparasite

community, often showing polyparasitism and host overlap. We observed a positive

relationship between *Bartonella* prevalence and aggregated ectoparasite load per host,

reiterating the role of ectoparasites as vectors for *Bartonella* transmission. While all the

Bartonella lineages were host-specific, ectoparasites carried non-specific lineages from

other hosts, indicating the potential for cross-species transmission. Evidence of a historic

spillover event between two primary *Bartonella* hosts suggests a high chance for such

spillovers in the community, especially when ectoparasites show wide host ranges and carry

non-specific *Bartonella* lineages. Circulating potentially zoonotic diversity in these small

mammals, including synanthropic hosts and their ectoparasites, amplifies the concern of

zoonotic transmission. Increased density of generalist hosts and potential vectors due to

habitat disturbances would further drive the likelihood of such transmissions. In summary,

our study highlights the complex relationship between small mammals, ectoparasites, and

pathogen ecology in multi-host, multi-parasite communities. At the same time, these results

warrant focused research on bacterial vector-borne pathogens in small mammals to

understand the zoonotic implications of undetected spillover in changing multi-host

communities.

Ethics statement

This study and associated protocols were approved by National Centre for Biological Science

Institutional Animal Ethics Committee (NCBS-IAEC-2016/10-[M], NCBS-IAE-2020/ 02[N]) and

Institutional Biosafety Committee (TFR:NCBS:23_IBSC/2017).

Acknowledgement

This study was primarily supported by the Department of Atomic Energy, Government of India (Project Identification RTI 4006) awarded to UR. We are grateful to Kadamane Estate and Mr. K.M. Cariappa, Senior Manager, Kadamane Estates Company, for granting permission and field accommodation; Karnataka Forests and Wildlife Department and Kudremukh Forest Division for granting permission for the study; Kudremukh Iron Ore Company for providing accommodation in Kudremukh; NCBS NGS facility for sequencing. We thank S. Yashas, Vikrant Jathar, S. Vijayakumar, K. Kamaraj, Tamil Selvan, Subramanian, and C. Karnan for their help in sample collection. ABR thanks Ian Mendenhall, V.V. Robin, and Varadharajan Sundaramurthy for academic discussions and comments on the results. ABR was supported by the SPM fellowship by CSIR-HRDG, Government of India. ABR also acknowledges the support from the Tata Institute for Genetics and Society during the manuscript preparation. AS was supported by fellowship from the Trivedi School of Biosciences, Ashoka University.

References

1. Dirzo R, Young HS, Galetti M, Ceballos G, Isaac NJB, Collen B. 2014 Defaunation in the Anthropocene. *Science* **345**, 401–406. (doi:10.1126/science.1251817)

2. Gibb R, Redding DW, Chin KQ, Donnelly CA, Blackburn TM, Newbold T, Jones KE. 2020 Zoonotic host diversity increases in human-dominated ecosystems. *Nature* **584**, 398–402. (doi:10.1038/s41586-020-2562-8)

3. Hassell JM, Begon M, Ward MJ, Fèvre EM. 2017 Urbanization and Disease Emergence: Dynamics at the Wildlife–Livestock–Human Interface. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* **32**, 55–67. (doi:10.1016/j.tree.2016.09.012)

4.   Borremans B, Faust C, Manlove KR, Sokolow SH, Lloyd-Smith JO. 2019 Cross-species
pathogen spillover across ecosystem boundaries: mechanisms and theory. *Phil Trans R*
Soc B **374**, 9.

5.   Faust CL, McCallum HI, Bloomfield LSP, Gottdenker NL, Gillespie TR, Torney CJ, Dobson
AP, Plowright RK. 2018 Pathogen spillover during land conversion. *Ecol. Lett.* **21**, 471–
483. (doi:10.1111/ele.12904)

6.   Wang L-F, Eaton BT. 2007 Bats, Civets and the Emergence of SARS. In *Wildlife and*
Emerging Zoonotic Diseases: The Biology, Circumstances and Consequences of Cross-
Species Transmission, pp. 325–344. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
(doi:10.1007/978-3-540-70962-6_13)

7.   Pérez-Losada M, Arenas M, Galán JC, Palero F, González-Candelas F. 2015
Recombination in viruses: Mechanisms, methods of study, and evolutionary
consequences. *Infect. Genet. Evol.* **30**, 296–307. (doi:10.1016/j.meegid.2014.12.022)

8.   Plowright RK, Parrish CR, McCallum H, Hudson PJ, Ko AI, Graham AL, Lloyd-Smith JO.
2017 Pathways to zoonotic spillover. *Nat. Rev. Microbiol.* **15**, 502–510.
(doi:10.1038/nrmicro.2017.45)

9.   Rodríguez-Pastor R, Escudero R, Lambin X, Vidal MD, Gil H, Jado I, Rodríguez-Vargas M,
Luque-Larena JJ, Mougeot F. 2019 Zoonotic pathogens in fluctuating common vole
(Microtus arvalis) populations: occurrence and dynamics. *Parasitology* **146**, 389–398.
(doi:10.1017/S0031182018001543)

10. Stafford KC, Cartter ML, Magnarelli LA, Ertel S-H, Mshar PA. 1998 Temporal Correlations
between Tick Abundance and Prevalence of Ticks Infected with Borrelia burgdorferi and
Increasing Incidence of Lyme Disease. *J. Clin. Microbiol.* **36**, 1240–1244.
(doi:10.1128/JCM.36.5.1240-1244.1998)

11. Luis AD *et al.* 2013 A comparison of bats and rodents as reservoirs of zoonotic viruses:
are bats special? *Proc. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci.* **280**, 20122753. (doi:10.1098/rspb.2012.2753)

12. Han BA, Schmidt JP, Bowden SE, Drake JM. 2015 Rodent reservoirs of future zoonotic
diseases. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **112**, 7039–7044. (doi:10.1073/pnas.1501598112)

13. Johnson CK, Hitchens PL, Pandit PS, Rushmore J, Evans TS, Young CCW, Doyle MM. 2020
Global shifts in mammalian population trends reveal key predictors of virus spillover
risk. *Proc. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci.* **287**, 20192736. (doi:10.1098/rspb.2019.2736)

14. Burgin CJ, Colella JP, Kahn PL, Upham NS. 2018 How many species of mammals are
there? *J. Mammal.* **99**, 1–14. (doi:10.1093/jmammal/gyx147)

15. Andreazzi CS, Martinez-Vaquero LA, Winck GR, Cardoso TS, Teixeira BR, Xavier SCC,
Gentile R, Jansen AM, D'Andrea PS. 2023 Vegetation cover and biodiversity reduce
parasite infection in wild hosts across ecological levels and scales. *Ecography* **2023**,
e06579. (doi:10.1111/ecog.06579)

16. Morand S *et al.* 2015 Assessing the distribution of disease-bearing rodents in human-
modified tropical landscapes. *J. Appl. Ecol.* **52**, 784–794. (doi:10.1111/1365-2664.12414)

17. Young HS *et al.* 2014 Declines in large wildlife increase landscape-level prevalence of
rodent-borne disease in Africa. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **111**, 7036–7041.
(doi:10.1073/pnas.1404958111)

18. Allan BF, Keesing F, Ostfeld RS. 2003 Effect of Forest Fragmentation on Lyme Disease
Risk. *Conserv. Biol.* **17**, 267–272. (doi:10.1046/j.1523-1739.2003.01260.x)

19. Estavillo C, Pardini R, Rocha PLB da. 2013 Forest Loss and the Biodiversity Threshold: An
Evaluation Considering Species Habitat Requirements and the Use of Matrix Habitats.
PLoS ONE **8**, e82369. (doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0082369)

20. García-Peña GE, Rubio AV, Mendoza H, Fernández M, Milholland MT, Aguirre AA, Suzán
G, Zambrana-Torrelio C. 2021 Land-use change and rodent-borne diseases: hazards on
the shared socioeconomic pathways. *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci.* **376**, 20200362.
(doi:10.1098/rstb.2020.0362)

21. Brooks TM *et al.* 2002 Habitat Loss and Extinction in the Hotspots of Biodiversity.
Conserv. Biol. **16**, 909–923. (doi:10.1046/j.1523-1739.2002.00530.x)

22. Ellis-Cockcroft I, Cotter J. 2014 Tropical Forest Fragmentation; Implications for
Ecosystem Function. , 15.

23. Allen T, Murray KA, Zambrana-Torrelio C, Morse SS, Rondinini C, Di Marco M, Breit N,
Olival KJ, Daszak P. 2017 Global hotspots and correlates of emerging zoonotic diseases.
Nat. Commun. **8**, 1124. (doi:10.1038/s41467-017-00923-8)

24. Jones KE, Patel NG, Levy MA, Storeygard A, Balk D, Gittleman JL, Daszak P. 2008 Global
trends in emerging infectious diseases. *Nature* **451**, 990–993.
(doi:10.1038/nature06536)

25. Lei BR, Olival KJ. 2014 Contrasting Patterns in Mammal–Bacteria Coevolution: Bartonella
and Leptospira in Bats and Rodents. *PLoS Negl. Trop. Dis.* **8**, e2738.
(doi:10.1371/journal.pntd.0002738)

26. Neves ES, Mendenhall IH, Borthwick SA, Su YCF, Smith GJD. 2018 Detection and genetic
characterization of diverse Bartonella genotypes in the small mammals of Singapore.
Zoonoses Public Health **65**, e207–e215. (doi:10.1111/zph.12430)

27. Ellerman JR. 1961 *The fauna of India including Pakistan, Burma and Ceylon*. Zoological
Survey of India.

28. Johnsingh A, Manjrekar N, editors. 2015 *Mammals of South Asia*. Universities Press.

29. Menon V. 2014 *Indian mammals: a field guide*. Hachette India.

30. He K, Li Y-J, Brandley MC, Lin L-K, Wang Y-X, Zhang Y-P, Jiang X-L. 2010 A multi-locus
phylogeny of Nectogalini shrews and influences of the paleoclimate on speciation and
evolution. *Mol. Phylogenet. Evol.* **56**, 734–746. (doi:10.1016/j.ympev.2010.03.039)

31. Wolda H. 1981 Similarity indices, sample size and diversity. *Oecologia* **50**, 296–302.
(doi:10.1007/BF00344966)

32. Oksanen J *et al.* 2019 vegan. R package version 2.5-6.

33. Seber G. 1982 *The Estimation of Animal Abundance and Related Parameters*. 2nd edn.
Macmillan, New York.

34. Baillargeon S, Rivest L-P. 2007 Rcapture: Loglinear Models for Capture-Recapture in R. *J.*
Stat. Softw. **19**, 31.

35. Iyengar R. 1973 The Siphonaptera of the Indian Subregion. *Orient. Insects* **7**, 1–91.
(doi:10.1080/00305316.1973.11745225)

36. Geevarghese G, Mishra A C. 2011 *Haemaphysalis Ticks of India*. National Institute of
Virology, Pune, Maharashtra, India.

37. Elango A. 2022 Hands-on Training Module on Medically Important Hard Ticks (Ixodidae).

38. Mullen GR, OConnor BM. 2019 Mites (Acari). In *Medical and Veterinary Entomology*, pp.
533–602. Elsevier. (doi:10.1016/B978-0-12-814043-7.00026-1)

39. Bray JR, Curtis JT. 1957 An Ordination of the Upland Forest Communities of Southern
Wisconsin. *Ecol. Monogr.* **27**, 325–349. (doi:10.2307/1942268)

40. R Core Team. 2020 R: A language and environment for statistical computing.

41. Wickham H. 2011 ggplot2: R package Version 3.3.2.

42. Renesto P, Gouvernet J, Drancourt M, Roux V, Raoult D. 2001 Use of rpoB Gene Analysis
for Detection and Identification of Bartonella Species. *J. Clin. Microbiol.* **39**, 430–437.
(doi:10.1128/JCM.39.2.430-437.2001)

43. Ansil BR, Mendenhall IH, Ramakrishnan U. 2021 High prevalence and diversity of
Bartonella in small mammals from the biodiverse Western Ghats. *PLoS Negl. Trop. Dis.*
15, e0009178. (doi:10.1371/journal.pntd.0009178)

44. Altschul SF, Gish W, Miller W, Myers EW, Lipman DJ. 1990 Basic Local Alignment Search
Tool. *J. Mol. Biol.* **215**, 403–410.

45. Harrell Jr F. 2019 'Hmisc'. R package version 4.2-0.

46. Kumar S, Stecher G, Tamura K. 2016 MEGA7: Molecular Evolutionary Genetics Analysis
Version 7.0 for Bigger Datasets. *Mol. Biol. Evol.* **33**, 1870–1874.
(doi:doi:10.1093/molbev/msw054)

47. Lanfear R, Frandsen PB, Wright AM, Senfeld T, Calcott B. 2016 PartitionFinder 2: New
Methods for Selecting Partitioned Models of Evolution for Molecular and Morphological
Phylogenetic Analyses. *Mol. Biol. Evol.* **34**, 260. (doi:10.1093/molbev/msw260)

48. Drummond AJ, Suchard MA, Xie D, Rambaut A. 2012 Bayesian Phylogenetics with BEAUti
and the BEAST 1.7. *Mol. Biol. Evol.* **29**, 1969–1973. (doi:10.1093/molbev/mss075)

49. Rambaut A, Drummond AJ, Xie D, Baele G, Suchard MA. 2018 Posterior Summarization
in Bayesian Phylogenetics Using Tracer 1.7. *Syst. Biol.* **67**, 901–904.
(doi:10.1093/sysbio/syy032)

50. Rambaut A. 2014 FigTree 1.4. 2 Software.

51. Charleston MA, Robertson DL. 2002 Preferential Host Switching by Primate Lentiviruses
Can Account for Phylogenetic Similarity with the Primate Phylogeny. *Syst. Biol.* **51**, 528–
535. (doi:10.1080/10635150290069940)

52. Naaf T, Wulf M. 2010 Habitat specialists and generalists drive homogenization and
differentiation of temperate forest plant communities at the regional scale. *Biol.*
Conserv. **143**, 848–855. (doi:10.1016/j.biocon.2009.12.027)

53. Pandit SN, Kolasa J, Cottenie K. 2009 Contrasts between habitat generalists and
specialists: an empirical extension to the basic metacommunity framework. *Ecology* **90**,
2253–2262. (doi:10.1890/08-0851.1)

54. Gentili S, Sigura M, Bonesi L. 2014 Decreased small mammals species diversity and
increased population abundance along a gradient of agricultural intensification. *Hystrix*
Ital. J. Mammal. **25**. (doi:10.4404/hystrix-25.1-9246)

55. Olivier T, Thébault E, Elias M, Fontaine B, Fontaine C. 2020 Urbanization and agricultural
intensification destabilize animal communities differently than diversity loss. *Nat.*
Commun. **11**, 2686. (doi:10.1038/s41467-020-16240-6)

56. Kumar A, Chellam R, Choudhury BC, Mudappa D, Vasudevan K, Ishwar NM, Noon B.
2002 Impact of rainforest fragmentation on small mammals and herpetofauna in the
Western Ghats, South India. , 159.

57. Hurst ZM, McCleery RA, Collier BA, Fletcher RJ, Silvy NJ, Taylor PJ, Monadjem A. 2013
Dynamic Edge Effects in Small Mammal Communities across a Conservation-Agricultural
Interface in Swaziland. *PLoS ONE* **8**, e74520. (doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0074520)

58. Harper GA, Bunbury N. 2015 Invasive rats on tropical islands: Their population biology
and impacts on native species. *Glob. Ecol. Conserv.* **3**, 607–627.
(doi:10.1016/j.gecco.2015.02.010)

59. Gámez-Virués S *et al.* 2015 Landscape simplification filters species traits and drives
biotic homogenization. *Nat. Commun.* **6**, 8568. (doi:10.1038/ncomms9568)

60. Marvier M, Kareiva P, Neubert MG. 2004 Habitat Destruction, Fragmentation, and
Disturbance Promote Invasion by Habitat Generalists in a Multispecies Metapopulation.
Risk Anal. **24**, 869–878. (doi:10.1111/j.0272-4332.2004.00485.x)

61. Moore JH, Palmeirim AF, Peres CA, Ngoprasert D, Gibson L. 2022 Invasive rat drives
complete collapse of native small mammal communities in insular forest fragments.
Curr. Biol. **32**, 2997-3004.e2. (doi:10.1016/j.cub.2022.05.053)

62. Hill JG, Summerville KS, Brown RL. 2008 Habitat Associations of Ant Species
(Hymenoptera: Formicidae) in a Heterogeneous Mississippi Landscape. *Environ.*
Entomol. **37**, 11.

63. Lindström J, Ranta E, Kokko H, Lundberg P, Kaitala V. 2001 From arctic lemmings to
adaptive dynamics: Charles Elton's legacy in population ecology. *Biol. Rev. Camb. Philos.*
Soc. **76**, 129–158. (doi:10.1017/S1464793100005637)

64. Myers JH. 2018 Population cycles: generalities, exceptions and remaining mysteries.
Proc. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci. **285**, 20172841. (doi:10.1098/rspb.2017.2841)

65. Gibb R, Franklinos LHV, Redding DW, Jones KE. 2020 Ecosystem perspectives are needed
to manage zoonotic risks in a changing climate. *BMJ* , m3389. (doi:10.1136/bmj.m3389)

66. Esser HJ, Foley JE, Bongers F, Herre EA, Miller MJ, Prins HHT, Jansen PA. 2016 Host body
size and the diversity of tick assemblages on Neotropical vertebrates. *Int. J. Parasitol.*
Parasites Wildl. **5**, 295–304. (doi:10.1016/j.ijppaw.2016.10.001)

67. Stanko M, Miklisová D, Goüy De Bellocq J, Morand S. 2002 Mammal density and
patterns of ectoparasite species richness and abundance. *Oecologia* **131**, 289–295.
(doi:10.1007/s00442-002-0889-5)

68. Samuel PP, Govindarajan R, Krishnamoorthi R, Rajamannar V. 2020 A study on
ectoparasites with special reference to chigger mites on rodents/shrews in scrub typhus
endemic areas of Kerala, India. *ENTOMON* **45**, 285–294.
(doi:10.33307/entomon.v45i4.572)

69. Wale M, Bekele A, Yihune M. 2023 Diversity of small mammal ectoparasite species and
factors that affect their abundance in Chimit Kola, northwestern Ethiopia. *Glob. Ecol.*
Conserv. **41**, e02370. (doi:10.1016/j.gecco.2023.e02370)

70. Bordes F *et al.* 2015 Habitat fragmentation alters the properties of a host-parasite
network: rodents and their helminths in South-East Asia. *J. Anim. Ecol.* **84**, 1253–1263.
(doi:10.1111/1365-2656.12368)

71. Dáttilo W, Barrozo-Chávez N, Lira-Noriega A, Guevara R, Villalobos F, Santiago-Alarcon
D, Neves FS, Izzo T, Ribeiro SP. 2020 Species-level drivers of mammalian ectoparasite
faunas. *J. Anim. Ecol.* **89**, 1754–1765. (doi:10.1111/1365-2656.13216)

72. Rust MK. 1994 Interhost Movement of Adult Cat Fleas (Siphonaptera: Pulieidae). *J. Med.*
Entomol. **31**, 486–489. (doi:10.1093/jmedent/31.3.486)

73. McCoy KD, Léger E, Dietrich M. 2013 Host specialization in ticks and transmission of tick-
borne diseases: a review. *Front. Cell. Infect. Microbiol.* **3**.
(doi:10.3389/fcimb.2013.00057)

74. Goldberg AR, Conway CJ, Biggins DE. 2020 Flea sharing among sympatric rodent hosts:
implications for potential plague effects on a threatened sciurid. *Ecosphere* **11**.
(doi:10.1002/ecs2.3033)

75. Sotomayor-Bonilla J, Tolsá-García MJ, García-Peña GE, Santiago-Alarcon D, Mendoza H,
Alvarez-Mendizabal P, Rico-Chávez O, Sarmiento-Silva RE, Suzán G. 2019 Insights into

the Host Specificity of Mosquito-Borne Flaviviruses Infecting Wild Mammals. *EcoHealth*
16, 726–733. (doi:10.1007/s10393-019-01442-2)

76. Rahelinirina S, Duplantier JM, Ratovonjato J, Ramilijaona O, Ratsimba M, Rahalison L.
2010 Study on the Movement of Rattus rattus and Evaluation of the Plague Dispersion
in Madagascar. *Vector-Borne Zoonotic Dis.* **10**, 77–84. (doi:10.1089/vbz.2009.0019)

77. Gundi VAKB, Kosoy MY, Myint KSA, Shrestha SK, Shrestha MP, Pavlin JA, Gibbons RV.
2010 Prevalence and Genetic Diversity of Bartonella Species Detected in Different
Tissues of Small Mammals in Nepal. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* **76**, 8247–8254.
(doi:10.1128/AEM.01180-10)

78. Krawczyk AI, van Duijvendijk GLA, Swart A, Heylen D, Jaarsma RI, Jacobs FHH, Fonville M,
Sprong H, Takken W. 2020 Effect of rodent density on tick and tick-borne pathogen
populations: consequences for infectious disease risk. *Parasit. Vectors* **13**, 34.
(doi:10.1186/s13071-020-3902-0)

79. Kantsø B, Svendsen CB, Jensen PM, Vennestrøm J, Krogfelt KA. 2010 Seasonal and
habitat variation in the prevalence of Rickettsia helvetica in Ixodes ricinus ticks from
Denmark. *Ticks Tick-Borne Dis.* **1**, 101–103.

80. McMichael L, Edson D, Smith C, Mayer D, Smith I, Kopp S, Meers J, Field H. 2017
Physiological stress and Hendra virus in flying-foxes (Pteropus spp.), Australia. *PLoS ONE*
12.

81. Saisongkorh W, Rolain J-M, Suputtamongkol Y, Raoult D. 2009 Emerging Bartonella in
Humans and Animals in Asia and Australia. **92**, 25.

82. Garcia-Quintanilla M, Dichter AA, Guerra H, Kempf VAJ. 2019 Carrion's disease: more
than a neglected disease. *Parasit. Vectors* **12**, 141. (doi:10.1186/s13071-019-3390-2)

83. Woolhouse MEJ, Gowtage-Sequeria S. 2005 Host Range and Emerging and Reemerging
Pathogens. *Emerg. Infect. Dis.* **11**, 1842–1847. (doi:10.3201/eid1112.050997)

84. Weckworth JK *et al.* 2020 Cross-species transmission and evolutionary dynamics of

canine distemper virus during a spillover in African lions of Serengeti National Park. *Mol.*

Ecol. **29**, 4308–4321. (doi:10.1111/mec.15449)

85. Boyard C, Vourc'h G, Barnouin J. 2008 The relationships between Ixodes ricinus and

small mammal species at the woodland–pasture interface. *Exp. Appl. Acarol.* **44**, 61–76.

(doi:10.1007/s10493-008-9132-3)

86. Becker DJ, Streicker DG, Altizer S. 2018 Using host species traits to understand the

consequences of resource provisioning for host-parasite interactions. *J. Anim. Ecol.* **87**,

511–525. (doi:10.1111/1365-2656.12765)

809