1

Food supplementation affects gut microbiota and immunological resistance

to parasites in a wild bird species

Sarah A. Knutie[1,2]

Affiliations:

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

06269, USA.

[2]Institute for Systems Genomics, University of Connecticut, Storrs, CT, 06269, USA.

Corresponding author: E-mail: sarah.knutie@uconn.edu

Abstract

1. Supplemental feeding can increase the overall health of animals but also can have varying

consequences for animals dealing with parasites. Furthermore, the mechanism mediating the

effect of food supplementation on host-parasite interactions remains poorly understood.

2. The goal of the study was to determine the effect of food supplementation on host defenses

against parasitic nest flies and whether host gut microbiota, which can affect immunity,

potentially mediates these relationships. In a fully crossed design, I experimentally manipulated

the abundance of parasitic nest flies (*Protocalliphora sialia*) and food availability then

characterized the gut microbiota, immune responses, and nest parasite abundance of nestling

eastern bluebirds (*Sialia sialis*).

3. Food supplemented birds had 75% fewer parasites than unsupplemented birds. Parasite

abundance decreased throughout the breeding season for unsupplemented birds, but abundance

did not change throughout the season for supplemented birds. Food supplementation increased

overall fledging success. Parasitism had a sublethal effects on blood loss, but food

supplementation mitigated these effects by increasing parasite resistance via the nestling IgY

antibody response.

4. Food supplementation increased the gut bacterial diversity in nestlings, which was negatively

related to parasite abundance. Food supplementation also increased the relative abundance of

Clostridium spp. in nestlings, which was positively related to their antibody response and

negatively related to parasite abundance.

5. *Synthesis and applications*. Overall, these results suggest that food supplementation,

especially early in the breeding season, increases resistance to parasitism during the early life

stage of the host, which could be mediated by the effect of supplementation on the gut

microbiota. Wildlife food supplementation is a common pastime for humans worldwide and

therefore it is important to determine the consequences of this activity on animal health.

Furthermore, supplemental feeding could induce resistance to detrimental parasites (e.g. invasive

parasites) in hosts when management of the parasite is not immediately possible.

Keywords: bird feeding, blowfly, diet, food supplementation, host defenses, microbiome,

resistance, tolerance

1 | INTRODUCTION

Environmental factors, such a food availability, can influence host-parasite interactions (Becker, Streicker & Altizer 2015; Becker *et al.* 2018; Sánchez *et al.* 2018). Host defense strategies against parasites, such as tolerance and resistance, are often condition-dependent and regulated by resource availability (Lee *et al.* 2006; Cotter *et al.* 2011; Sternberg *et al.* 2012; Howick & Lazzaro 2014; Knutie *et al.* 2017c). Tolerance mechanisms, such as tissue repair or compensation for energy loss, reduce the damage that parasites cause without reducing parasite fitness (Miller, White & Boots 2006; Råberg, Sim & Read 2007; Read, Graham & Råberg 2008; Medzhitov, Schneider & Soares 2012). For example, avian parents from parasite-infested nests reduce the cost of parasitism by feeding their offspring more than parents from non-parasitized nests (Christe et al. 1996; Tripet and Richner 1997; Knutie et al. 2016). Consequently, despite increasing parasite loads, offspring do not suffer a high cost of parasitism because they are able to compensate for resources lost to the parasites.

Another condition-dependent defense mechanism is resistance, such as the immune response, which reduces the damage that parasites cause by reducing parasite fitness (Read *et al.* 2008). Resistance can be condition-dependent because mounting immune responses can be energetically costly and therefore only hosts with enough food resources may be able to invest in immunity (Sheldon & Verhulst 1996; Svensson *et al.* 1998; Lochmiller & Deerenberg 2000; Demas 2004; Sternberg *et al.* 2012; Howick & Lazzaro 2014; Cornet *et al.* 2014). One explanation for the positive relationship between food availability and immunity is that the extra nutrients directly increase the production of immune cells (Strandin, Babayan & Forbes 2018). For example, supplemented protein can increase the concentration of cellular immune cells (e.g.

eosinophils, globule leukocytes and mast cells) (reviewed in Coop and Kyriazakis 2001) and

humoral immune cells (e.g. Ig antibodies) (Datta *et al.* 1998).

Food availability might also indirectly influence resistance by affecting the gut

microbiota of the host. Host diet composition can directly alter the gut microbiota of the host

(David *et al.* 2014; Carmody *et al.* 2015). For example, hosts that consume a plant-based diet

have significantly different bacterial communities than hosts that consume an animal-based diet

(David *et al.* 2014; Knutie *et al.* 2017a). Since the gut microbiota can affect the development and

maintenance of the immune system of the host (reviewed in Round and Mazmanian 2009;

Hooper et al. 2012), diet-based shifts in the host gut microbiota might also affect parasite

resistance. However, studies are still needed to determine whether the host microbiota plays a

role in mediating the effect of food availability on parasite resistance.

Humans can change resource availability for animals by increasing the abundance of

unnatural food using wild bird feeders and the disposal of human trash (Murray *et al.* 2016;

Bosse *et al.* 2017; Start *et al.* 2018). In fact, humans provide many wild bird species with a large

proportion of their food (Jones & James Reynolds 2008; Jones 2011; Cox & Gaston 2018),

which can play a key role in maximizing the birds' fitness (Tollington *et al.* 2019). In the United

States alone, approximately 50 million households provide over a half a million tons of

supplemental food to attract wild birds to their property (Robb *et al.* 2008; Cox & Gaston 2018).

Supplemental feeding of birds can have several benefits to birds and humans. Feeding wild birds

can improve the mental health of humans along with their connection with nature (Jones 2011;

Cox & Gaston 2016, 2018; Cox *et al.* 2016; Shaw, Miller & Wescott 2017). Birds that are

supplemented with food are often in better condition, which in turn can increase their

reproductive success (Tollington *et al.* 2019) and enhance some measures of immunity

(Lochmiller, Vestey & Boren 1993; Wilcoxen *et al.* 2015; Ruhs, Vézina & Karasov 2018;

Sánchez *et al.* 2018; Strandin *et al.* 2018). Because supplemental feeding can increase bird

abundance (Fuller *et al.* 2008), it can also increase pathogen transmission by increasing host

aggregation and contact at the feeders (Wilcoxen *et al.* 2015; Becker *et al.* 2015). Although

correlational studies have variably linked food availability and host-parasite outcomes, causal

tests are still needed to determine the effect of food supplementation on host-parasite interactions

and how the host microbiota could be affecting parasite resistance (Becker *et al.* 2015; Altizer *et*

al. 2018).

The eastern bluebird (*Sialia sialis*) is a North American bird species that is unnaturally

fed by humans. In the 1970s, populations of eastern bluebirds declined, which was thought to be

linked to a loss of suitable foraging and nesting habitat (Gowaty & Plissner 2015). In response,

humans built and established artificial nest boxes and started supplementing the birds' natural

diet of insects, spiders, and small fruits (Pinkowski 1977a) with mealworms. Since the 1970s, the

eastern bluebird population size has rebounded (Sauer & Droege 1990) but humans continue to

maintain nest boxes and provide bluebirds with supplemental food, such as mealworms.

Bluebirds are also infested with parasitic nest flies (*Protocalliphora* sp.) throughout their range.

Past studies have found highly variable blowfly abundances along with both a negative and no

effect of blowflies on fledging success of bluebirds (Johnson 1929; Pinkowski 1977b; Roby,

Brink & Whitmann 1992; Wittmann & Beason 1992; Smar 1996; Hannam 2006). One

explanation for the variable parasite load and relationship between bluebirds and their parasites

is that the bluebird populations have access to different resources (natural and supplemental),

which in turn, could affect their ability to defend themselves.

The goal of this study was to determine the effect of food supplementation on host

defenses against parasites, whether these effects differ across the breeding season, and whether

the gut microbiota of the host could be mediating the effect of food on host defense

strategies. Across the breeding season, I experimentally manipulated parasite abundance and

food availability (by supplementing birds with mealworms (*Tenebrio molitor*) or not) then

quantified growth, hemoglobin levels (proxy of blood loss), glucose levels (proxy of energy),

and survival (fledging success) of nestling bluebirds. I also quantified the *Protocalliphora-*

binding antibody response, as a measure of resistance, and the gut microbiota of nestlings.

Bluebird nestlings are naturally tolerant of *Protocalliphora sialia* in relation to growth

and survival but suffered sublethal effects (blood loss) from the parasite (Grab *et al.* 2019). If

food supplementation supports host tolerance without affecting resistance, then parasitized birds

that are supplemented will maintain good health (i.e. growth, survival) without changes in their

parasite load. However, because food supplementation can enhance the immune response of

birds (Strandin *et al.* 2018), birds with supplemented food are predicted to shift their host

defense strategy from tolerance to resistance in order to reduce the sublethal effect of the parasite

on blood loss. Therefore, I predicted that food supplementation would reduce parasite load in the

naturally parasitized control nests. Because insect (food) availability can increase throughout

breeding season (Bowlin & Winkler 2004), I predicted that supplementation would be less

effective at reducing parasite abundance later in the breeding season.

Food supplementation could either directly or indirectly increase host resistance to

parasitism. More nutrients could provide additional resources to directly speed up immune

system development, such as the IgY antibody response or haptoglobin production, in nestlings.

When a host is bitten by an ectoparasite, a series of immune pathways is activated by the host to

induce an inflammatory response that acts to prevent or reduce feeding by the ectoparasite

(reviewed in Owen, Nelson & Clayton 2010). Briefly, tissue damage and the introduction of

antigens from the parasite stimulate the release of pro-inflammatory cytokines, which can

produce acute phase proteins (e.g. haptoglobins). These chemical substances signal cells of the

innate immune system, such as macrophages, to travel to the damaged tissue to degrade antigens

and cells of the adaptive immune response induce the production of antigen-specific antibodies

(e.g. IgY antibodies), which form lasting memory cells that can be activated quickly when the

host is re-exposed to the parasite (antigen). The immune cascade described above can negatively

affect ectoparasites by causing edema (tissue swelling), which prevents the parasites from

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

Consequently, these actions can reduce the fitness of the parasite by reducing blood meal size

(Owen *et al.* 2009). However, an immune response can be energetically costly to produce and

therefore only well-fed nestlings might be able to produce this response (Sheldon & Verhulst

1996; Lochmiller & Deerenberg 2000; Cornet *et al.* 2014).

Alternatively, diet can affect the gut microbiota (e.g. particular taxa) of the host (Knutie

et al. 2017a), which could impact parasite resistance. Therefore, I predicted that food

supplementation would increase the gut bacterial diversity of the nestlings, which would be

positively correlated with the immune responses and negatively correlated with parasite

abundance. Additionally, a particular species of symbiont (e.g. gut bacterial pathogens) could

affect another species due to its earlier arrival by modulating the immune response (Sousa 1992;

de Roode *et al.* 2005; Devevey *et al.* 2015). Therefore, I also explored the relationship between

ectoparasite abundance and the relative abundance of bacterial genera that included avian

pathogens, such as *Campylobacter spp., Clostridium spp., Enterococcus spp., Escherichia spp.,*

Lactobacillus spp., Listeria spp., Mycobacteria spp., Pasteurella spp., Salmonella spp.,

Staphylococcus spp., Streptococcus spp., and *Vibrios spp.* (reviewed in Benskin *et al.* 2009).

2 | MATERIAL AND METHODS

2.1 | Study system

161 From May to July 2017, approximately 150 nest boxes were monitored in Clearwater and

162 Hubbard County in Northern Minnesota, USA, near the University of Minnesota Itasca

163 Biological Station and Itasca State Park (47°13'33" N, - 95°11'42" W). Eastern bluebirds are

164 abundant at the site and nest in artificial cavities. *P. sialia* is the only ectoparasite that infests the

165 nests of bluebirds at this site.

2.2 | Experimental manipulation of parasites and food availability

Parasite abundance and food availability were experimentally manipulated for each nest

using a 2x2 factorial design. Boxes were checked once a week for nesting activity. Once eggs

appeared, nests were checked every other day until nestlings hatched. When eggs were incubated

for 10 days, mealworm feeders were placed 10 m from the nest box (Fig. S1), with the intention

that the feeder would only provide food to the birds from this focal nest. The feeders were

constructed from pine wood (2.54 cm by 10.16 cm) and the basin for the mealworms was an

empty, sterilized aluminum cat food can. The can had pin sized holes in the bottom of the can to

allow for drainage from the rain and the can was attached to the wood platform with Velcro. The

feeders were attached to a green garden fence post with 18-gauge aluminum wire, approximately

1.5m above the ground.

Nests were assigned to the mealworm-supplemented or non-supplemented treatment. For

the supplemented treatment, 15 mealworms (Rainbow Mealworms, Compton, CA) per nestling

per day were added to the feeders until the bird eggs hatched, which was based on the

recommended feeding regime by the North American Bluebird Society. For the non-

supplemented treatment, the feeders were visited daily but mealworms were not added to the

feeders to control for the effect of disturbance on the birds. Parents were supplied with

mealworms a few days before nestlings hatched to increase the chances that parents would find

the feeders before their nestlings hatched. Birds were supplemented or not until nestlings reached

10 days old.

Nests were also assigned to the parasitized or non-parasitized treatment when eggs

hatched. The nestlings and top liner of the nest were removed in order to treat the nest with either

water to allow for natural parasitism or a 1% permethrin solution (Permacap) to remove all

parasites (Knutie *et al.* 2016; DeSimone *et al.* 2018). Nestlings never contacted the parasite

treatment since the liquid was sprayed under the nest liner.

2.3 | Nestling growth and survival

Within two days of hatching, nestlings (g) were weighed using a portable digital scale

balance and tarsus length (mm), bill length (mm), and first primary feather length (mm) were

measured using dial calipers. When nestlings were ten days old, they were measured again and

banded with a numbered metal band. When nestlings were approximately 13 days old, the boxes

were checked every other day from a distance (to avoid pre-mature fledging) to determine the

fledging success and age at which the nestlings fledged or died (>10-day old nestlings are not

typically removed from the nest by the parents after they die, S.A.K. personal obs.).

2.4 | Sample collection

Feces and a small blood sample (<30 µL) were collected from nestlings when they were

10 days old. Hemoglobin was measured from whole blood using a HemoCue® HB +201

portable analyzer and glucose was measured using a HemoCue® Glucose 201 portable analyzer.

Blood samples were placed on ice until they were centrifuged for 3 minutes at 10000 rpm to

separate the plasma from the red blood cells. Plasma and red blood cells were then stored

separately in a -80°C freezer. Fecal samples were placed on ice until stored in a -80°C freezer.

Samples were then transported on dry ice to the University of Connecticut. Enzyme-linked

immunosorbent assays (ELISA) and Tridelta PHASE haptoglobin assay (TP-801) were then

performed to quantify *P. sialia*-binding antibody (IgY) and haptoglobin (acute phase protein)

levels, respectively, in the plasma of parasitized nestling. IgY antibody levels from

unsupplemented nestlings were first published in (Grab *et al.* 2019); see this paper for the

detailed protocol for the IgY ELISA.

2.5 | Quantifying parasites

Once nestlings died or fledged, nests were collected and stored in plastic bags. Within

eight hours of collection, nests were dissected and all larvae, pupae, and pupal cases were

counted to determine total parasite abundance for each nest. Eclosed flies were collected and

identified as *Protocalliphora sialia.*

2.6 | Bacterial DNA extraction and sequencing

Total DNA was extracted from nestling bluebird feces from parasitized nests and three

mealworms using a MoBio PowerFecal DNA Isolation Kit. DNA extractions were then sent to

the University of Connecticut Microbial Analysis, Resources and Services for sequencing with

an Illumina MiSeq platform and v2 2x250 base pair kit (Illumina, Inc). A laboratory blank was

also sequenced to control for kit contamination and found no detectable sequences. Bacterial

inventories were conducted by amplifying the V4 region of the 16S rRNA gene using primers

515F and 806R and with Illumina adapters and dual indices (Kozich *et al.* 2013). Raw sequences

were demultiplexed with onboard bcl2fastq and then processed in Mothur v1.39.5 (Schloss *et al.*

2009) according to the standard MiSeq protocol (Kozich *et al.* 2013). Briefly, forward and

reverse sequences were merged. All sequences with any ambiguities, that did not align to the

correct region, or that did not meet length expectations, were removed. Sequences were aligned

to the Silva nr_v119 alignment (Quast *et al.* 2013). Chimeric reads were also removed using

UCHIME (Edgar *et al.* 2011). Non-bacterial sequences that classified as chloroplasts,

mitochondria, or unknown (i.e. did not classify to the level of kingdom) were removed.

Sequences were grouped into operational taxonomic units (OTUs) based on a 97% similarity

level and identification of the OTUs was done using the Ribosomal Database Project Bayesian

classifier (Wang *et al.* 2007) against the Silva nr_v119 taxonomy database. Alpha (sobs,

Shannon index, Simpson index) and beta diversity statistics were calculated by averaging 1,000

random subsampling of 10,000 reads per sample. The resulting data sets included a total of

702,648 sequences and an average of 41,332 reads per sample (min: 17,582, max: 57,283).

2.7 | Statistical analyses

A generalized linear model (GLM) with zero-inflated Poisson errors (to control for the

number of zeros in the fumigated treatment) was used to determine whether parasite treatment,

food treatment, and their interaction affected parasite abundance. Within the sham-fumigated

treatment, a negative binomial GLM was used to determine whether food supplementation,

timing of breeding (Julian date), and their interaction affected parasite abundance.

A GLM with binomial errors for proportional data (i.e. logistic regression) was used to

determine the effect of the food treatment, parasite treatment, and their interaction on fledging

success. A GLM was also used to determine the effect of the interaction between the food

treatment and parasite abundance on fledging success to test whether food treatment affected

host tolerance of the parasite (Simms 2000); i.e. if the effect of the interaction on fledging

success is significant then nestlings from each food treatment differ in parasite tolerance. Julian

date was originally included as a covariate for the growth and fledging success models but it was

excluded from all models because it did not account for a significant amount of variation.

Nestling growth metrics (bill length, tarsus length, first primary feather length, body

mass) were not highly correlated (pairwise correlation coefficients ranged from 0.37 to 0.66;

Table S1); therefore, individual generalized linear mixed models (GLMM) with nest as a random

effect were used to determine the effect of parasite treatment, food treatment, and their

interaction on each $\log_{10}$ transformed nestling growth metrics. GLMMs with nest as a random

effect were also used to determine the effect of parasite treatment, food treatment, and their

interaction on $\log_{10}$ transformed hemoglobin levels (proxy of blood loss) and glucose levels

(proxy of energy levels).

Within the sham-fumigated treatment, GLMMs with nest as a random effect were used to

determine the effect of food treatment on immune responses (antibody levels) and alpha bacterial

diversity metrics (Shannon index and the $\log_{10}$ of sobs and Simpson index). A GLM was used to

analyze the effect of food treatment on haptoglobin levels because haptoglobin was measured in

only one nestling per nest. Analyses were conducted using the glm (GLM) and glmer (GLMM)

functions with the lme4 package or glmmTMB (zero-inflated Poisson GLM) function with the

glmmTMB package. Probability values were calculated using log-likelihood ratio tests using the

Anova function in the car package (Fox & Weisberg 2002).

Microbiota data were also analyzed from mealworm samples and parasitized nestlings

from both food treatments. The effect of food treatment on bacterial community dynamics in

parasitized nestlings was analyzed with the Bray-Curtis Dissimilarity Matrices using

PERMANOVA+ (2008, version 1.0.1; with 999 permutations) in PRIMER (2008, version

6.1.11). Relative abundances (arcsine square root transformed; Shchipkova et al. 2010; Kumar et

al. 2012) of bacterial phyla and genera of birds and mealworms were analyzed using ANOVAs

with food treatment and mealworms as independent variables; false discovery rate (FDR) tests

were used to control for multiple analyses and Tukey post-hoc tests were used for pairwise

interactions. Relative abundances of six bacterial genera that include pathogenic species were

also compared between food treatments ANOVAs with FDR corrections. Analyses were

conducted in R (2017, version 3.4.3). All figures were created in Prism (2017, version 7).

3 | RESULTS

3.1 | Effect of treatment and timing of breeding on parasite abundance

Fumigation of nests with permethrin was effective at reducing parasite abundance to zero

(Fig. 1A) (Table S2) (GLM, $\chi^2 = 29.83$, $df = 1$, $P < 0.0001$). Food supplementation and the

interaction between food and parasite treatments also affected parasite abundance (Fig. 1A)

(GLM, food: $\chi^2 = 12.88$, $df = 1$, $P < 0.001$; interaction: $\chi^2 = 9.37$, $df = 1$, $P = 0.002$). Food

supplementation decreased parasite abundance within the sham-fumigated treatment: 100%

(11/11) of unsupplemented nests and 55.6% (5/9) of supplemented were infested with parasites

and unsupplemented nests had, on average, four times as many parasites as supplemented nests

(Fig. 1A). Overall, parasite abundance decreased with timing of breeding (Table S3) (Julian date:

$\chi^2 = 0.20$, $df = 1$, $P = 0.66$) but more specifically, there was an interaction between food

treatment and Julian date (interaction: $\chi^2 = 4.18$, $df = 1$, $P = 0.04$); parasite abundance decreased

throughout the season in unsupplemented nests, but not supplemented nests (Fig. 1B).

3.2 | Fledging success and nestling growth

Parasite and food treatment affected fledging success (GLM, parasite: $\chi^2 = 4.09$, $df =$

1, $P = 0.04$; food: $\chi^2 = 6.78$, $df = 1$, $P = 0.009$), with sham-fumigated nests having higher

fledging success than fumigated nests and supplemented nests having higher fledging success

than unsupplemented nests (Fig. 1C). However, the interaction between parasite and food

treatment did not affect fledging success ($\chi^2 = 2.35$, $df = 1$, $P = 0.13$). The relationship between

fledging success and parasite abundance did not differ across food treatments (Fig. 1D) (i.e.

tolerance to parasitism did not differ; $\chi^2 = 0.10$, $df = 1$, $P = 0.75$).

Parasite treatment, food treatment, and the interaction between the two factors did not

significantly affect bill length (Tables 1 and S4) (GLMM, parasite: $\chi^2 = 0.69$, $df = 1$, $P = 0.41$,

food: $\chi^2 = 0.99$, $df = 1$, $P = 0.32$, interaction: $\chi^2 = 0.23$, $df = 1$, $P = 0.63$). Parasite treatment had a

marginally non-significant effect on tarsus length (GLMM, parasite: $\chi^2 = 3.65$, $df = 1$, $P = 0.06$),

but food treatment and the interaction between the treatments did not affect tarsus length (food:

$\chi^2 = 0.99$, $df = 1$, $P = 0.32$, interaction: $\chi^2 = 0.72$, $df = 1$, $P = 0.40$). Food treatment affected

nestling body mass and first primary feather length (mass: $\chi^2 = 5.09$, $df = 1$, $P = 0.02$; feather: χ^2

$= 3.36$, $df = 1$, $P = 0.07$) with unsupplemented nestlings having lower body mass and slower

feather growth than supplemented nestlings (Table 1). Parasite treatment and the interaction

between parasite and food treatment did not affect body mass and first primary feather length

(Table 1) (mass: parasite, $\chi^2 = 0.04$, $df = 1$, $P = 0.83$; interaction, $\chi^2 = 0.01$, $df = 1$, $P = 0.92$;

feather: parasite, $\chi^2 = 1.13$, $df = 1$, $P = 0.29$; interaction, $\chi^2 = 0.38$, $df = 1$, $P = 0.54$).

3.3 | Nestling hemoglobin and glucose levels

Parasite treatment affected hemoglobin levels (Table S4) (GLMM, $\chi^2 = 5.55$, $df = 1$, $P =$

0.02) with parasitized nestlings having lower hemoglobin than non-parasitized nestlings (Table

1). Food treatment had a marginally non-significant effect on hemoglobin levels ($\chi^2 = 3.43$, $df =$

1, $P = 0.06$) with unsupplemented nestlings having lower hemoglobin levels than supplemented

nestlings (Table 1). These results were likely because hemoglobin levels were negatively related

to parasite abundance across parasite treatments ($\chi^2 = 18.60$, $df = 1$, $P < 0.0001$). The interaction

between parasite and food treatment did not affect hemoglobin levels ($\chi^2 = 1.29$, $df = 1$, $P =$

0.26). Parasite treatment, food treatment, and the interaction between the two factors did not

affect glucose levels (Tables 1 and S4) (parasite: $\chi^2 = 0.41$, $df = 1$, $P = 0.52$, food: $\chi^2 = 0.83$, $df =$

1, $P = 0.36$, interaction: $\chi^2 = 0.00$, $df = 1$, $P = 0.96$).

3.4 | Immune responses of parasitized nestlings

Food treatment affected nestling antibody levels (Table S5) (GLMM, $\chi^2 = 5.96$, $df =$

1, $P = 0.02$; supplemented, $n = 9$: 0.53 ± 0.15, unsupplemented, $n = 11$: 0.24 ± 0.07) with

supplemented nestlings having higher antibody levels than unsupplemented nestlings within the

sham-fumigated treatment (Fig. 2A). Mean nestling antibody levels within a nest were negatively

related to parasite abundance (Fig. 2B) (GLM, $\chi^2 = 5.86$, $df = 1$, $P = 0.02$). Food treatment did

not affect haptoglobin levels (Table S5) (GLM, $\chi^2 = 0.20$, $df = 1$, $P = 0.65$; supplemented: $0.36 \pm$

0.06, unsupplemented: 0.32 ± 0.04; $n = 5$ nestlings for both treatments). Haptoglobin levels were

not significantly correlated with antibody levels (GLM, $\chi^2 = 0.39$, $df = 1$, $P = 0.53$) or parasite

abundance (GLM, $\chi^2 = 0.08$, $df = 1$, $P = 0.78$).

3.5 | Microbiota of parasitized nestlings

Bacterial community structure and membership differed between the parasitized nestlings

and mealworms, but did not differ between food treatments for the nestlings (Fig. 3A and B)

(PERMANOVA, structure: $F_{2,16} = 2.15$, $P = 0.002$, membership: $F_{2,16} = 2.09$, $P = 0.001$).

Supplemented nestlings had higher bacterial diversity (sobs) compared to unsupplemented

nestlings, but this difference was not significant for sobs (Fig. 4A) (Tables S5 and S6) (GLMM,

$\chi^2 = 3.07$, $df = 1$, $P = 0.08$). Bacterial diversity (sobs) was not significantly related to antibody

levels (Fig. 4B) (GLM, $\chi^2 = 0.85$, $df = 1$, $P = 0.36$) but negatively related to parasite abundance

(Fig. 4C) (GLMM, $\chi^2 = 4.17$, $df = 1$, $P = 0.04$). Food treatment did not significantly affect the

Shannon (GLMM, $\chi^2 = 2.02$, $df = 1$, $P = 0.15$) and Simpson index (Tables S5 and S6) (GLMM,

$\chi^2 = 1.41$, $df = 1$, $P = 0.24$). Neither indices were significantly correlated with parasite abundance

(GLMM, Shannon: $\chi^2 = 0.29$, $df = 1$, $P = 0.59$, Simpson: $\chi^2 = 0.13$, $df = 1$, $P = 0.71$) or antibody

levels (GLM, Shannon: $\chi^2 = 0.43$, $df = 1$, $P = 0.51$, Simpson: $\chi^2 = 0.30$, $df = 1$, $P = 0.59$).

The relative abundance of several bacterial phyla differed between the birds and

mealworms. Birds in both treatments had higher relative abundances of phyla Planctomycetes

(ANOVA, $F = 8.61$, $P = 0.04$) compared to the mealworms, but mealworms had higher relative

abundances of phyla Cyanobacteria (ANOVA, $F = 20.96$, $P = 0.001$) and Tenericutes (ANOVA,

$F = 7.65$, $P = 0.04$) than the birds ($P < 0.05$ for each pairwise test). Mealworms were dominated

by phyla Firmicutes (36.03%), Proteobacteria (25.78%), Cyanobacteria (20.07%), Actinobacteria

(10.14%), Tenericutes (5.25%), and Bacteroidetes (2.44%). Nestling feces were dominated by

phyla Proteobacteria (28.24%), Actinobacteria (28.05%), Firmicutes (21.91%), Bacteroidetes

(8.07%), Cyanobacteria (6.14%), Planctomycetes (1.47%), and Saccharibacteria (1.04%).

Several bacterial genera differed between the nestlings and mealworms (Table S7).

Genera with known pathogenic bacterial species were then compared specifically between

supplemented and unsupplemented birds. *Campylobacter spp., Listeria spp., Mycobacteria spp.,*

Pasteurella spp., Salmonella spp., and Vibrios spp. were not found in the feces of nestlings.

Food treatment did not affect relative abundances of *Enterococcus spp., Escherichia spp.,*

Lactobacillus spp., Staphylococcus spp., and Streptococcus spp. Supplemented birds had higher

relative abundances of genus *Clostridium* (Fig. 4D) (ANOVA, $F = 7.92$, $P = 0.02$) than

unsupplemented birds. Relative abundance of *Clostridium spp.* correlated positively with

antibody levels (Fig. 4E) (GLM, $\chi^2 = 21.39$, $df = 1$, $P < 0.0001$) and negatively with parasite

abundance (Fig. 4F) (GLM, $\chi^2 = 3.59$, $df = 1$, $P = 0.058$), but did not correlate significantly with

haptoglobin levels (GLM, $\chi^2 = 0.11$, $df = 1$, $P = 0.74$).

4 | DISCUSSION

The study showed that parasitism did not significantly affect growth or fledging success

but negatively affected hemoglobin levels. Although nestlings maintained parasite tolerance

across food treatments, food supplementation combatted the sublethal effects of parasitism by

increasing nestling resistance to the parasites. However, food supplementation primarily

benefited the birds (i.e. reduced parasite abundance) early in the breeding season. The extra food

resources increased the nestling antibody response in parasitized nestlings, which decreased

parasite abundance. Interestingly, haptoglobin levels did not relate to parasite abundance, nor

were they affected by food supplementation, suggesting that these acute phase proteins are not

related to blowfly resistance. Supplementation also increased gut bacterial diversity in

parasitized nestlings, which was negatively related to parasite abundance, but not the antibody

response. However, specifically, supplementation increased the relative abundance of genus

Clostridium spp., which was positively related to the antibody response and negatively related to

parasite abundance. The mealworms had a distinct bacterial community from the birds, which

suggests that the nutritional composition of the mealworms influenced the gut microbiota of the

birds. Overall, these results suggest that food supplementation facilitates an increase in gut

Clostridium spp., which potentially primes the non-specific antibody response in nestlings to

resist parasitic nest flies.

Without the extra food, bluebird nestlings are tolerant to the parasitic nest flies, at least in

relation to survival (Grab *et al.* 2019). Therefore, why does food supplementation increase

resistance when the birds are already relatively well-defended against the parasite? Parasitism

negatively affected hemoglobin levels, which could have had lasting effects after the young left

the nest. For example, blowflies did not affect nestling mass or fledging success of ovenbirds

(*Seiurus aurocapilla*), however, fledgling survival and minimum distance traveled the first day

after fledging was significantly lower when the ovenbirds were parasitized (Streby, Peterson &

Kapfer 2009). Thus, when extra food is available resource-dependent resistance is likely

beneficial to ameliorate the long-term or subtle adverse effects of parasitism.

Traditionally, food supplementation is thought to have a direct effect on the antibody

response produced by the host. Immune function can be condition-dependent because the

immune response can be energetically costly to produce and therefore only hosts in good

condition may be physiologically able to invest in these responses (reviewed by Sheldon and

Verhulst 1996; Lochmiller and Deerenberg 2000; Svensson *et al.* 1998). Other studies have

found that supplemented nutrients can increase immunity (e.g. Ig antibodies) to parasites (Datta

et al. 1998). For example, hosts fed a high-protein diet produced more IgG antibodies to

parasitic worms compared to hosts fed a low-protein diet (Datta *et al.* 1998). Supplemented

mealworms could provide the necessary additional protein to induce or increase the development

of the IgY response in nestlings.

Food supplementation might have also or alternatively affected the nestling antibody

response through changes in the gut microbiota. Host diet can affect the gut microbiota (David *et*

al. 2014; Carmody *et al.* 2015; Knutie *et al.* 2017a). Specifically, my study found that food

supplementation increased the relative abundance of *Clostridium* spp. and other studies have also

found varying effects of host diet on *Clostridium* spp. abundance (e.g. in chickens) (Stutz &

Lawton 1984; Mitsch *et al.* 2004; Jia *et al.* 2009). For example, Drew *et al.* (2004) found that

protein supplementation increased *Clostridium perfringens* abundance. The high protein content

of mealworms (46.44%) (Ravzanaadii *et al.* 2012) could be responsible for the increase

Clostridium spp. abundance, but this idea requires further study.

A remaining question is whether the presence of *Clostridium spp.* in the gut is priming a

non-specific antibody response to ectoparasitic nest flies. Pathogenic *Clostridium spp.* can

activate the innate and adaptive immune system (including the IgY antibody response) in

chickens (Kulkarni *et al.* 2007), which can be influenced by food supplementation (Yitbarek *et*

al. 2012). Furthermore, priority effects, or the effect of one species on another species due to its

earlier arrival, can influence the fitness of the multiple symbionts (Sousa 1992; de Roode *et al.*

2005; Devevey *et al.* 2015). For example, initial infection by parasitic worms can negatively

affect the establishment of subsequent infections by other parasitic species in the host

(Hoverman, Hoye & Johnson 2013; Wuerthner, Hua & Hoverman 2017), which could either be

mediated by direct competition between the parasites or by the priming of the immune response

of the host. Although gut bacteria and ectoparasites occupy different spaces on and in their host,

the organisms are potentially exposed to the same circulating molecules related to the immune

system (e.g. plasma IgY antibodies). However, future experimental studies are needed to

determine whether increases in *Clostridium* spp. in hatchlings causally affects their IgY antibody

response and resistance to *P. sialia*.

Between 1920-1970, bluebird populations declined throughout North America due, in

part, to habitat destruction and the introduction of invasive species (Gowaty & Plissner 2015).

However, in the 1980s, bluebird populations started to rebound because the public established

nest boxes throughout the range of the bluebird. At study's field site, I established 70 nest boxes

in 2014-15, which increased to 150 boxes by 2017. Consequently, the number of nesting

bluebird pairs increased from six pairs in 2015 to 31 pairs in 2017, and this number continues to

increase. Across the past several decades, the public also became concerned about nest parasites

affecting the health of the birds and therefore, have implemented methods to eliminate or deter

the parasites (Zeleny 1976). Methods to remove parasites include removing old nests from the

box (Møller 1989) and placing deterrents in the box, such as vanilla extract and insecticides

(S.A.K. pers. comm.). My study suggests that supplying mealworms to bluebirds not only

increases the health of nestlings, but also reduces parasite loads in the nests. However, these

effects are most pronounced during the early part of the breeding season, likely because natural

insect (food) availability is lowest at this time (Bowlin & Winkler 2004).

5 | CONCLUSION

Determining the consequences of food supplementation is important because artificial bird feeding is a common activity for humans throughout the world (reviewed in Cox & Gaston 2018). The results of this study show that increasing food availability for hosts can decrease parasite pressure, especially during formative life stages. However, studies have shown that having an epicenter of feeders where animals are directly or indirectly interacting can increase transmission of more directly transmitted parasites (Becker *et al.* 2015). Therefore, the effect of food supplementation on parasite resistance could vary when considering how feeders affect parasite exposure. In this study, only the focal bluebirds were visiting the feeders (S.A.K. pers. obs.), which reduced contact with other birds. Therefore, when feeding breeding birds, especially box-nesting birds, placing individual feeders in the birds' territory could increase host defenses without the risk of infection transmission.

Additionally, the results of the study might be particularly important for systems that are dealing with detrimental parasites, such as Darwin's finches of the Galapagos Islands or pardalotes of Australia and their parasitic nest flies (Fessl *et al.* 2010; Edworthy, Langmore & Heinsohn 2019). When managing the parasites is not immediately possible, providing additional food resources to the host could help increase their resistance (or even tolerance; (Knutie *et al.* 2016; McNew *et al.* 2019)) to parasites. However, assessing the potential risks of providing additional resources to endangered or threatened species is required before attempting the method.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I thank Terry Whitworth for identifying *Protocalliphora sialia*, Steve Knutie and Doug

Thompson for building nest boxes, and Itasca Biological Station (David Biesboer, Laura

Domine, and Lesley Knoll) for logistical support. I also thank the following people for allowing

us access to nest boxes on their property and their help in the field (in alphabetical order): Wade

and Kelly Foy (Rock Creek General Store), Aaron Hebbeler, Jim Humeniuk, John and Dottie

Hurlbert, Alvin and Dorothy Katzenmeyer, Lesley Knoll, Lake Itasca Pioneer Farmer's, Helen

and Ken Perry, Natasha, Jay, Tatiana, and Jesse Smrekar, and Doug and Dawn Thompson. I

thank Brian Hiller, McKenzie Ingram, Allie Parker, and Darya Pokutnaya for field assistance,

Lauren Albert for lab assistance, Sabrina McNew, Samantha Rumschlag, and Michael Mahon for

help with the statistical analyses, and Kendra Maas at the University of Connecticut Microbial

Analysis, Resources, and Services for workshop training and advice on the Mothur

bioinformatics. The work was funded by a Savaloja Research Grant from the Minnesota

Ornithologists' Union, a Research Grant from the North American Bluebird Society, and start-up

funds from the University of Connecticut. All applicable institutional guidelines for the care and

use of animals were followed. The author declares no competing interests.

DATA ACCESSIBILITY

Sequences have been uploaded to GenBank (BioProject accession number: available upon

acceptance) and data have been uploaded to FigShare (doi available upon acceptance).

REFERENCES

Altizer, S., Becker, D.J., Epstein, J.H., Forbes, K.M., Gillespie, T.R., Hall, R.J., Hawley, D.M.,

Hernandez, S.M., Martin, L.B., Plowright, R.K., Satterfield, D.A. & Streicker, D.G. (2018) Food for contagion: synthesis and future directions for studying host–parasite responses to resource shifts in anthropogenic environments. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, **373**, 20170102.

Becker, D.J., Hall, R.J., Forbes, K.M., Plowright, R.K. & Altizer, S. (2018) Anthropogenic resource subsidies and host–parasite dynamics in wildlife. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, **373**, 20180086.

Becker, D.J., Streicker, D.G. & Altizer, S. (2015) Linking anthropogenic resources to wildlife-pathogen dynamics: a review and meta-analysis. *Ecology Letters*, **18**, 483–495.

Benskin, C.M.H., Wilson, K., Jones, K. & Hartley, I.R. (2009) Bacterial pathogens in wild birds: a review of the frequency and effects of infection. *Biological Reviews*, **84**, 349–373.

Bosse, M., Spurgin, L.G., Laine, V.N., Cole, E.F., Firth, J.A., Gienapp, P., Gosler, A.G., McMahon, K., Poissant, J., Verhagen, I., Groenen, M.A.M., Van Oers, K., Sheldon, B.C., Visser, M.E. & Slate, J. (2017) Recent natural selection causes adaptive evolution of an avian polygenic trait. *Science*, **6361**, 365–368.

Bowlin, M.S. & Winkler, D.W. (2004) Natural variation in flight performance Is related to timing of breeding in tree swallows (*Tachycineta bicolor*) in New York. *The Auk*, **121**, 345–353.

Carmody, R.N., Gerber, G.K., Luevano, J.M., Gatti, D.M., Somes, L., Svenson, K.L. & Turnbaugh, P.J. (2015) Diet dominates host genotype in shaping the murine gut microbiota. *Cell Host and Microbe*, **17**, 72–84.

Christe, P., Richner, H. & Oppliger, A. (1996) Begging, food provisioning, and nestling competition in great tit broods infested with ectoparasites. *Behavioral Ecology*, **7**, 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**, 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. *The Journal of*

Animal Ecology, **83**, 256–265.

Cotter, S.C., Simpson, S.J., Raubenheimer, D. & Wilson, K. (2011) Macronutrient balance

mediates trade-offs between immune function and life history traits. *Functional Ecology*,

25, 186–198.

Cox, D.T.C. & Gaston, K.J. (2016) Urban bird feeding: connecting people with nature. *PLoS*

ONE, **11**, e0158717.

Cox, D.T.C. & Gaston, K.J. (2018) Human–nature interactions and the consequences and drivers

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

Sciences, **373**, 20170092.

Cox, D.T.C., Inger, R., Hancock, S., Anderson, K. & Gaston, K.J. (2016) Movement of feeder-

using songbirds: the influence of urban features. *Scientific Reports*, **6**, 37669.

Datta, F.U., Nolan, J. V., Rowe, J.B. & Gray, G.D. (1998) Protein supplementation improves the

performance of parasitised sheep fed a straw-based diet. *International Journal for*

Parasitology, **28**, 1269–1278.

David, L.A., Maurice, C.F., Carmody, R.N., Gootenberg, D.B., Button, J.E., Wolfe, B.E., Ling,

A. V, Devlin, A.S., Varma, Y., Fischbach, M.A., Biddinger, S.B., Dutton, R.J. &

Turnbaugh, P.J. (2014) Diet rapidly and reproducibly alters the human gut microbiome.

Nature, **505**, 559–563.

Demas, G.E. (2004) The energetics of immunity: a neuroendocrine link between energy balance

and immune function. *Hormones and Behavior*, **45**, 173–180.

DeSimone, J.G., Clotfelter, E.D., Black, E.C. & Knutie, S.A. (2018) Avoidance, tolerance, and

resistance to ectoparasites in nestling and adult tree swallows. *Journal of Avian Biology*, **49**,

jav-01641.

Devevey, G., Dang, T., Graves, C.J., Murray, S. & Brisson, D. (2015) First arrived takes all:

inhibitory priority effects dominate competition between co-infecting *Borrelia burgdorferi*

strains. *BMC Microbiology*, **15**, 61.

Drew, M.D., Syed, N.A., Goldade, B.G., Laarveld, B. & Van Kessel, A.G. (2004) Effects of

dietary protein source and level on intestinal populations of *Clostridium perfringens* in

broiler chickens. *Poultry Science*, **83**, 414–420.

Edgar, R.C., Haas, B.J., Clemente, J.C., Quince, C. & Knight, R. (2011) UCHIME improves

sensitivity and speed of chimera detection. *Bioinformatics*, **27**, 2194–2200.

Edworthy, A.B., Langmore, N.E. & Heinsohn, R. (2019) Native fly parasites are the principal

cause of nestling mortality in endangered Tasmanian pardalotes. *Animal Conservation*, **22**,

96–103.

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 of London B*, **365**, 1019–

1030.

Fox, J. & Weisberg, S. (2002) An {R} Companion to Applied Regression. *Sage Publications*, 2–

3.

Fuller, R.A., Warren, P.H., Armsworth, P.R., Barbosa, O. & Gaston, K.J. (2008) Garden bird

feeding predicts the structure of urban avian assemblages. *Diversity and Distributions*, **14**,

131–137.

Gowaty, P.A. & Plissner, J.H. (2015) Eastern bluebird (*Sialia sialis*). *The Birds of North America Online*, 2nd ed (ed A. Poole), Cornell Lab of Ornithology, Ithaca, NY, USA.

Grab, K.M., Hiller, B.J., Hurlbert, J.H., Ingram, M.E., Parker, A.B., Pokutnaya, D.Y. & Knutie, S.A. (2019) Host tolerance and resistance to parasitic nest flies differs between two wild bird species. *Ecology and Evolution,* 12144–12155.

Hannam, K. (2006) Ectoparasitic blow flies (*Protocalliphora* sp.) and nestling Eastern Bluebirds (*Sialia sialis*): direct effects and compensatory strategies. *Canadian Journal of Zoology*, **84**, 921–930.

Hooper, L. V., Littman, D.R. & Macpherson, A.J. (2012) Interactions between the microbiota and the immune system. *Science*, **336**, 1268–1273.

Hoverman, J.T., Hoye, B.J. & Johnson, P.T.J. (2013) Does timing matter? How priority effects influence the outcome of parasite interactions within hosts. *Oecologia*, **173**, 1471–1480.

Howick, V.M. & Lazzaro, B.P. (2014) Genotype and diet shape resistance and tolerance across distinct phases of bacterial infection. *BMC Evolutionary Biology*, **14**, 56.

Jia, W., Slominski, B.A., Bruce, H.L., Blank, G., Crow, G. & Jones, O. (2009) Effects of diet type and enzyme addition on growth performance and gut health of broiler chickens during subclinical *Clostridium perfringens* challenge. *Poultry Science*, **88**, 132–140.

Johnson, C.W. (1929) The injury to nestling birds by the larvae of *Protocalliphora*. *Annals of the Entomological Society of America*, **22**, 131–135.

Jones, D. (2011) An appetite for connection: why we need to understand the effect and value of feeding wild birds. *Emu*, **111**, i–vii.

Jones, D.N. & James Reynolds, S. (2008) Feeding birds in our towns and cities: a global research

592   opportunity. *Journal of Avian Biology*, **39**, 265–271.

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

594   Thompson, M., Koop, J.A.H. & Clayton, D.H. (2016) Galápagos mockingbirds tolerate

595   introduced parasites that affect Darwin's finches. *Ecology*, **97**, 940–950.

596 Knutie, S.A., Shea, L.A., Kupselaitis, M., Wilkinson, C.L., Kohl, K.D. & Rohr, J.R. (2017a)

597   Early-life diet affects host microbiota and later-life defenses against parasites in frogs.

598   *Integrative and Comparative Biology*, **57**, 732–742.

599 Knutie, S.A., Wilkinson, C.L., Kohl, K.D. & Rohr, J.R. (2017b) Early-life disruption of

600   amphibian microbiota decreases later-life resistance to parasites. *Nature Communications*,

601   **8**, 86.

602 Knutie, S.A., Wilkinson, C.L., Wu, Q.C., Ortega, C.N. & Rohr, J.R. (2017c) Host resistance and

603   tolerance of parasitic gut worms depend on resource availability. *Oecologia*, **183**, 1031–

604   1040.

605 Kozich, J.J., Westcott, S.L., Baxter, N.T., Highlander, S.K. & Schloss, P.D. (2013) Development

606   of a dual-index sequencing strategy and curation pipeline for analyzing amplicon sequence

607   data on the miseq illumina sequencing platform. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology*,

608   **79**, 5112–5120.

609 Kulkarni, R.R., Parreira, V.R., Sharif, S. & Prescott, J.F. (2007) Immunization of broiler

610   chickens against *Clostridium perfringens*-induced necrotic enteritis. *Clinical and Vaccine*

611   *Immunology*, **14**, 1070–1077.

612 Kumar, P.S., Mason, M.R., Brooker, M.R. & O'Brien, K. (2012) Pyrosequencing reveals unique

613   microbial signatures associated with healthy and failing dental implants. *Journal of Clinical*

614   *Periodontology*, **39**, 425–433.

Lee, K.P., Cory, J.S., Wilson, K., Raubenheimer, D. & Simpson, S.J. (2006) Flexible diet choice

offsets protein costs of pathogen resistance in a caterpillar. *Proceedings of the Royal Society*

B: Biological Sciences, **273**, 823–829.

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

the cost of immunity? *Oikos*, **88**, 87–98.

Lochmiller, R.L., Vestey, M.R. & Boren, J.C. (1993) Relationship between protein nutritional

status and immunocompetence in northern bobwhite chicks. *The Auk*, **110**, 503–510.

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

Bush, S.E. & Clayton, D.H. (2019) Annual environmental variation influences host

tolerance to parasites. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, **286**,

20190049.

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

Science, **335**, 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**, 945–956.

Mitsch, P., Zitterl-Eglseer, K., Kohler, B., Gabler, C., Losa, R. & Zimpernik, I. (2004) The effect

of two different blends of essential oil components on the proliferation of *Clostridium*

perfringens in the intestines of broiler chickens. *Poultry Science*, **83**, 669–675.

Møller, A.P. (1989) Parasites, predators and nest boxes: facts and artefacts in nest box studies of

birds? *Oikos*, **56**, 421–423.

Murray, M.H., Becker, D.J., Hall, R.J. & Hernandez, S.M. (2016) Wildlife health and

supplemental feeding: A review and management recommendations. *Biological*

Conservation, **204**, 163–174.

Owen, J.P., Delany, M.E., Cardona, C.J., Bickford, A.A. & Mullens, B.A. (2009) Host

inflammatory response governs fitness in an avian ectoparasite, the northern fowl mite

(*Ornithonyssus sylviarum*). *International Journal for Parasitology*, **39**, 789–799.

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

systems. *Trends in Parasitology*, **26**, 530–9.

Pinkowski, B.C. (1977a) Foraging behavior of the eastern bluebird. *The Wilson Bulletin*, **89**,

404–414.

Pinkowski, B.C. (1977b) Blowfly parasitism of eastern bluebirds in natural and artificial nest

sites. *Journal of Wildlife Management*, **41**, 272–276.

Quast, C., Pruesse, E., Yilmaz, P., Gerken, J., Schweer, T., Yarza, P., Peplies, J. & Glöckner,

F.O. (2013) The SILVA ribosomal RNA gene database project: imporved data processing

and web-based tools. *Nucleic Acids Research*, **41**, D590–D596.

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

tolerance to infectious diseases in animals. *Science*, **318**, 812–814.

Ravzanaadii, N., Kim, S.-H., Choi, W.-H., Hong, S.-J. & Kim, N.-J. (2012) Nutritional value of

mealworm, *Tenebrio molitor*, as food source. *International Journal of Industrial*

Entomology, **25**, 93–98.

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**, 2638–2641.

Robb, G.N., McDonald, R.A., Chamberlain, D.E. & Bearhop, S. (2008) Food for thought:

supplementary feeding as a driver of ecological change in avian populations. *Frontiers in*

Ecology and the Environment, **6**, 476–484.

Roby, D.D., Brink, K.L. & Whitmann, K. (1992) Effects of bird blowfly parasitism on eastern

bluebird and tree swallow nestlings. *Wilson Bulletin*, **104**, 630–643.

de Roode, Michelle E. H. Helinski, Anwar & Read. (2005) Dynamics of multiple infection and

within-host competition in genetically diverse malaria infections. *The American Naturalist*,

166, 531.

Round, J.L. & Mazmanian, S.K. (2009) The gut microbiota shapes intestinal immune responses

during health and disease. *Nature Reviews Immunology*, **9**, 313–323.

Ruhs, E.C., Vézina, F. & Karasov, W. (2018) Physiological and immune responses of free-

living, temperate birds provided a gradient of food supplementation. *Physiological and*

Biochemical Zoology, **92**, 701389.

Sánchez, C.A., Becker, D.J., Teitelbaum, C.S., Barriga, P., Brown, L.M., Majewska, A.A., Hall,

R.J. & Altizer, S. (2018) On the relationship between body condition and parasite infection

in wildlife: a review and meta-analysis. *Ecology Letters*, **21**, 1869–1884.

Sauer, J.R. & Droege, S. (1990) Recent population trends of the eastern bluebird. *The Wilson*

Bulletin, **102**, 239–252.

Schloss, P.D., Westcott, S.L., Ryabin, T., Hall, J.R., Hartmann, M., Hollister, E.B., Lesniewski,

R.A., Oakley, B.B., Parks, D.H., Robinson, C.J., Sahl, J.W., Stres, B., Thallinger, G.G., Van

Horn, D.J. & Weber, C.F. (2009) Introducing mothur: Open-source, platform-independent,

community-supported software for describing and comparing microbial communities.

Applied and Environmental Microbiology, **75**, 7537–7541.

Shaw, A., Miller, K.. & Wescott, G. (2017) Australian native gardens: Is there scope for a

community shift? *Landscape and Urban Planning*, **157**, 322–330.

Shchipkova, A.Y., Nagaraja, H.N. & Kumar, P.S. (2010) Subgingival microbial profiles of

smokers with periodontitis. *Journal of Dental Research*, **89**, 1247–1253.

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

offs in evolutionary ecology. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, **11**, 317–321.

Simms, E.L. (2000) Defining tolerance as a norm of reaction. *Evolutionary Ecology*, **14**, 563–

570.

Smar, M. (1996) The Ecology of Protocalliphora (Diptera: Calliphoridae) Parasitism of Two

Cavity Nesting Passerine Birds in Southwestern Quebec. Master's Thesis, McGill

University.

Sousa, W.P. (1992) Interspecific interactions among larval trematode parasites of freshwater and

marine snails. *American Zoologist*, **32**, 583–592.

Start, D., Bonner, C., Weis, A.E. & Gilbert, B. (2018) Consumer-resource interactions along

urbanization gradients drive natural selection. *Evolution*, **9**, 1863–1873.

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**, 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**, 20170088.

Streby, H.M., Peterson, S.M. & Kapfer, P.M. (2009) Fledging success is a poor indicator of the

effects of bird blow flies on ovenbird survival. *The Condor*, **111**, 193–197.

Stutz, M.W. & Lawton, G.C. (1984) Effects of diet and antimicrobials on growth, feed

efficiency, intestinal *Clostridium perfringens*, and ileal weight of broiler chicks. *Poultry

Science*, **63**, 2036–2042.

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

immunosuppression and the costs of an antibody response. *Functional Ecology*, **12**, 912–

919.

Tollington, S., Ewen, J.G., Newton, J., McGill, R.A.R., Smith, D., Henshaw, A., Fogell, D.J.,

Tatayah, V., Greenwood, A., Jones, C.G. & Groombridge, J.J. (2019) Individual

consumption of supplemental food as a predictor of reproductive performance and viral

infection intensity. *Journal of Applied Ecology*, **56**, 594–603.

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

blue tits. *Oikos*, **78**, 557–561.

Wang, Q., Garrity, G.M., Tiedje, J.M. & Cole, J.R. (2007) Naïve Bayesian classifier for rapid

assignment of rRNA sequences into the new bacterial taxonomy. *Applied and*

Environmental Microbiology, **73**, 5261–5267.

Wilcoxen, T.E., Horn, D., Hogan, B.M., Hubble, C.N., Huber, S.J., Flamm, J., Knott, M.,

Lundstrom, L., Salik, F., Wassenhove, S.J. & Wrobel, E.R. (2015) Effects of bird-feeding

activities on the health of wild birds. *Conservation Physiology*, **3**, cov058.

Wittmann, K. & Beason, R.C. (1992) The effect of blowfly parasitism on nestling eastern

bluebird development. *Journal of Field Ornithology*, **63**, 286–293.

Wuerthner, V.P., Hua, J. & Hoverman, J.T. (2017) The benefits of coinfection: trematodes alter

disease outcomes associated with virus infection. *Journal of Animal Ecology*, **86**, 921–931.

Yitbarek, A., Echeverry, H., Brady, J., Hernandez-Doria, J., Camelo-Jaimes, G., Sharif, S.,

Guenter, W., House, J.D. & Rodriguez-Lecompte, J.C. (2012) Innate immune response to

yeast-derived carbohydrates in broiler chickens fed organic diets and challenged with

Clostridium perfringens. *Poultry Science*, **91**, 1105–1112.

Zeleny, L. 1976. *The Bluebird: How You Can Help Its Fight For Survival*. Indiana University

Press, Bloomington, IN, USA. 170pp.

 Figure Legend

 Fig. 1. Effect of food and parasite treatment on parasite load and fledging success of bluebirds.

 Birds that were supplemented with food were more resistant to parasites than birds that were not

 supplemented (A). Parasite abundance decreased throughout the breeding season in the

 unsupplemented treatment but not the supplemented treatment (B). Parasitism did not affect

 fledging success, but supplemented birds had marginally higher fledging success than

 unsupplemented bird (C). Within the parasitized treatment, birds from each treatment were

 tolerant to their respective parasite abundances (D).

 Fig. 2. Within the parasitized treatment, supplemented birds had higher antibody levels than

 unsupplemented birds (A). Antibody levels were negatively related to parasite abundance (B).

 Fig. 3. Within the parasitized treatment, bacterial community structure (A) and membership (B)

 of nestlings did not differ between food treatments. The bacterial community of mealworms was

 distinct from the bacterial community of the nestlings.

 Fig. 4. Effect of food treatment on microbiota of nestlings and the relationships among

 microbiota, immune response, and parasite abundance within the parasitized treatment.

 Supplemented nestlings had marginally higher bacterial diversity than unsupplemented nestlings

 (A). Bacterial diversity was not significantly related to antibody levels (B) but negatively related

 to parasite abundance (C). Relative abundance of *Clostridium* spp. was higher in supplemented

 nestlings than unsupplemented nestlings (D). *Clostridium* spp. abundance was positively related

 to antibody levels (E) and negatively related to parasite abundance (F).

755 Table 1. Effect of parasite and food treatment on nestling growth, physiology, and fledging

756 success. Numbers are mean ± SE and numbers in parentheses are the number of nests.

Measurement	Non-supplemented		Supplemented	
	Non-parasitized	Parasitized	Non-parasitized	Parasitized
Parasite abundance	0.00 ± 0.00 (9)	55.55 ± 10.60 (11)	0.00 ± 0.00 (6)	12.89 ± 5.00 (9)
Bill length (mm)	5.00 ± 0.12 (6)	5.19 ± 0.14 (11)	5.26 ± 0.22 (6)	5.27 ± 0.10 (9)
Tarsus length (mm)	18.35 ± 0.19 (6)	18.60 ± 0.23 (11)	18.32 ± 0.25 (6)	18.93 ± 0.13 (9)
1st primary length (mm)	13.64 ± 1.06 (6)	16.41 ± 1.51 (11)	17.26 ± 1.43 (6)	17.81 ± 0.81 (9)
Mass (g)	25.71 ± 0.77 (6)	25.50 ± 0.77 (11)	27.21 ± 0.52 (6)	27.11 ± 0.56 (9)
Hemoglobin levels (g/dL)	11.21 ± 0.47 (5)	8.29 ± 0.83 (11)	11.55 ± 0.30 (6)	10.54 ± 0.88 (9)
Glucose levels (mg/dL)	282.50 ± 17.53 (5)	287.30 ± 32.50 (11)	321.30 ± 25.09 (6)	293.40 ± 18.80 (9)
Nestlings fledged	26/34 (77%)	48/51 (94%)	21/21 (100%)	38/39 (97%)

758   Fig. 1.

761   Fig. 2.

764   Fig. 3.

A

B

766   Fig. 4.

767