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

Vincenzo A. Ellis, Michael D. Collins, Matthew C.I. Medeiros, Eloisa H. R. Sari, Elyse D. Coffey, Rebecca C. Dickerson, Camile Lugarini, Jeffrey A. Stratford, Donata R. Henry, Loren Merrill, Alix E. Matthews, Alison Hanson, Jackson Roberts, Michael Joyce, Melanie R. Kunkel, and Robert E. Ricklefs

Supplementary Information, Tables S1-S9, Figures S1-S4

Table S1 All parasite lineages recovered in our study and the number of times each was sampled overall (N), the number of hosts each was found infecting, its genus, and the Genbank number(s) where the sequence can be recovered. Lineages are ordered by their abundance in our samples.

Lineage	N	Number of Hosts	Genus	Genbank Numbers
OZ 14	257	33	Plasmodium	AY540210, HM222474
OZ 01	253	26	Plasmodium	GQ395654, HQ287549, GQ395654, GQ141574
OZ 35	194	8	Plasmodium	HM222474-HM222480
NA 04	115	9	Haemoproteus	AF465562
OZ 10	80	6	Haemoproteus	AF465576
OZ 08	66	6	Plasmodium	AF540207, HM222485
LA 01	57	6	Haemoproteus	AF465572
OZ 03	55	15	Haemoproteus	AF465563
OZ 05	55	6	Haemoproteus	AY167241
OZ 06	52	17	Plasmodium	AF465554
KZ 01	50	17	Plasmodium	AY455663, KF359936
CHI 02PL	44	2	Plasmodium	KC789821
NA 15	35	6	Haemoproteus	GQ395665, GQ141584
CHI 08PA	28	2	Haemoproteus	KM280616, KM065800
OZ 02	28	10	Haemoproteus	AY455658
OZ 12	28	5	Haemoproteus	AY817748, GQ395673
OZ 45	27	11	Plasmodium	HM222481, HM222482
CHI 35PL	26	7	Plasmodium	KM280608
TI P25L	23	2	Plasmodium	KC680673, KC680702, KC680706
LA 22	22	3	Haemoproteus	HQ287537
CHI 05PL	21	5	Plasmodium	KC789824
CHI 20PA	20	9	Haemoproteus	KM065797, KM280614
CHI 09PL	18	6	Plasmodium	KC789828
CHI 30PA	18	2	Haemoproteus	KM280621, KM280624, KM280635
OZ 49	18	1	Haemoproteus	KJ910306, KF359931
EL 02	16	7	Plasmodium	KM598210
OZ 07	16	7	Haemoproteus	AF465580
OZ 04	15	7	Plasmodium	AY540197, GQ395669, GQ395657, KC680705,

				KC680692, KC680679
OZ 26	15	2	Haemoproteus	AY540212
OZ 16	14	9	Haemoproteus	AY817750
JA 01	12	4	Plasmodium	KM598212
OZ 17	11	3	Haemoproteus	GQ395632, AY817751, AY167244
CHI 23PA	10	2	Haemoproteus	KM280611
NA 01	9	7	Plasmodium	AF465547
OZ 13	9	1	Haemoproteus	AY540209, AY540209, GQ395674, GU252006
OZ 09	8	3	Plasmodium	AY540208, KC680672
OZ 25	8	4	Plasmodium	AY540211, GQ395679, GQ141593
IN 01	7	1	Haemoproteus	KM598226
NA 05	6	1	Haemoproteus	AF465564
OZ 38	6	4	Plasmodium	AF465559, HQ287545
CHI 16PL	5	3	Plasmodium	KC680714
MI 02	5	1	Plasmodium	KM598221
NA 14	5	1	Haemoproteus	AY540205
OZ 54	5	3	Plasmodium	KF359933
OZ 58	5	1	Haemoproteus	KM598223
PR 03	5	4	Haemoproteus	AY455659
OZ 36	4	1	Plasmodium	AY540220, AY167248
YU 01	4	3	Plasmodium	DQ838997, DQ659549, HQ287539, GQ395688, GQ141598
GAM 06	3	3	Plasmodium	KP771715
KZ 02	3	3	Plasmodium	AY540195
NA 16	3	2	Haemoproteus	HM222472, GQ395666, GU252003
OZ 19	3	3	Plasmodium	AY455661
OZ 21	3	3	Haemoproteus	AY167242, HQ287540
OZ 28	3	1	Haemoproteus	AY817753
OZ 53	3	2	Haemoproteus	KJ91307, KM065799
OZ 55	3	1	Plasmodium	KF359934
TI P10	3	3	Plasmodium	KC680707
CHI 26PA	2	2	Haemoproteus	KM280632
IN 04	2	1	Haemoproteus	KP771716
MI 01	2	1	Plasmodium	KM598218
NA 11	2	2	Plasmodium	AF465549
OZ 27	2	2	Haemoproteus	AY817752
CE hapH	1	1	Haemoproteus	JX501902
CHI 17PL	1	1	Plasmodium	JN792148, EU627845
CHI 19PA	1	1	Haemoproteus	KM280617
CHI 27PA	1	1	Haemoproteus	KM280631
CHI 28PA	1	1	Haemoproteus	KM280633
DR 07	1	1	Haemoproteus	HM222464

IN 02	1	1	Plasmodium	KM598227
IN 05	1	1	Plasmodium	KP771717
JA 04	1	1	Plasmodium	KM598213
LA 07	1	1	Haemoproteus	GQ395658, GU252000
LSW 01	1	1	Plasmodium	KP771718
MI 03	1	1	Haemoproteus	KM598220
MI 04	1	1	Haemoproteus	KM598219
MI 05	1	1	Plasmodium	KM598228
NA 10	1	1	Haemoproteus	AY540202
OZ 29	1	1	Haemoproteus	AY817754
OZ 31	1	1	Haemoproteus	AF465582
OZ 32	1	1	Haemoproteus	AY540214
OZ 34	1	1	Haemoproteus	AY540216, GQ395682, GQ141596
OZ 43	1	1	Haemoproteus	AY817755
OZ 51	1	1	Plasmodium	KJ910311, KF359932
OZ 57	1	1	Haemoproteus	GU252022
OZ 60	1	1	Plasmodium	KP771719
TN 24	1	1	Haemoproteus	KM065796
YU 03	1	1	Haemoproteus	GQ395690, GU252009

Location	Abbrev- iation	Longitude (°W)	Latitude (°N)	Sample Years	Ν	Sample Type
Alabama	ALA	87.84833	31.13	2001	108	Community-level
Champaign	CHAMP	88.54445	40.3126	2014	37	Restricted to several species
Chicago	CHI	87.7607	41.74647	2006, 2007	2023	Community-level
western Chicago	CHI2	88.78047	41.83926	2014	13	Restricted to several species
Connecticut	СТ	73.25889	41.145	2002, 2003	301	Community-level
Indiana	IN	86.75176	39.06639	2012, 2013	500	Community-level
Louisiana	LA	89.71083	30.4025	2013	157	Community-level
Michigan	MI	85.34944	42.32667	2012	381	Community-level
Mississippi	MS	88.812	33.474	2013	39	Restricted to one species, <i>Cardinalis cardinalis</i>
Ozarks	OZ	91.0374	37.12555	1999, 2000, 2001, 2002, 2005, 2007, 2011	1438	Community-level
Pennsylvania	PA	75.88861	41.24472	2012, 2013	204	the 2012 sample was restricted to several species, the 2013 sample was community-level
St. Louis	STL	90.5625	38.52472	2008, 2009	338	Community-level
Tennessee	TN	84.48111	35.87361	2013	328	Community-level

Table S2 Information on each sampling location, including the total number of samples collected (N).

Table S3 Simple Mantel correlations for the connections in Fig 2. All associated *P* values are lower than 0.05.

	Birds	Parasites	Climate
Parasites	0.446		
Climate	0.815	0.424	
Space	0.572	0.326	0.595

Table S4 Results of a principal components analysis (PCA) of 19 bioclim variables downloaded from http://www.worldclim.org/ for each of our community sampling locations. We report the proportion of variance and cumulative variance explained by each axis up to eight axes, although we only used five in our analysis.

	PC1	PC2	PC3	PC4	PC5	PC6	PC7	PC8
Proportion of variance	0.7435	0.1312	0.08014	0.02375	0.01187	0.00695	0.00211	0.00038
Cumulative variance	0.7435	0.8747	0.95481	0.97856	0.99043	0.99738	0.99949	0.99988

Table S5 Results of partial Mantel tests comparing hypothesized relationships between space (i.e., geographic distance between sites), the environment (i.e., climatic differences between sites), birds (i.e., host community dissimilarity between sites), and parasites separated by genus (i.e., parasite community dissimilarity between sites). Relationships between birds and the environment and space (not including parasites) can be found in Table 1.

Parasite Genus	Relationship b	etween	Controlling for	r _p	Р
Haemoproteus	Birds	Environment	Parasites	0.80	< 0.001
	Birds	Space	Parasites	0.53	0.006
	Parasites	Environment	Birds	0.10	0.292
	Parasites	Space	Birds	0.14	0.226
	Parasites	Environment	Space	0.17	0.163
	Parasites	Space	Environment	0.13	0.237
	Birds	Parasites	Environment	0.10	0.291
	Birds	Parasites	Space	0.17	0.135
Plasmodium	Birds	Environment	Parasites	0.78	< 0.001
	Birds	Space	Parasites	0.51	0.010
	Parasites	Environment	Birds	0.24	0.113
	Parasites	Space	Birds	0.18	0.216
	Parasites	Environment	Space	0.30	0.086
	Parasites	Space	Environment	0.13	0.257
	Birds	Parasites	Environment	0.04	0.395
	Birds	Parasites	Space	0.22	0.108

Table S6 We also analyzed the relationships between distance matrices presented in Figure 2 using multiple regression on distance matrices (MRM), and we present those results here. MRM analysis involves unfolding the upper elements of a distance matrix (above the diagonal) into a vector and using this vector in a multiple regression analysis, where significance of model coefficients and the model R^2 value are determined by permutation of the response variable (1). Here we calculate a "whole model" where the response variable is derived from the distance matrix of bird distributions ("Hosts") or the distance matrix of parasite distributions ("Parasites"), and all of the remaining distance matrices from Figure 2 are included as explanatory variables after being converted to vectors ("Geography" refers to the matrix of geographic distances between sampling locations). These models were constructed using all parasites together and each parasite genus separately. We report an R^2 and corresponding P value in parentheses for each whole model, and the model coefficients for each explanatory variable (i.e., distance matrix) and their corresponding P values. Following Krasnov et al. (2), we removed each explanatory variable from the whole model and re-calculated the R^2 and corresponding P value for the model without that explanatory variable (" R^2 Without"). " R^2 Pure" is the whole model R^2 minus " R^2 Without", and represents a measure of the variance explained by the explanatory variable that was removed. Finally, we calculated the percentage of the model variance explained by each explanatory variable by dividing " R^2 Pure" by the whole model R^2 and multiplying by 100 ("% Variance explained due to "Pure" effect"). MRM analysis was conducted using the R package ecodist (3). These results are largely consistent with the results of the partial Mantel tests (Table 1).

Response matrix	Explanatory matrices	R ²	Coefficient	<i>R</i> ² Without	<i>R</i> ² Pure	% Variance explained due to "Pure" effect
Hosts	Whole model	0.686 (<i>P</i> < 0.001)				
	Parasites (all)	·	0.111 (<i>P</i> = 0.321)	0.676 (<i>P</i> < 0.001)	0.010	1.46
	Geography		0.121 (<i>P</i> = 0.303)	0.677 (<i>P</i> < 0.001)	0.009	1.31
	Environment		0.696 (<i>P</i> < 0.001)	0.402 (<i>P</i> = 0.002)	0.284	41.40
Hosts	Whole model	0.676 (<i>P</i> < 0.001)				
	Parasites (<i>Plasmodium</i>)	、 , ,	0.009 (<i>P</i> = 0.935)	0.676 (<i>P</i> < 0.001)	0.000	0.00
	Geography		0.132 (<i>P</i> = 0.282)	0.665 (<i>P</i> < 0.001)	0.011	1.63
	Environment		0.732 (<i>P</i> < 0.001)	0.36 (<i>P</i> = 0.005)	0.316	46.75
Hosts	Whole model	0.678 (<i>P</i> < 0.001)				
	Parasites (<i>Haemoproteus</i>)	(1 0.001)	0.045 (<i>P</i> = 0.657)	0.676 (<i>P</i> < 0.001)	0.002	0.29
	Geography		0.127 (<i>P</i> = 0.286)	0.668 (<i>P</i> < 0.001)	0.010	1.47
	Environment		0.727 (<i>P</i> < 0.001)	0.347 (<i>P</i> = 0.004)	0.331	48.82
Parasites (all)	Whole model	0.214				
	Hosts	(7 - 0.120)	0.279 (<i>P</i> = 0.384)	0.188 (<i>P</i> = 0.056)	0.026	12.15

	Geography		0.076 (<i>P</i> = 0.776) 0.152	0.210 (<i>P</i> = 0.054) 0.206	0.004	1.87
	Environment		(P = 0.628)	(P = 0.047)	0.008	3.74
Parasites (<i>Plasmodium</i>)	Whole model	0.203 (<i>P</i> = 0.162)				
	Hosts		0.022 ($P = 0.948$)	0.203 ($P = 0.068$) 0.190 ($P = 0.083$) 0.169	0.000	0.00
	Geography		(P = 0.612)		0.013	6.40
	Environment		(<i>P</i> = 0.341)	(P = 0.117)	0.034	16.75
Parasites (<i>Haemoproteus</i>)	Whole model	0.107 (<i>P</i> = 0.262)				
	Hosts		0.123 (<i>P</i> = 0.669)	0.102 (<i>P</i> = 0.130)	0.005	4.67
	Geography		0.140 (<i>P</i> = 0.536)	0.095 (<i>P</i> = 0.155)	0.012	11.21
	Environment		0.111 (<i>P</i> = 0.702)	(P = 0.104)	0.003	2.80

- 1. Lichstein JW (2007) Multiple regression on distance matrices: a multivariate spatial analysis tool. *Plant Ecol* 188(2):117–131.
- 2. Krasnov BR, et al. (2010) Similarity in ectoparasite faunas of Palaearctic rodents as a function of host phylogenetic, geographic or environmental distances: Which matters the most? *Int J Parasitol* 40(7):807–817.
- 3. Goslee SC, Urban DL (2007) The ecodist package for dissimilarity-based analysis of ecological data. *J Stat Softw* 22(7):1–19.

Table S7 Mantel correlation coefficients (*r*) and P values from comparisons of host phylogenetic distances and host Bray-Curtis dissimilarities based on parasite sharing for each "community" sampling location. Only parasite lineages sampled at least 10 times in each location were included in the analysis. N.Host and N.Parasite represent the number of host species and parasite lineages, respectively, considered in each analysis. Alabama, Connecticut, Pennsylvania, and Louisiana were left out of the analysis due to low sample sizes.

Location	r	Р	N.Host	N.Parasite
Chicago	0.303	0.035	19	13
Indiana	0.473	0.008	11	5
Michigan	0.229	0.210	7	2
Ozarks	0.147	0.099	22	10
St. Louis	0.293	0.016	17	4
Tennessee	0.100	0.096	19	4

Table S8 Pairwise Spearman correlations coefficients (ρ) were calculated between parasite relative abundances (separated by genus) and host species abundances across the region. We report the mean observed ρ and its SE, and whether either statistic differed from a randomized distribution of the statistics derived by row-shuffling the parasite relative abundance matrix and recalculating them 9999 times.

Parasite Genus	Mean observed p	P (mean ρ)	SE	P(SE)
Plasmodium	0.006	0.868	0.012	0.086
Haemoproteus	-0.026	0.355	0.010	0.565

Table S9 Host species codes corresponding to three letter host species codes in Dataset S1. "N" refers to sample size, "AOU species code" is a four letter code for host species commonly used by bird banders. The "Genus" and "Species" columns reflect the taxonomy used at <u>http://birdtree.org/</u>. The "Current" column represents current taxonomy (when different) based on the American Ornithological Union's Checklist of North American Birds (<u>http://checklist.aou.org/</u>).

Host species code	N	AOU species code	Genus	Species	Current	Common Name
PDO	565	HOSP	Passer	domesticus		House Sparrow
TMI	491	AMRO	Turdus	migratorius		American Robin
CCA	353	NOCA	Cardinalis	cardinalis		Northern Cardinal
DCA	348	GRCA	Dumetella	carolinensis		Gray Catbird
VOL	284	REVI	Vireo	olivaceus		Red-eyed Vireo
PCY	231	INBU	Passerina	cyanea		Indigo Bunting
VGR	220	WEVI	Vireo	griseus		White-eyed Vireo
MME	219	SOSP	Melospiza	melodia		Song Sparrow
IVI	210	YBCH	Icteria	virens		Yellow- breasted Chat
CTR	209	AMGO	Carduelis	tristis	Spinus tristis	American Goldfinch
WCI	142	HOWA	Wilsonia	citrina	Setophaga citrina	Hooded Warbler
HMU	136	WOTH	Hylocichla	mustelina		Wood Thrush
OFO	130	KEWA	Oporornis	formosus	Geothlypis formosa	Kentucky Warbler
MVA	128	BAWW	Mniotilta	varia		Black-and- White Warbler
EVI	127	ACFL	Empidonax	virescens		Acadian Flycatcher
GTR	110	COYE	Geothlypis	trichas		Common Yellowthroat
HVE	108	WEWA	Helmitheros	vermivorum		Worm-eating Warbler
SAU	106	OVEN	Seiurus	aurocapilla		Ovenbird
CME	101	HOFI	Carpodacus	mexicanus	Haemorhous mexicanus	House Finch
TLU	91	CAWR	Thryothorus	ludovicianus		Carolina Wren
PPU	82	DOWO	Picoides	pubescens		Downy Woodpecker
BBI	71	TUTI	Baeolophus	bicolor		Tufted
SVU	69	EUST	Sturnus	vulgaris		European Starling
QQU	68	COGR	Quiscalus	quiscula		Common Grackle
APH	60	RWBL	Agelaius	phoeniceus		Red-winged Blackbird
PAM	59	NOPA	Parula	americana		Northern Parula

SRU	57	AMRE	Setophaga	ruticilla		American Redstart
VPI	50	BWWA	Vermivora	pinus	Vermivora cyanoptera Parkesia noveboracensis	Blue-winged Warbler Northern Waterthrush Field Sparrow Carolina Chickadee
SNO	46	NOWA	Seiurus	noveboracensis		
SPU	45	FISP	Spizella	pusilla		
PCA	43	CACH	Parus	carolinensis	Poecile carolinensis	
ZAL	43	WTSP	Zonotrichia	albicollis		White-throated Sparrow
POL	41	SCTA	Piranga	olivacea	O tradiciona	Scarlet Tanager
DPE	38	YEWA	Dendroica	petechia	Setopnaga petechia	Yellow Warbler
MAT	37	BHCO	Molothrus	ater		Brown-neaded Cowbird
ZMA	36	MODO	Zenaida	macroura		Mourning Dove
CFU	30	VEER	Catharus	fuscescens	Satanhaga	Veery
DMA	30	MAWA	Dendroica	magnolia	Setopnaga magnolia	Warbler
BCE	29	CEDW	Bombycilla	cedrorum		Cedar Waxwing
PCE	29	BGGN	Polioptila	caerulea		Blue-gray Gnatcatcher
PER	29	EATO	Pipilo	erythrophthalmus		Lastern Towhee
SPA	29	CHSP	Spizella	passerina		Chipping Sparrow
DDI	26	PRAW	Dendroica	discolor	Setophaga discolor	Prairie Warbler
LSW	26	SWWA	Limnothlypis	swainsonii		Swainson's Warbler
CVI	25	EAWP	Contopus	virens		Eastern Wood- Pewee
TRU	25	BRTH	Toxostoma	rufum		Brown Thrasher
ETR	23	WIFL	Empidonax	traillii		Willow Flycatcher
SCR	23	WBNU	Sitta	carolinensis		White-breasted Nuthatch
DCN	21	CAWA	Wilsonia	canadensis	Cardellina canadensis	Canada Warbler
IGA	19	BAOR	Icterus	galbula	Poecile atricapillus Parkesia motacilla	Baltimore Oriole Black-capped Chickadee Louisiana Waterthrush
PAT	19	BCCH	Parus	atricapillus		
SMO	19	LOWA	Seiurus	motacilla		
SPH	18	EAPH	Sayornis	phoebe		Eastern Phoebe
TAE	17	HOWR	Troglodytes	aedon		House Wren
CCR	16	BLJA	Cyanocitta	cristata		Blue Jay
DCO	16	YRWA	Dendroica	coronata	Setophaga coronata	Yellow- rumped/Myrtle

						Warbler
DPN	16	CSWA	Dendroica	pensylvanica	Setophaga pensylvanica	Chestnut-sided Warbler
VGI	16	WAVI	Vireo	gilvus		Warbling Vireo Tree Swallow Swamp Sparrow Yellow-billed Cuckoo Summer Tanager Nashville Warbler Black-throated Blue Warbler Yellow-throated Warbler Prothonotary Warbler
TBC	14	TRSW	Tachycineta	bicolor		
MGR	13	SWSP	Melospiza	georgiana		
CAM	12	YBCU	Coccyzus	americanus		
PRU	12	SUTA	Piranga	rubra		
VRU	11	NAWA	Vermivora	ruficapilla	Leiothlypis ruficapilla	
DCR	10	BTBW	Dendroica	caerulescens	Setophaga caerulescens	
DDO	10	YTWA	Dendroica	dominica	Setophaga dominicana	
PCI	10	PROW	Protonotaria	citrea		
SSI	10	EABL	Sialia	sialis		Eastern Bluebird
MPO	9	NOMO	Mimus	polyglottos		Northern Mockingbird
ISP	8	OROR	lcterus	spurius		Orchard Oriole
MCA	8	RBWO	Melanerpes	carolinus		Red-bellied Woodpecker
RCA	8	RCKI	Regulus	calendula		Ruby-crowned Kinglet
VFL	7	YTVI	Vireo	flavifrons		Yellow-throated Vireo
CAU	6	NOFL	Colaptes	auratus		Northern Flicker
CMN	6	GCTH	Catharus	minimus		Gray-cheeked Thrush
MCR	6	GCFL	Myiarchus	crinitus		Great Crested Flycatcher
VPE	6	TEWA	Vermivora	peregrina	Oreothlypis peregrina	Tennessee Warbler
PVI	5	HAWO	Picoides	villosus		Hairy Woodpecker
CVR	4	BOBW	Colinus	virginianus		Northern Bobwhite
EFV	4	YBFL	Empidonax	flaviventris		Yellow-bellied Flycatcher
DFU	3	BLBW	Dendroica	fusca	Setophaga fusca	Blackburnian Warbler
DVI	3	BTNW	Dendroica	virens	Setophaga virens	Black-throated Green Warbler
GCA	3	BLGR	Passerina	caerulea		Blue Grosbeak
OPH	3	MOWA	Oporornis	philadelphia	Geothlypis philadelphia	Mourning Warbler
CER	2	BBCU	Coccyzus	erythropthalmus	prinadolprina	Black-billed Cuckoo
CGU	2	HETH	Catharus	guttatus		Hermit Thrush

EAL	2	ALFL	Empidonax	alnorum		Alder Flycatcher
HRS	2	BASW	Hirundo	rustica		Barn Swallow
PMN CCN	2	ETSP	Passer	montanus		Eurasian Tree Sparrow Northern
CON	•		0//000	oyuncuo		Harrier
CFM	1	BRCR	Certhia	familiaris		Brown Creeper
DCE	1	CERW	Dendroica	cerulea	Setophaga cerulea	Cerulean Warbler
DPA	1	PAWA	Dendroica	palmarum	Setophaga palmarum	Palm Warbler
DPI	1	PIWA	Dendroica	pinus	Setophaga pinus	Pine Warbler
DST	1	BLPW	Dendroica	striata	Setophaga striata	Blackpoll Warbler
EMI	1	LEFL	Empidonax	minimus		Least Flycatcher
PLD	1	RBGR	Pheucticus	ludovicianus		Rose-breasted Grosbeak
SDE	1	ECDO	Streptopelia	decaocto		Eurasian Collared-Dove
VBE	1	BEVI	Vireo	bellii		Bell's Vireo
VPH	1	PHVI	Vireo	philadelphicus		Philadelphia Vireo



Fig. S1 The first five axes of a principal components analysis (PCA) ordinating 19 bioclim variables downloaded from http://www.worldclim.org/ for each sampling location (Table S3).



Fig. S2 Frequency distribution of parasite host-breadth (Rao's Quadratic Entropy) from parasite lineages sampled at least 10 times across all locations. It does not differ from a unimodal distribution (i.e., it is not bimodal; Hartigans' dip test, $D_{33} = 0.047$, P = 0.87).



Fig. S3 The distribution of randomized mean dissimilarities between four locations where *Cardinalis cardinalis* was well-sampled in 2013 based on the prevalence of five parasite lineages at each location. Observed dissimilarity between locations was greater than the random distribution indicating that parasite by location combinations were more unique than expected by chance alone (P < 0.001).



Fig. S4 The relationship between parasite host-breadth, calculated by Rao's Quadratic Entropy, and the Gini-Simpson Index for parasites sampled at least 10 times across community sampling locations ($R^2 = 0.724$, P < 0.001). The blue line is the predicted linear relationship and is surrounded by 95% confidence intervals.