

**Table S4.** Model comparisons for Lyme disease and babesiosis. (We fitted a series of nested models and evaluate model fit with  $\Delta\text{DIC}$  compared with the non-spatial process-based model. Process-based models include: (i) a non-spatial process model; (ii) a spatial model allowing for linear dependence of invasion mechanisms on local infection risk; (iii) a full covariate model including nonlinear dependence of invasion mechanisms on local infection risk and ecological covariates; (iv) a parsimonious model excluding any covariate from the full covariate model with a 95% credible interval that includes 0; and (v) a parsimonious model without the observation process. To justify modelling latent ecological processes, we also present results of fitting a ‘null’ phenomenological model described in the electronic supplementary material, text S1. All models estimate  $\beta$ , the coefficient for population size offset.)

	model description	observation parameter	ecological parameters	DIC	$\Delta\text{DIC}$
Lyme disease					
process-based model	non-spatial	$r_s$	<b>p</b> , $\phi_0$ , $\gamma_0$ , $\theta_0$	17 462	—
	linear spatial dependence	$r_s$	<b>p</b> , $\phi_0$ , $\phi_1$ , $\gamma_0$ , $\gamma_1$ , $\theta_0$ , $\theta_1$	14 774	2688
	full covariate	$r_s$	<b>p</b> , $\phi_0$ , $\phi_1$ , $\phi_2$ , $\phi_3$ , $\phi_4$ , $\gamma_0$ , $\gamma_1$ , $\gamma_2$ , $\gamma_3$ , $\gamma_4$ , $\theta_0$ , $\theta_1$ , $\theta_2$ , $\theta_3$ , $\theta_4$	14 321	3141
	parsimonious model	$r_s$	<b>p</b> , $\phi_0$ , $\phi_1$ , $\phi_2$ , $\phi_3$ , $\gamma_0$ , $\gamma_1$ , $\gamma_2$ , $\theta_0$ , $\theta_1$ , $\theta_3$	14 316	3146
	parsimonious no observation	$r_s$	<b>p</b> , $\phi_0$ , $\phi_1$ , $\phi_2$ , $\phi_3$ , $\gamma_0$ , $\gamma_1$ , $\gamma_2$ , $\theta_0$ , $\theta_1$ , $\theta_3$	14 333	3129
	null	$r_s$	$\tau_0$ , $\tau_1$ , $\tau_2$	16 214	1248
babesiosis					
process-based model	non-spatial	$r_s$	<b>p</b> , $\phi_0$ , $\gamma_0$ , $\theta_0$	8691	—
	linear spatial dependence	$r_s$	<b>p</b> , $\phi_0$ , $\phi_1$ , $\gamma_0$ , $\gamma_1$ , $\theta_0$ , $\theta_1$	8038	653
	full covariate	$r_s$	<b>p</b> , $\phi_0$ , $\phi_1$ , $\phi_2$ , $\phi_3$ , $\phi_4$ , $\phi_5$ , $\gamma_0$ , $\gamma_1$ , $\gamma_2$ , $\gamma_3$ , $\gamma_4$ , $\gamma_5$ , $\theta_0$ , $\theta_1$ , $\theta_2$ , $\theta_3$ , $\theta_4$ , $\theta_5$	7293	1398
	parsimonious model	$r_s$	<b>p</b> , $\phi_0$ , $\phi_1$ , $\phi_3$ , $\phi_4$ , $\phi_5$ , $\gamma_0$ , $\gamma_1$ , $\gamma_2$ , $\gamma_4$ , $\gamma_5$ , $\theta_0$ , $\theta_1$ , $\theta_4$	7287	1404
	parsimonious, no observation	$r_s$	<b>p</b> , $\phi_0$ , $\phi_1$ , $\phi_3$ , $\phi_4$ , $\phi_5$ , $\gamma_0$ , $\gamma_1$ , $\gamma_2$ , $\gamma_4$ , $\gamma_5$ , $\theta_0$ , $\theta_1$ , $\theta_4$	7355	1336
	null	$r_s$	$\tau_0$ , $\tau_1$ , $\tau_2$	8634	57