



THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

Edinburgh Research Explorer

The fine-scale landscape of immunity and parasitism in a wild ungulate population

Citation for published version:

Albery, GF, Becker, DJ, Kenyon, F, Nussey, DH & Pemberton, JM 2019, 'The fine-scale landscape of immunity and parasitism in a wild ungulate population', *Integrative and comparative biology*.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/icb/icz016>

Digital Object Identifier (DOI):

[10.1093/icb/icz016](https://doi.org/10.1093/icb/icz016)

Link:

[Link to publication record in Edinburgh Research Explorer](#)

Document Version:

Peer reviewed version

Published In:

Integrative and comparative biology

General rights

Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Edinburgh Research Explorer is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy

The University of Edinburgh has made every reasonable effort to ensure that Edinburgh Research Explorer content complies with UK legislation. If you believe that the public display of this file breaches copyright please contact openaccess@ed.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.



The fine-scale landscape of immunity and parasitism in a wild ungulate population

Gregory F. Albery*¹, Daniel J. Becker², Fiona Kenyon³, Daniel H. Nussey¹, Josephine M. Pemberton¹

1: Institute of Evolutionary Biology, School of Biological Sciences, University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, UK, EH9 3FL

2: Department of Biology, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana, 47405

3: Moredun Research Institute, Pentlands Science Park, Bush Loan, Midlothian, UK, EH26 0PZ

[*gfalbery@gmail.com](mailto:gfalbery@gmail.com)

Symposium article

Abstract

Spatial heterogeneity in parasite susceptibility and exposure is a common source of confounding variation in disease ecology studies. However, it is not known whether spatial autocorrelation acts on immunity at small scales, within wild animal populations, and whether this predicts spatial patterns in infection. Here we used a well-mixed wild population of individually recognised red deer (*Cervus elaphus*) inhabiting a heterogeneous landscape to investigate fine-scale spatial patterns of immunity and parasitism. We noninvasively collected 842 faecal samples from 141 females with known ranging behaviour over two years. We quantified total and helminth-specific mucosal antibodies and counted propagules of three gastrointestinal helminth taxa. These data were analysed with linear mixed models using the Integrated Nested Laplace Approximation (INLA), using a Stochastic Partial Differentiation Equation approach (SPDE) to control for and quantify spatial autocorrelation. We also investigated whether spatial patterns of immunity and parasitism changed seasonally. We discovered substantial spatial heterogeneity in general and helminth-specific antibody levels and parasitism with two helminth taxa, all of which exhibited contrasting seasonal variation in their spatial patterns. Notably, *Fasciola hepatica* intensity appeared to be strongly influenced by the presence of wet grazing areas, and antibody hotspots did not correlate with distributions of any parasites. Our results suggest spatial heterogeneity may be an important factor affecting immunity and parasitism in a wide range of study systems. We discuss these findings with regards to the design of sampling regimes and public health interventions, and suggest

1 that disease ecology studies investigate spatial heterogeneity more regularly to enhance their
2 results, even when examining small geographic areas.

3

1 Introduction

2 Parasite infection in the wild is extremely spatially heterogeneous. The scale at which spatial
3 variation acts depends on the host and parasite being studied, and even fine-scale
4 environmental heterogeneity may influence the spatial epidemiology of human diseases
5 (Murdock *et al.* 2017). However, the spatial ecology of disease is most often considered in
6 terms of large-scale patterns (e.g. Murray *et al.*, 2018) and using occurrence or prevalence
7 data, which is less informative than intensity, particularly for macroparasites. In addition, due
8 to practical considerations, many studies investigating spatial variation in wild animals
9 compare several discrete populations rather than sampling across a continuous, mixing
10 population (e.g. Downs *et al.* 2015; Cheynel *et al.* 2017). Alternatively, some studies rely on
11 opportunistic convenience sampling, which can produce an inaccurate representation of
12 disease processes and bias estimates of infection prevalence due to their non-random
13 sampling in space (Nusser *et al.* 2008). As a result, little is known about fine-scale patterns of
14 susceptibility and exposure, and how they influence spatial patterns of infection, in wild
15 animals.

16 Identifying the relevant spatial scale for disease processes such as susceptibility and exposure
17 is important, as quantifying spatial trends at different scales can introduce uncertainty at best,
18 and can profoundly affect the conclusions drawn at worst (Gilligan *et al.* 2007; Vidal-Martínez
19 *et al.* 2010; Lachish and Murray 2018). For example, Lyme disease risk correlates positively
20 with biodiversity at the within-forest level, but the reverse is true between forests (Wood and
21 Lafferty 2013). An understanding of spatial processes is therefore crucial for designing public
22 health interventions (Caprarelli and Fletcher 2014) and sampling regimes (Nusser *et al.* 2008;
23 Vidal-Martínez *et al.* 2010; Lachish and Murray 2018). A deeper understanding of fine-scale
24 spatial variation in disease processes could also inform patterns seen over wider distances
25 (Murdock *et al.* 2017; Pawley and McArdle 2018). In addition, if immunity and parasitism vary
26 over short distances, infection-oriented studies of wild populations could be affected by greater
27 degrees of spatial dependence than previously considered, which can affect inference. When
28 spatial autocorrelation is not considered, the type I error rate may be inflated due to inflated
29 covariance of explanatory and/or response variables emerging from geographic proximity
30 (Pawley and McArdle 2018).

31 Spatial variation in immunity can originate from gradients in abiotic conditions such as
32 temperature (Laughton *et al.* 2017) or in biotic factors such as prey availability (Becker *et al.*
33 2018). Spatial variation in parasitism will arise in part as a result of this immune heterogeneity
34 owing to variation in susceptibility, clearance, and tolerance (Jolles *et al.* 2015), as well as
35 from abiotic factors affecting parasite transmission (e.g. sunlight; Parsons *et al.* 2015) or from

1 variation in abundance of secondary hosts or vectors (Sol *et al.* 2011; Olsen *et al.* 2015). In
2 addition, conspecific density can influence resource availability, immune investment, and
3 parasite exposure (Wilson *et al.* 2004; Downs *et al.* 2015; Ezenwa *et al.* 2016). We therefore
4 expect to see considerable spatial variation in both immunity and parasitism in heterogeneous
5 environments (Becker *et al.* 2019); where gradients are steep and mixing is minimal, this
6 variation should occur over short distances. A recent study in wild mice (*Mus musculus*)
7 demonstrated high between-site immune heterogeneity, but with extensive variation in the
8 degree of within-site differentiation, suggesting short-range spatial dependence (Abolins *et al.*
9 2018). However, few studies have examined how both immunity and parasitism vary
10 continuously across space within wild animal populations, so it is unclear to what degree
11 spatial variation in parasitism in the wild originates from immune-mediated processes rather
12 than from environmental factors affecting exposure. Finally, spatial patterns are rarely static,
13 and may change over time (Hawkins 2012), yet seasonal or annual changes in these spatial
14 patterns are rarely examined.

15 The red deer (*Cervus elaphus*) is a large land mammal closely related to the American wapiti
16 (*Cervus canadensis*) whose distribution covers much of Europe. The relationship between red
17 deer disease and their spatial behaviour is important to pathogen spillover, as this species
18 carries a plethora of parasites that can infect humans and livestock (Bohm *et al.* 2007; Brites-
19 Neto *et al.* 2015) and which they can vector between farms and distribute through the
20 landscape (Chintoan-Uta *et al.* 2014; Qviller *et al.* 2016). The wild red deer living in the North
21 Block of the Isle of Rum in Scotland are individually recognised and regularly censused,
22 providing detailed information on each individual's life history and ranging behaviour (Clutton-
23 Brock *et al.* 1982). These censuses have previously been used to uncover important roles of
24 the environment and spatial behaviour in influencing individuals' phenotypes (Stopher *et al.*
25 2012; Froy *et al.* 2018). Longitudinal noninvasive faecal sampling of the population has
26 revealed a high prevalence of several gastrointestinal helminth parasites including strongyle
27 nematodes, the liver fluke *Fasciola hepatica*, and the tissue nematode *Elaphostrongylus cervi*
28 (Albery, Kenyon, *et al.* 2018). The life cycle of strongyle nematodes is direct, while *F. hepatica*
29 must infect *Galba truncatula* water snails (Taylor *et al.* 2016), and *E. cervi* infects a range of
30 land snails (Mason 1989). Their mucosal antibodies (IgA) have also been quantified by faecal
31 ELISA, offering a measure of immune investment (Albery, Watt, *et al.* 2018). Both helminth
32 intensity and IgA concentrations are affected by deer reproductive investment and fluctuate
33 seasonally (Albery, Watt, *et al.* 2018). However, the spatial distributions of these immune and
34 parasite measures have yet to be investigated.

35 In this study, we used regular census data and noninvasive faecal samples from the deer
36 population to investigate how individuals' spatial behaviour was associated with immunity and

1 parasitism at fine spatial scales. We incorporated spatial autocorrelation structures in order to
2 investigate how this affected model fit, to identify hotspots of immunity and infection, and to
3 quantify the spatial scale at which our data were autocorrelated. We also allowed spatial
4 autocorrelation structures to vary seasonally. We expected that accounting for spatial
5 autocorrelation would improve model fit, and that this would be a more effective way of
6 investigating spatial trends than separating the population into discrete arbitrary
7 subpopulations as was previously done to control for spatial variation (Huisman *et al.* 2016).
8 We also predicted that individuals living in different areas of the study system would exhibit
9 notably different antibody levels and parasite intensities. Finally, we predicted that *F. hepatica*
10 and *E. cervi* intensity would be influenced by the habitats of their secondary hosts – particularly
11 that *F. hepatica* would be more common in wetter areas (Olsen *et al.* 2015).

12

13 Methods

14 Study system and sampling regime

15 The study population is located in the north block of the Isle of Rum, Scotland (57°N, 6°20'W;
16 Figure 1). The sampling area measures ~4 km north-south and ~3 km west-east (total area
17 ~12.7km²). The most intensely sampled area consists of a river running from south to north
18 along a valley, flanked by hills on either side, and an extended ranging area around the coast
19 to the east, close to the sea. Peat bogs and *Juncus* marshland comprise much of the southern
20 and central areas of the valley, while the hills are dominated by wet and dry heath and *Molinia*
21 grassland. In the north, moving seaward, the landscape is dominated by *Agrostis* and *Festuca*
22 grassland, followed by sandy dunes and beaches. The study population is wild and
23 unmanaged, and is censused five times a month for eight months of the year (see Clutton-
24 Brock *et al.*, 1982). During censusing, one of two predetermined routes is walked or driven
25 through the study area and individuals' locations (to the nearest 100 metres) are noted. The
26 northern part of the study area hosts the highest population density, with most deer centred
27 around the high-quality grazing near the mouth of the river and the land around the coast to
28 the east (Figure 1). Annual home ranges are highly repeatable from year to year (Stopher *et*
29 *al.* 2012).

30 The deer reproductive cycle (“deer year”) spans from the start of the calving season, May 1st,
31 until April 30th the following year. Samples were collected as previously described (Albery,
32 Kenyon, *et al.* 2018), on a seasonal basis during 7 two-week trips in August (“summer”),
33 November (“autumn”) and April (“spring”) between April 2016 and April 2018 inclusive. Note
34 that our dataset included a sampling trip from April 2016, which was part of the deer year
35 beginning in May 2015, with no accompanying summer and autumn trips from this

1 reproductive cycle. In the study period, 842 faecal samples were collected noninvasively from
2 141 individually known adult females aged 3 and above. Parasite propagule counts and
3 antibody ELISA quantification were carried out on these samples as previously described
4 (Albery, Kenyon, *et al.* 2018; Albery, Watt, *et al.* 2018). Parasites included strongyle
5 nematodes (order: Strongylida), the common liver fluke *Fasciola hepatica* and the red deer
6 tissue nematode *Elaphostrongylus cervi*. Our two antibody measures were total mucosal IgA
7 levels (“total IgA”) and anti-*Teladorsagia circumcincta* L3 larval antigen IgA (“anti-Tc IgA”).
8 The former is taken as an indicator of general investment in mucosal immunity, while the latter
9 gives a measure of specific anti-strongyle IgA response which is thought to be more indicative
10 of protective immunity against strongyles (Watt *et al.* 2016; Albery, Watt, *et al.* 2018). There
11 was not enough faecal matter in all samples to quantify all variables; final sample sizes are
12 displayed in Table 1. Using the census data, each individual’s mean easting and northing over
13 the deer year was taken as their average location. This was taken to be a better indication of
14 an individual’s spatial behaviour than the location at which the faecal sample itself was
15 collected. We subdivided the study area into six approximate subpopulations based on each
16 individual’s average location (Huisman *et al.* 2016). These locations and subpopulations are
17 displayed in Figure 1.

18 Statistical analysis

19 Statistical analysis was carried out using the Integrated Nested Laplace Approximation (INLA).
20 INLA is a deterministic Bayesian approach which is increasingly being used for analysis of
21 spatial data (Zuur *et al.* 2017). Models were fitted in R version 3.5 (R Core Team 2018) using
22 the linear modelling package R-INLA (Rue and Martino 2009; Martins *et al.* 2013). We
23 constructed five generalised linear mixed models (GLMMs) for each response variable, each
24 featuring different combinations of fixed and spatial random effects. The distinguishing
25 components of these model sets are outlined below and displayed in Table 1.

26 Our five response variables included integer counts per gram of three parasite propagules
27 following a negative binomial distribution (strongyles, *F. hepatica* and *E. cervi*) and Gaussian-
28 distributed optical densities of two mucosal antibodies (total IgA and anti-Tc IgA). Antibody
29 levels were corrected for collection effects as previously described, by taking the residuals
30 from a linear model including raw antibody OD as a response variable and including day of
31 collection, time of collection and extraction session as explanatory variables (Albery, Watt, *et al.*
32 *et al.* 2018). In our main GLMMs, explanatory variables included: Deer year (categorical with
33 three levels: 2015, 2016, and 2017); Season (categorical with three levels: Summer, Autumn,
34 and Spring); Age (continuous, in years); Reproductive status (categorical variable with three
35 levels: No Calf, Calf Died, and Calf Survived; see Albery, Watt, *et al.* (2018) for definitions);
36 Subpopulation (categorical, six levels). All models included individual ID as a random effect.

1 INLA allows incorporation of a spatially distributed random effect to account for spatial
2 autocorrelation (Lindgren *et al.* 2011). This uses a stochastic partial differentiation equation
3 (SPDE) approach to approximate the continuous random field using a triangulated mesh of
4 connected discrete locations (Lindgren and Rue 2015). The mesh we used for the spatial
5 random effect is displayed in Figure 1. The random effect can be plotted in 2D (giving the
6 “spatial field” of variation) to investigate hot- and coldspots of the response variable, and the
7 kappa/range parameters can be extracted to investigate the distance at which autocorrelation
8 fades in space. It is also possible to allow multiple spatial fields within a single model, by
9 assigning separate fields to different categories or by linking fields with correlation structures
10 to investigate spatiotemporal variation. The underlying mathematics of INLA and associated
11 spatial/spatiotemporal models have been extensively discussed elsewhere, and such models
12 are increasingly being used to examine spatiotemporal trends (e.g. fisheries ecology
13 (Cosandey-Godin *et al.* 2015)); see <http://www.r-inla.org> for more examples.

14 We constructed a set of competing models for each response variable. Each model set
15 contained five models, resulting in 25 models total. Our base model set (model set 1) included
16 year, season, age, and reproductive status as fixed effects, similar to models previously used
17 to investigate associations between reproduction, immunity, and parasitism (Albery, Watt, *et*
18 *al.* 2018). Model set 2 added subpopulation as a fixed effect to investigate whether this
19 explained any variation and to examine the value of analysing continuous populations using
20 discrete subdivisions (Figure 1). Model set 3 added a spatially distributed SPDE random effect,
21 rather than the subpopulation fixed effect, to control for and quantify spatial autocorrelation. In
22 model set 4, this spatial field was allowed to vary between seasons (summer, autumn, and
23 spring), and model set 5 allowed correlation between these seasonal fields. To allow spatial
24 fields to correlate, we used an “exchangeable” model, where all fields in the model were
25 correlated by the same value (ρ) rather than e.g. following an autoregressive process through
26 time. We elected not to fit different spatial fields across years as our number of replicates was
27 small for detecting annual variation. We also had no *a priori* hypotheses concerning spatial
28 differences between years; splitting up the spatial field into individual sampling trips
29 (field:season:year) would cut down the sample size considerably for each field, reducing the
30 likelihood of picking up spatial patterns; and we have only one season (Spring) from the first
31 year of collection, so the years are unlikely to be comparable.

32 For each response variable, the five fitted models were compared using Deviance Information
33 Criterion (DIC). A change in 2 DIC was selected to distinguish between models and select the
34 most parsimonious model. When the best-fitting models included spatial autocorrelation, we
35 extracted the range parameters to estimate the range of autocorrelation and ρ parameters to
36 estimate correlation between seasonal fields. For the range of autocorrelation, we report the

1 distance at which spatial autocorrelation decayed to 0.5 (henceforth “halving range”; (Brooker
2 *et al.* 2006)). Finally, we compared effect sizes from each model to investigate whether
3 incorporating spatial autocorrelation altered any conclusions about the fixed effects. We
4 particularly focussed on whether accounting for spatial autocorrelation altered the estimates
5 for reproductive status effects, which have previously been demonstrated to impact both
6 immunity and parasitism, and vary spatially across the population.

7 Results

8 Our models revealed strong and contrasting spatial trends in all but one of our response
9 variables. All models but *E. cervi* were incrementally improved by first incorporating a spatial
10 random effect and then by allowing it to vary between seasons (DIC values in Table 1; all
11 secondary models had $\Delta\text{DIC} \geq 3.44$). In all cases, including spatially distributed random effects
12 improved model fit compared to fitting a subpopulation fixed effect (Table 1; $\Delta\text{DIC} \geq 2.4$). The
13 spatial fields of the random effects, taken from model sets 3-5, are displayed in Figure 2. For
14 each response variable, we report the spatial field and results from both model set 3 (spatial
15 field constant across the study period) and model set 4 (spatial seasons varying seasonally,
16 with no correlation between fields). The exception is *F. hepatica*, for which allowing the
17 seasonal fields to correlate in model set 5 improved model fit ($\Delta\text{DIC} = 2.29$, Table 1); therefore,
18 for *F. hepatica*, we display the fields and results from model sets 3 and 5. Response variables
19 differed considerably in terms of both their spatial fields (Figure 2) and the range at which they
20 varied (Figure 3). Table 1 also displays the distance at which spatial autocorrelation reduced
21 to 0.5 (“halving ranges”) and ρ values; as *E. cervi* models were never improved by the inclusion
22 of the subpopulation fixed effect or by SPDE random effects ($\Delta\text{DIC} > 1.36$), we do not report
23 these results further.

24 Strongyle nematode intensity exhibited weak spatial patterns, with a very short range of
25 autocorrelation; this did not increase when spatial fields were allowed to vary seasonally
26 (Figure 2-3, halving range $< 59.62\text{M}$). Allowing the spatial field to vary between seasons
27 resulted in similar patchy distributions which are hard to distinguish (Figure 2) but nevertheless
28 improved model fit compared to all other models (Table 1, $\Delta\text{DIC} = 4.25$). *F. hepatica*
29 demonstrated a strong spatial pattern, with high intensities in the mid- and south-valley
30 decreasing to the north and northeast (Figure 2). This gradual, unidirectional trend was
31 reflected in the long range of autocorrelation (Figure 3, halving range = 1323M). Allowing the
32 spatial field to vary between seasons improved *F. hepatica* model fit, but resulted in similar
33 seasonal fields (Figure 2). This was reflected in the positive ρ parameter ($\rho = 0.67$) derived from
34 model 5, which was the best-fitting model for *F. hepatica*, demonstrating that seasonal spatial
35 fields were substantially positively correlated.

1 When the spatial field was kept constant across the study period, total IgA and anti-Tc IgA
2 both demonstrated a very short range of spatial autocorrelation (Figure 3, halving
3 range<150.06M). Both antibody distributions were similar and negatively correlated with that
4 of strongyles, being lower in the central north and higher in the south and edges of the study
5 area (Figure 2). However, allowing both antibodies' spatial fields to vary between seasons
6 improved model fit substantially compared to all other models (Table 1, Δ DIC<18.58),
7 increased the range of autocorrelation (Figure 3, halving range>415.82M), and resulted in very
8 different seasonal patterns (Figure 2). These patterns were similar between total IgA and anti-
9 Tc IgA, although total IgA had a slightly larger range of autocorrelation (Figure 3, halving
10 range=640.07M and 415.82M for total IgA and anti-Tc IgA respectively). The best-fitting model
11 for total IgA and anti-Tc IgA was either model 4 or 5 for total IgA (Table 1, Δ DIC<2), while
12 model 5 fit slightly better for anti-Tc IgA (Δ DIC=2.02). Hence model 4 is presented for total IgA
13 as the model with fewer degrees of freedom, and model 5 is presented for anti-Tc IgA.

14 The subpopulation fixed effects broadly followed the spatial fields of the SPDE random effects
15 (Figure SI1). Briefly, strongyles showed little difference across different regions, although
16 estimates for the two northern regions (regions 3 and 5) did not overlap with zero when
17 compared to the southern region 1. For *F. hepatica* intensities decreased moving northeast
18 from region 1 to region 6, and all regions exhibited significantly decreased levels below the far
19 south region 1. The reverse was true for *E. cervi* intensities. Patterns for total IgA and anti-Tc
20 IgA are harder to interpret and less significant, but broadly the far south region 1 subpopulation
21 featured higher antibody levels than northern regions (regions 2, 3, and 5 for total IgA and
22 region 5 for anti-Tc IgA).

23 Most fixed effect estimates were only slightly modified by incorporating spatial autocorrelation
24 structures in our models (Figure SI1). No estimates were reduced in significance except the
25 seasonal effects in models 4 and 5 for *F. hepatica* and *E. cervi* (Figure SI1). Examining the
26 spatial fields (Figure 2), this reduction in seasonal effect probably originated from competition
27 between the seasonally varying spatial random effect and the season variable itself.
28 Otherwise, effect estimates remained unchanged when spatial autocorrelation was included.
29 This was particularly true for reproductive status effects, many of which actually increased
30 slightly in magnitude when we accounted for spatial autocorrelation (Figure SI1). The models
31 therefore replicated our previous study by demonstrating that reproductive investment was
32 associated with lower antibody levels and higher strongyle intensities (Albery, Watt, et al.
33 2018).

1 Discussion

2 This study has revealed fine-scale spatial variation in immunity and parasitism at an individual
3 level in a large wild mammal population. Spatial heterogeneity contributed considerably to
4 between-individual differences in immunity and parasitism despite a total sampling area of
5 only ~12.7 km². The scale of spatial dependence was therefore extremely short, and well
6 within the scale of the study area. These findings are in accordance with a previous study
7 demonstrating fine-scale immune variation in a discrete spatial context (within-site versus
8 between-site) in wild mice (Abolins *et al.* 2018). We demonstrate similar spatial variation in a
9 continuous context, and in both antibody levels and parasite counts, despite considerable
10 mixing within the population. Furthermore, the response variables differed in terms of their
11 spatial fields, the distances at which autocorrelation decayed in space, and their interactions
12 with seasonality. Finally, spatial distributions of antibodies were not similar to any parasite
13 distributions, implying that fine-scale environmental factors acting on exposure are more
14 important than host immune susceptibility in driving spatial heterogeneity of parasite infection.

15 The scale of dependence and its importance for disease ecology studies

16 Understanding the spatiotemporal scale of disease processes is important for designing
17 sampling regimes and disease control strategies (Caprarelli and Fletcher 2014; Lachish and
18 Murray 2018). In this context, our results have several important general implications. Firstly,
19 fine-scale trends like those exhibited here may scale up quickly where environments vary
20 across larger distances, contributing to larger-scale geographic patterns of disease that are
21 more commonly studied (Ostfeld *et al.* 2005; Murdock *et al.* 2017; Murray *et al.* 2018). Second,
22 disease ecology and ecoimmunology studies that do not consider spatial autocorrelation, even
23 over short distances, may be missing important sources of variation in immunity and exposure
24 and risk reporting biased effect estimates. The persistent spatial trend seen in *F. hepatica*
25 (Figure 2) demonstrates that different areas of a given study system can be consistently
26 associated with either higher or lower parasitism, so that uneven sampling in space could
27 introduce confounding variation and bias. In contrast, where the range of autocorrelation is
28 extremely short, as in strongyles, sampling regimes that do not consider spatial dependence
29 may incidentally sample areas of both high and low parasitism, reducing the risk of spatial
30 biasing. The range of autocorrelation was well within the range of an individual deer's home
31 range (Froy *et al.* 2018), implying that individuals may experience considerable variation in
32 parasitism depending on their movement choices within this range. Trends are not necessarily
33 similar across variables, complicating matters: most notably, spatial gradients of *F. hepatica*
34 and strongyle intensity differed considerably both in range and patterns, and antibody hotspots
35 did not align with parasite hotspots (Figure 2). Therefore, information on the spatial distribution
36 of one immune or parasite measure could not be used to infer the distribution of another, and

1 appropriate sampling regimes will differ between response variables. Finally, all models
2 except *E. cervi* were further improved when the spatial field was allowed to vary seasonally,
3 and spatial patterns of antibody levels changed considerably between seasons (Figure 2).
4 This confirmed our expectations that spatial fields would not be static in time (Hawkins 2012).
5 Therefore, in some cases, even sampling from a wide, contiguous area may only capture a
6 cross-sectional snapshot of the spatial dynamics of a given study system, necessitating
7 longitudinal analysis.

8 Spatial heterogeneity has the potential to obscure or produce artefactual associations with
9 other variables, modifying conclusions drawn from models without spatial dependence
10 structures – in particular by inflating the type I error rate (Beale *et al.*, 2010; Pawley and
11 McArdle, 2018). However, in this study, fixed effects remained largely unchanged when
12 incorporating spatial dependence structures despite the importance of spatial heterogeneity
13 (Figure S11). In particular, previously reported reproductive status effects (Albery, Watt, *et al.*
14 2018) persisted or increased slightly in size, despite the fact that reproductive success varies
15 across the study area (McLoughlin *et al.* 2006; Stopher *et al.* 2012). This demonstrates that
16 spatial variation can contribute to ecological patterns of disease without necessarily obscuring
17 other findings (Pawley and McArdle 2018). We suggest that disease ecology studies that
18 examine wild populations attempt to investigate spatial variation to enrich their results, rather
19 than viewing spatial autocorrelation as a nuisance (Pawley and McArdle 2018). In addition,
20 although the spatial fields were broadly reflected by the subpopulation fixed effect results
21 (Figure S11), the spatial fields were more easily interpretable and increased model fit, and
22 therefore incorporating spatial autocorrelation was advantageous. While integrating spatial
23 dependence did not have severe impacts on effect sizes in our study, we lastly encourage
24 researchers to consider accounting for spatial dependence even at the fine scales here to
25 improve statistical inference and account for this variation.

26 Interpreting the spatial fields

27 The spatial fields derived from our models can help to indicate the factors determining
28 immunity and parasite infection. Spatial trends of *F. hepatica* were especially stark, being
29 much higher in the south of the study area and decreasing to the north and northeast (Figure
30 2). Given that the parasite distributions were not explained through differences in immune
31 susceptibility, particularly considering minimal overlap with antibody level distributions (Figure
32 2), spatial patterns in parasite intensity likely instead resulted from spatial variation in
33 exposure. This heterogeneity likely originated from the drier environment in the north
34 compared to the wet, marshy ground in the south of the valley, the latter of which could be
35 conducive to parasite persistence in the environment. After being excreted, *F. hepatica* eggs
36 develop to form infectious miracidia, which seek out and infect *Galba truncatula* water snails

1 (Taylor *et al.* 2016; Beesley *et al.* 2018). After a period within the snail, cercariae are produced
2 which encyst on vegetation as metacercariae to be consumed by deer. Wet areas are likely to
3 host higher *G. truncatula* abundance, and warmer, wetter environments are conducive to fluke
4 development and host seeking behaviour, both of which will produce higher exposure
5 (Ollerenshaw and Smith 1969). The observed fluke distribution agrees with a number of
6 studies in livestock demonstrating high fluke risk where grazing and wet areas intersect (e.g.
7 Olsen *et al.*, 2015). Similar relationships with water sources are displayed by the human
8 trematode *Schistosoma mansoni*, which shows a similar range of autocorrelation (Brooker *et al.*
9 *et al.* 2006). Our corroboration of these findings in a wild mammal implies that similar
10 environmental risk factors may be influencing trematode infection in wild animals, humans,
11 and livestock.

12 In contrast to *F. hepatica*, the spatial field of strongyle intensity is difficult to interpret: spatial
13 autocorrelation introduced important variation, yet the range of autocorrelation was small,
14 similar to that reported for human hookworm infection (Brooker *et al.* 2006), and displayed no
15 discernible pattern either across the study period nor within seasons (Figure 2). Strongyles
16 may be less impacted by environmental factors than is *F. hepatica* due to their direct life cycle,
17 which does not involve a secondary host, such that spatial autocorrelation in intrinsic factors
18 affecting susceptibility is more important than environmental effects on exposure and
19 transmission. Host genetic similarity is a possible intrinsic factor producing the spatial
20 autocorrelation seen in strongyle counts and antibody levels: both are heritable in ungulates
21 (Bisset *et al.* 1992; Callaby *et al.* 2014; Hayward *et al.* 2014), and genetic relatedness is
22 correlated with spatial distance in this system (Stopher *et al.* 2012). Alternatively, as social
23 behaviours commonly covary with spatial behaviour (e.g. Sanchez and Hudgens 2015), the
24 spatial patterns established here may be partially explicable through social metrics such as
25 conspecific density. Future studies in this population could examine whether local population
26 density and/or other social variables affect individuals' immunity and parasitism in ways that
27 the INLA SPDE effect was unable to detect, potentially by using individual-level behavioural
28 metrics derived from census data (Coulson *et al.* 1997; Froy *et al.* 2018).

29 Ecological and epidemiological implications

30 The fine-scale spatial heterogeneity demonstrated here has implications for the ecology and
31 control of infectious disease in wild ungulate populations. For example, localised transmission
32 hotspots may maintain parasite diversity, preventing competitive exclusion of parasites
33 through geographic niche differentiation and contributing to the considerable genetic
34 differentiation seen in liver fluke populations (Beesley *et al.* 2016). Additionally, when
35 combined with sex-specific deer ranging patterns, spatial trends could contribute to previously
36 observed sex biases in infection intensity (Albery, Kenyon, *et al.* 2018). Finally, it is possible

1 that the strong seasonality in ranging behaviour (Stopher *et al.* 2012) interacts with seasonal
2 patterns of parasitism and immunity (Albery, Kenyon, *et al.* 2018). With more data, future
3 investigations in this system may be able to examine these associations.

4 As *F. hepatica* is an important livestock parasite, fluke control initiatives should consider the
5 presence of high-risk wet areas of grazing that may be used by deer populations. However, it
6 is worth noting that the fluke hotspots here were observed at the per-capita count level, rather
7 than as an absolute number of parasites in the environment. Given the higher deer density in
8 the north, taking *F. hepatica* as an example, it is likely that the absolute number of fluke eggs
9 being excreted in the north is higher than the south, but these parasites are less likely to
10 complete their life cycle due to unsuitable environmental conditions. In the future, it may be
11 possible to compare the excretion and movement patterns of the deer with pasture larval
12 counts and snail sampling across the study area to examine the rate at which successful
13 infection occurs, and to investigate whether deer living in the high-risk southern area of the
14 valley may indeed be vectoring *F. hepatica* to the north (Chintoan-Uta *et al.* 2014; French *et*
15 *al.* 2016).

16 Author contributions

17 GFA designed the study, collected samples, conducted labwork, analysed the data, and
18 wrote the manuscript. DJB, FK, DHN, and JMP offered comments and suggestions on
19 theory, analysis, and the manuscript throughout.

20 Acknowledgements

21 The authors thank the Division of Ecoimmunology and Disease Ecology, Division of
22 Comparative Endocrinology, Division of Animal Behavior, and Division of Ecology and
23 Evolution of the Society for Integrative and Comparative Biology as well as the Macroecology
24 of Infectious Disease Research Coordination Network funded by the National Science
25 Foundation (NSF DEB 1316223) for supporting the symposium “The scale of sickness: how
26 immune variation across space and species affects infectious disease dynamics” financially.
27 The long term red deer study is funded by the Natural Environment Research Council (grant
28 number NE/L00688X/1), as is GFA’s PhD studentship through the E3 Doctoral Training
29 Partnership (grant number NE/L002558/1). FK receives funding from the Scottish
30 Government, RESAS, Strategic Research Programmes 2016-21. We thank Scottish Natural
31 Heritage for permission to work on the Isle of Rum NNR and for the support of the reserve
32 management team on the island. Thanks to Dave McBean and Gillian Mitchell at the Moredun
33 Research Institute for their help with parasitological methods. The *Teladorsagia circumcincta*
34 antigen was received from Moredun Research Institute, and was prepared by David Bartley,
35 Alison Morrison, Leigh Andrews, David Frew and Tom McNeilly. Thanks also to Kathryn Watt

1 for assisting with immunological labwork and to Sean Morris, Alison Morris, Olly Gibb, and all
2 other field assistants for their help in sample collection. Finally, we thank two anonymous
3 reviewers for their helpful comments.

4 References

- 5 Abolins S, Lazarou L, Weldon L, Hughes L, King EC, Drescher P, Pocock MJO, Hafalla JCR,
6 Riley EM, Viney M. 2018. The ecology of immune state in a wild mammal, *Mus*
7 *musculus domesticus*. *PLOS Biol* 16:e2003538.
- 8 Albery GF, Kenyon F, Morris A, Morris S, Nussey DH, Pemberton JM. 2018. Seasonality of
9 helminth infection in wild red deer varies between individuals and between parasite
10 taxa. *Parasitology* 145:1–11.
- 11 Albery GF, Watt K, Keith R, Morris S, Morris A, Kenyon F, Nussey DH, Pemberton JM. 2018.
12 Reproduction has different costs for immunity and parasitism in a wild mammal. *bioRxiv*
13 472597.
- 14 Beale CM, Lennon JJ, Yearsley JM, Brewer MJ, Elston DA. 2010. Regression analysis of
15 spatial data. *Ecol Lett* 13:246–64.
- 16 Becker DJ, Czirják GÁ, Volokhov D V., Bentz AB, Carrera JE, Camus MS, Navara KJ,
17 Chizhikov VE, Fenton MB, Simmons NB, Recuenco SE, Gilbert AT, Altizer S, Streicker
18 DG. 2018. Livestock abundance predicts vampire bat demography, immune profiles,
19 and bacterial infection risk. *Philos Trans R Soc B* in press:DOI:
20 10.1098/rstb.2017.0089.
- 21 Becker DJ, Nachtmann C, Argibay HD, Botto G, Escalera-Zamudio M, Carrera JE, Tello C,
22 Winiarski E, Greenwood AD, Méndez-Ojeda ML, Loza-Rubio E, Lavergne A, de Thoisy
23 B, Czirják GÁ, Plowright RK, Altizer S, Streicker DG. 2019. Leukocyte profiles reflect
24 geographic range limits in a widespread Neotropical bat. *Integr Comp Biol*.
- 25 Beesley NJ, Caminade C, Charlier J, Flynn RJ, Hodgkinson JE, Martinez-Moreno A,
26 Martinez-Valladares M, Perez J, Rinaldi L, Williams DJL. 2018. *Fasciola* and fasciolosis
27 in ruminants in Europe: Identifying research needs. *Transbound Emerg Dis* 65:199–
28 216.
- 29 Beesley NJ, Williams DJLL, Paterson S, Hodgkinson J. 2016. *Fasciola hepatica*
30 demonstrates high levels of genetic diversity, a lack of population structure and high
31 gene flow: possible implications for drug resistance. *Int J Parasitol* 47:11–20.
- 32 Bisset SA, Vlassoff A, Morris CA, Southey BR, Baker RL, Parker AGH. 1992. Heritability of
33 and genetic correlations among faecal egg counts and productivity traits in Romney
34 sheep. *New Zeal J Agric Res* 35:51–58.
- 35 Bohm M, White PCL, Chambers J, Smith L, Hutchings MR. 2007. Wild deer as a source of
36 infection for livestock and humans in the UK. *Vet J* 174:260–76.
- 37 Brites-Neto J, Maria Duarte Roncato K, Martins TF. 2015. Tick-borne infections in human
38 and animal population worldwide. *Vet World* 8:301–15.
- 39 Brooker S, Alexander N, Geiger S, Moyeed RA, Stander J, Fleming F, Hotez PJ, Correa-
40 Oliveira R, Bethony J. 2006. Contrasting patterns in the small-scale heterogeneity of
41 human helminth infections in urban and rural environments in Brazil. *Int J Parasitol*
42 36:1143–51.
- 43 Callaby R, Hanotte O, Conradie van Wyk I, Kiara H, Toye P, Mbole-Kariuki MN, Jennings A,
44 Thumbi SM, Coetzer JAW, de C Bronsvort BM, Knott SA, Woolhouse MEJ, Kruuk

- 1 LEB. 2014. Variation and covariation in strongyle infection in East African shorthorn
2 zebu calves. *Parasitology* 142:1–13.
- 3 Caprarelli G, Fletcher S. 2014. A brief review of spatial analysis concepts and tools used for
4 mapping, containment and risk modelling of infectious diseases and other illnesses.
5 *Parasitology* 141:581–601.
- 6 Cheynel L, Lemaître JF, Gaillard JM, Rey B, Bourgoïn G, Ferté H, Jégo M, Débias F,
7 Pellerin M, Jacob L, Gilot-Fromont E. 2017. Immunosenescence patterns differ
8 between populations but not between sexes in a long-lived mammal. *Sci Rep* 7:1–11.
- 9 Chintoan-Uta C, Morgan ER, Skuce PJ, Coles GC. 2014. Wild deer as potential vectors of
10 anthelmintic-resistant abomasal nematodes between cattle and sheep farms. *Proc R*
11 *Soc B* 281:20132985.
- 12 Clutton-Brock TH, Guinness FE, Albon SD. 1982. *Red Deer: Behavior and Ecology of Two*
13 *Sexes* University of Chicago Press.
- 14 Cosandey-Godin A, Krainski ET, Worm B, Flemming JM. 2015. Applying Bayesian
15 spatiotemporal models to fisheries bycatch in the Canadian Arctic. *Can J Fish Aquat*
16 *Sci* 72:186–97.
- 17 Coulson T, Albon S, Guinness F, Pemberton J, Clutton-Brock T. 1997. Population
18 Substructure, Local Density, and Calf Winter Survival in Red Deer (*Cervus Elaphus*).
19 *Ecology* 78:852.
- 20 Downs CJ, Stewart KM, Dick BL. 2015. Investment in constitutive immune function by north
21 American elk experimentally maintained at two different population densities. *PLoS One*
22 10:1–17.
- 23 Ezenwa VO, Ghai RR, McKay AF, Williams AE. 2016. Group living and pathogen infection
24 revisited. *Curr Opin Behav Sci* 12:66–72.
- 25 French AS, Zadoks RN, Skuce PJ, Mitchell G, Gordon-Gibbs DK, Craine A, Shaw D, Gibb
26 SW, Taggart MA. 2016. Prevalence of liver fluke (*Fasciola hepatica*) in wild red deer
27 (*Cervus elaphus*): Coproantigen elisa is a practicable alternative to faecal egg counting
28 for surveillance in remote populations. *PLoS One* 11:1–18.
- 29 Froy H, Börger L, Regan CE, Morris A, Morris S, Pilkington JG, Crawley MJ, Clutton-Brock
30 TH, Pemberton JM, Nussey DH. 2018. Declining home range area predicts reduced
31 late-life survival in two wild ungulate populations. *Ecol Lett* 21:1001–9.
- 32 Gilligan CA, Truscott JE, Stacey AJ. 2007. Impact of scale on the effectiveness of disease
33 control strategies for epidemics with cryptic infection in a dynamical landscape: An
34 example for a crop disease. *J R Soc Interface* 4:925–34.
- 35 Hawkins BA. 2012. Eight (and a half) deadly sins of spatial analysis. *J Biogeogr* 39:1–9.
- 36 Hayward AD, Garnier R, Watt KA, Pilkington JG, Bryan T, Matthews JB, Pemberton JM,
37 Nussey DH, Andrea L, Hayward AD, Garnier R, Watt KA, Pilkington JG, Grenfell BT,
38 Matthews JB, Pemberton JM, Nussey DH, Graham AL. 2014. Heritable,
39 heterogeneous, and costly resistance of sheep against nematodes and potential
40 feedbacks to epidemiological dynamics. *Am Nat* 184 Suppl:S58-76.
- 41 Huisman J, Kruuk LEB, Ellis PA, Clutton-Brock T, Pemberton JM. 2016. Inbreeding
42 depression across the lifespan in a wild mammal population. *Proc Natl Acad Sci*
43 201518046.
- 44 Jolles AE, Beechler BR, Dolan BP. 2015. Beyond mice and men: Environmental change,
45 immunity and infections in wild ungulates. *Parasite Immunol* 37:255–66.

- 1 Lachish S, Murray KA. 2018. The Certainty of Uncertainty: Potential Sources of Bias and
2 Imprecision in Disease Ecology Studies. *Front Vet Sci* 5:1–14.
- 3 Laughton AM, O'Connor CO, Knell RJ. 2017. Responses to a warming world: Integrating life
4 history, immune investment, and pathogen resistance in a model insect species. *Ecol*
5 *Evol* 7:9699–9710.
- 6 Lindgren F, Rue H. 2015. Bayesian Spatial Modelling with R-INLA. *J Stat Softw* 63.
- 7 Lindgren F, Rue H, Lindstrom J. 2011. An explicit link between Gaussian fields and
8 Gaussian Markov random fields : the stochastic. 423–98.
- 9 Martins TG, Simpson D, Lindgren F, Rue H. 2013. Bayesian computing with INLA: New
10 features. *Comput Stat Data Anal* 67:68–83.
- 11 Mason P. 1989. *Elaphostrongylus cervi* - a review. *Surveillance* 16:3–10.
- 12 McLoughlin PD, Boyce MS, Coulson T, Clutton-Brock T. 2006. Lifetime reproductive success
13 and density-dependent, multi-variable resource selection. *Proc R Soc B Biol Sci*
14 273:1449–54.
- 15 Murdock C, Evans M V, McClanahan T, Miazgowicz K, Tesla B. 2017. Fine-scale variation in
16 microclimate across an urban landscape changes the capacity of *Aedes albopictus* to
17 vector arbovirus. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis* 11:e0005640.
- 18 Murray K, Olivero J, Roche B, Tiedt S, Guégan J. 2018. Pathogeography: leveraging the
19 biogeography of human infectious diseases for global health management. *Ecography*
20 (Cop) 1–17.
- 21 Nusser SM, Clark WR, Otis DL, Huang L. 2008. Sampling Considerations for Disease
22 Surveillance in Wildlife Populations. *J Wildl Manage* 72:52–60.
- 23 Ollerenshaw CB, Smith LP. 1969. Meteorological Factors and Forecasts of Helminthic
24 Disease. *Adv Parasitol* 7:283–323.
- 25 Olsen A, Frankena K, Bødker R, Toft N, Thamsborg SM, Enemark HL, Halasa T. 2015.
26 Prevalence, risk factors and spatial analysis of liver fluke infections in Danish cattle
27 herds. *Parasit Vectors* 8:160.
- 28 Ostfeld RS, Glass GE, Keesing F. 2005. Spatial epidemiology: An emerging (or re-emerging)
29 discipline. *Trends Ecol Evol* 20:328–36.
- 30 Parsons SK, Bull CM, Gordon DM. 2015. Spatial variation and survival of *Salmonella*
31 *enterica* subspecies in a population of australian sleepy lizards (*Tiliqua rugosa*). *Appl*
32 *Environ Microbiol* 81:5804–11.
- 33 Pawley MDM, McArdle BH. 2018. Spatial autocorrelation: Bane or Bonus? bioRxiv 385526.
- 34 Qviller L, Viljugrein H, Loe LE, Meisingset EL, Mysterud A. 2016. The influence of red deer
35 space use on the distribution of *Ixodes ricinus* ticks in the landscape. *Parasit Vectors*
36 9:545.
- 37 R Core Team. 2018. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation
38 for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. .
- 39 Rue H, Martino S. 2009. Approximate Bayesian inference for latent Gaussian models by
40 using integrated nested Laplace approximations. 319–92.
- 41 Sanchez JN, Hudgens BR. 2015. Interactions between density, home range behaviors, and
42 contact rates in the Channel Island fox (*Urocyon littoralis*). *Ecol Evol* 5:2466–77.
- 43 Sol D, Jovani R, Torres J, Sol D, Jovani R, Torres J. 2011. Geographical Variation in Blood

- 1 Parasites in Feral Pigeons : The Role of Vectors Geographical variation in blood
2 parasites in feral pigeons : the role of vectors. 23:307–14.
- 3 Stopher K V, Walling CA, Morris A, Guinness FE, Clutton-brock TH, Pemberton JM, Nussey
4 DH. 2012. Shared spatial effects on quantitative genetic parameters: accounting for
5 spatial autocorrelation and home range overlap reduces estimates of heritability in wild
6 red deer. *Evolution* (N Y) 66:2411–26.
- 7 Taylor MA, Coop RL, Wall RL. 2016. Parasites of ungulates. In: *Veterinary Parasitology* p.
8 761–815.
- 9 Vidal-Martínez VM, Pech D, Sures B, Purucker ST, Poulin R. 2010. Can parasites really
10 reveal environmental impact? *Trends Parasitol* 26:44–51.
- 11 Watt KA, Nussey DH, Maclellan R, Pilkington JG, McNeilly TN. 2016. Fecal antibody levels
12 as a noninvasive method for measuring immunity to gastrointestinal nematodes in
13 ecological studies. *Ecol Evol* 6:56–67.
- 14 Wilson K, Grenfell BT, Pilkington JG, Boyd HEG, Gulland FMD. 2004. Parasites and their
15 impact. In: T. Clutton-Brock and J. Pemberton, editor. *Soay Sheep: Dynamics and
16 Selection in an Island Population* Cambridge University Press. p. 113–65.
- 17 Wood CL, Lafferty KD. 2013. Biodiversity and disease: a synthesis of ecological
18 perspectives on Lyme disease transmission. *Trends Ecol Evol* 28:239–47.
- 19 Zuur AF, Ieno EN, Saveliev AA. 2017. *Beginner's guide to spatial, temporal, and spatial-
20 temporal ecological data analysis with R-INLA*.
- 21