

Contents lists available at SciVerse ScienceDirect

# International Journal for Parasitology: Parasites and Wildlife

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/ijppaw

# What drives population-level effects of parasites? Meta-analysis meets life-history $\stackrel{\mbox{\tiny{\sc black}}}{\rightarrow}$



IJP

# Maggie J. Watson\*

School of Animal & Veterinary Sciences, Charles Sturt University, Boorooma Street, Wagga Wagga, NSW 2642, Australia

## ARTICLE INFO

Article history: Received 1 February 2013 Revised 7 May 2013 Accepted 8 May 2013

Keywords: Cost of parasites Lifespan Meta-regression Virulence

#### ABSTRACT

Parasites are considered drivers of population regulation in some species; unfortunately the research leading to this hypothesis has all been conducted on managed populations. Still unclear is whether parasites have population-level effects in truly wild populations and what life-history traits drive observed virulence. A meta-analysis of 38 data sets where parasite loads were altered on non-domesticated, free-ranging wild vertebrate hosts (31 birds, 6 mammals, 1 fish) was conducted and found a strong negative effect of parasites at the population-level (g = 0.49). Among different categories of response variables measured, parasites significantly affected clutch size, hatching success, young produced, and survival, but not overall breeding success. A meta-regression of effect sizes and life-history traits thought to determine parasite virulence indicate that average host life span may be the single most important driver for understanding the effects of parasites. Further studies, especially of long-lived hosts, are necessary to prove this hypothesis.

© 2013 The Authors. Published by Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

## 1. Introduction

A central goal of population ecology is to identify factors controlling population dynamics. In wild populations, predation and competition are well studied, with some theoretical and empirical investigations focusing on the effects of parasites. Population regulation by parasites has been identified in Red Grouse *Lagopus lagopus scoticus* (Hudson et al., 1998), Svalbard Reindeer *Rangifer tarandus platyrhnchus* (Albon et al., 2002) and Soay Sheep Ovis aries (Gulland, 1992); unfortunately, these examples represent managed populations, and therefore may not reflect true effects of parasites on wild populations. Thus, the question remains—are parasites significant drivers of population-level effects and what host life-history traits drive observed virulence (*sensu lato* Casadevall and Pirofski, 1999—the capacity of a parasite to cause damage to a host)?

The modern view of parasitism is predicated on the assumption that 'every parasitic organism... imposes a cost on its host' because resources, however slight, are being diverted from host to parasite (Combes, 2005). These costs can be couched in two evolutionary trajectories: (1) the 'mutual aggression model, (Holmes, 1983) which suggests that parasites evolve to be as virulent as possible, and thus are a primary regulatory force; and (2) the 'prudent parasite model' (Holmes, 1983; Renaud and de Meeüs, 1991) which suggests that parasites evolve towards a balance between shortand long-term needs conferring a range of benefits to the infected host that may or may not offset the costs (Michalakis et al., 1992; Schmidt-Hempel, 2003).

Several researchers have argued that the only way to assess the true effects of parasites is by altering the parasite population of the host in situ (Møller, 2005). Alterations of parasite loads are easy to effect in domestic and laboratory animals, and even wild animals in the laboratory (Diamond, 1983; McCallum, 1995). However, relatively little parasite work on wild, free-ranging hosts incorporates this technique due to logistical difficulties surrounding field work and obtaining sufficient sample sizes to detect differences between infected and non-infected hosts. Therefore, much ecological work on the effects of parasites ends up being correlative (Poulin, 2007a). It is unclear if the differences detected between parasitized and non-parasitised hosts are due to indirect effects or pre-existing differences (i.e., prior to infection; Bize et al., 2008 or host-quality; Lailvaux and Kasumovic, 2011). Field experimentation is necessary to quantify actual costs of parasites on hosts due to the many problems associated with extrapolating laboratory results on individuals or populations to real effects in the field (Seitz and Ratte, 1991).

In order to understand if parasites are truly a driver of host populations, reviews of the effects of parasites to wild hosts need to be conducted. Reviews to date of both observational and

<sup>\*</sup> This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike License, which permits noncommercial use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

<sup>\*</sup> Present address: School of Environmental Sciences, Charles Sturt University, Elizabeth Mitchell Drive, Albury, NSW 2641, Australia. Tel.: +61 2 6051 9893; fax: +61 2 6933 2991.

E-mail address: mawatson@csu.edu.au

experimental work on the cost of parasites to wild hosts (birds, mammals, fish and insects: Lehmann, 1993; birds: Møller, 1997; birds and mammals: Tompkins and Begon, 1999; mammals: Irvine, 2006) have implied that parasites are costly, but the implications of that cost are unreliable, due to the methods used to synthesize results (Stewart, 2010). A recent meta-analytical synthesis of parasite induced mortality of nestlings showed an overall small effect (12% mean parasite-induced mortality, range 0–89%, n = 117), with parasite-induced mortality determined by latitude, nesting site, probability of host survival and parasite prevalence (Møller et al., 2009). However, this meta-analysis only considered studies of nestling birds and may be fundamentally flawed because it includes observational data as well as experimental data (Borenstein et al., 2009).

The objectives of the present analyses were to review quantitatively experimental studies of wild, free-ranging hosts that measure parasite-induced changes in population-level traits (i.e. measures of fecundity and mortality); then, to evaluate this effect of parasites using life-history traits. Based on those host life-history traits that Møller et al. (2009) found to be significant, the following predictions are made: (1) cavity-nesting species (includes burrowing mammals as well as hollow nesting birds) will experience increased parasite density and intensity and thus more virulent effects than ground or open nesting species (Ewald, 1983); (2) colonial species will experience increased parasite density and intensity and thus more virulent effects than less gregarious species (Ewald, 1983); (3) tropical species will encounter more virulent parasites than temperate species because the absence of seasonality maintains higher parasite abundance (Møller, 1998); and (4) higher virulence will evolve in hosts with shorter life-spans because of the fewer opportunities there are for dispersal to a new host in search of a mate, and as a consequence, the parasites become more virulent (Lehmann, 1993; Nidelet et al., 2009).

# 2. Materials and methods

## 2.1. Data collection and inclusion criteria

The studies considered for use in the meta-analysis were obtained from a survey of the primary literature. The initial search was directed using reviews by Møller (1997), Newton (1998), Tompkins and Begon (1999) and Irvine (2006) followed by a comprehensive search of ISI Web of Science and Google Scholar up to and including January 2012. The following search terms and their combinations were used: "parasite\*", "experiment\*", "manipulation", "cost\*", "effect\*", "mortality", "survival", "fitness", "host\*", "life-history". Older literature (pre-1985) was identified through Literature Cited sections of recent papers and unpublished theses (the same search terms were used in ProQuest Dissertations and Theses, Theses Canada and Trove). Only papers written in English were included. When reference to unpublished work was encountered, attempts were made to solicit raw data from the author(s). A large number of studies were screened using abstracts only (<2000); 89 full-text articles were assessed for eligibility. Of these, 51 were excluded due to a lack of numerical data, lack of sample size and/or variance, untranslatable test statistics, duplication of dataset from a previous paper or reported results not relevant to the selection criteria (e.g. behavioural or physiological/individual responses). Studies were selected if (a) host species were wild (not domesticated), free-ranging (not held in captivity) and the study was conducted under field-conditions (not laboratory conditions); (b) parasite species were experimentally manipulated (increased or decreased); and (c) the parasite was naturally occurring and not introduced, thus avoiding the 'suicide king' issue of parasites infecting hosts outside their normal range and becoming more virulent in the process (Dybdahl and Storfer, 2003). Of these, a study was included in the final meta-analyses if it provided (a) the means and standard errors or standard deviations (or any other statistic whereby means and standard errors could be derived) of at least one population-level parameter measuring the cost of parasitism for experimental and control groups, and (b) the sample sizes associated with the means.

# 2.2. Response variables and calculation of effect sizes

Response variable and effect size data were extracted from the text and tables for all studies except Cheney and Côté (2003), Fitze et al. (2004), Pap et al. (2005), Slomczyński et al. (2006) (additional information requested and received from the authors); and Bize et al. (2004) and Hillegass et al. (2010) (data extracted from graphs using DataThief: Tummers, 2006). Statistics were converted to effect sizes in the form of Hedges' g (Hedges and Olkin, 1985) in the program Comprehensive Meta-analysis (CMA; Borenstein, 2006). Hedges' g was chosen as the effect size over the more commonly used Cohen's *d* because Hedges' g pools variance using n - 1instead of n and thus provides a better estimate for smaller sample sizes (Grissom and Kim, 2005). Studies that reported only F statistics (Møller, 2002; Vandegrift et al., 2008) were not converted to effect sizes due to issues surrounding the overestimation of effect sizes identified by Hullett and Levine (2003) and lack of accurate sample size data in the respective articles. The type of response variable was coded into the data set to enable subgroup analyses. The response variables used were: clutch size (number of eggs in the clutch), percent hatching success (percentage of eggs that hatched from a single clutch), number of young produced (total brood size), percent breeding success (percentage of young produced, fledged or survived during the study period), and survival rate (survival during the study period or between one breeding season and the next).

# 2.3. Meta-analytic procedures

All meta-analyses were performed in CMA (Borenstein, 2006). A random-effects model was used for all tests because variability was expected in the effects being measured across different species and hosts. Many articles included multiple effect sizes from different measures of the effects of parasitism, so rather than combining all the effect sizes within a study (which may have obfuscated the true effect), in the overall meta-analysis one effect size was chosen at random from each of the forty-three studies (Gurevitch and Hedges, 1999). Separate random-effects meta-analyses were conducted grouped by effect being studied—so any given study might have data in several meta-analyses (sub-analyses) thus maintaining the independence of the data (Gurevitch and Hedges, 1999). One study (Roby et al., 1992) considered the responses of two host species to the same anti-parasitic treatment, so the two hosts were considered as independent studies.

# 2.4. Heterogeneity and publication bias

Publication bias, or the 'file drawer problem', where non-significant results are relegated to the file drawer rather than to the published literature (Rosenberg, 2005), is an ongoing issue affecting meta-analyses, leading to bias via the selective publication of statistically significant results (Hedges and Olkin, 1985). To guard against this issue, publication bias was assessed using three methods: funnel plot (plot of effect size and precision to search for asymmetry), *Q*-rank correlation (a test for publication bias; Begg and Mazumdar, 1994), and trim-and-fill (Duval and Tweedie, 2000). Heterogeneity indicates the presence of effect-modifiers, and the *Q*-test for heterogeneity was calculated for the overall

#### Table 1

Studies used in the meta-analysis investigating using parasite load manipulations the effect of parasites on their wild, free-ranging hosts. Hosts are listed in taxonomic order using common name and parasites are listed by common name. Data for the meta-regression are coded in the following order: living in cavities/hollows (0 = open; 1 = cavity/hollow), coloniality (0 = solitary; 1 = 2-10 pairs; 2 = 11-100 pairs; 3 = 101-1000 pairs; 4 = 1001+ pairs), latitude (in cases where the same species is used from different locations, just the latitude is recorded), and host life-span (maximum recorded; average).

Jesche Proglomes Langfin Damsibilité     Lopods     Clutch size Nematodes     Clutch size Winnig produced     Cheney and C&é (2003)     0, 0, 13,10, 6, 6       Avian Californies Red Grosse     Nematodes Nematodes     Clutch size Proglomptones     Clutch size Winnig produced     Hudson (1986) Redpath et al. (2000)     0, 0, 5,358, 8, 3       Rock Dove Lice     Hatching success     Clayton et al. (1999)     0, 3, 41,55, 35, 6       Statem River Proflemitymes     Ticks     # Young produced     McRilligan (1996)     0, 4, 27,55, 17, 8       Exstern River Proflemity     Nets     Clutch size, Latching success, # young prod.     Van Gers et al. (2002)     0, 5, 33,56, 27, 25       Crested Tern     Lice, Licks     # Young Produced     Watson unpub. Data     0, 4, 38,31, 32, 15       Apol@rives     Lice, Licks     # Young Produced     Bize et al. (2004)     1, 3, 47,12, 26, 6       Suscessform CHaudifidate/     Mites     Clutch size, Latching success, # young produced     Meller (1990)     1, 2, 42,51, 21, 3       Tree Swallow     Mites     Clutch size, Latching success, # young produced     Meller (1990)     1, 2, 42,51, 1, 3       Tree Swallow     Bigs     Successful     Clutch size, Latching success, # young produced <th>Host</th> <th>Parasite</th> <th>Response variable</th> <th>Source paper</th> <th>Meta-regression</th>	Host	Parasite	Response variable	Source paper	Meta-regression		
Iongin Lowerting Voins CaliformsBogodsClutch size Arching success, # young producedEnderon (1986)0.013.10. 6, 6Columbor Red Grosse NematodeClutch size, hatching success, # young producedRedson (1986)0.0, 23.05, 8, 3Columbor Reds Dove PathonyLiceHatching success, # young producedRedson (1986)0.3, 41.15, 35, 6Columbor PathonyLiceHatching successNerrorss and Bolen (2002)0.3, 33.55, 27, 25Cattle Egret PathonyTackHatching success, # young producedNation unpub Data0.4, 33.13, 27, 25Cattle Egret PathonyLice, tacks# Young producedWatson unpub Data0.4, 33.13, 27, 15Cereted Tarn Data SuccessProme ProducedWatson unpub Data0.4, 33.13, 27, 15Applies Swith Data SuccessEuce tacks# Young ProducedWatson unpub Data0.4, 33.13, 27, 16Marter Starn Data SuccessMiler (1980)1.2, 25.72, 10, 6Nation (1986)1.4, 41.13, 11, 15Bart Swallow Data SuccessMiler Starcess# Young ProducedRoder (1991)1.2, 25.72, 10, 6Neares Data SuccessMiler Starcess# Young ProducedRoder (1990)1.2, 25.72, 10, 6Cutt Size, hatching success, # young producedRoder (1990)1.2, 25.92, 13, 2Tree SwallowBugs, taksS SuccessfulPoung ProducedRoder (1991)Buss Marin Data StarteNationS SuccessfulPoung Produced, SNationPare Bwart NationNationS SuccessfulPoung Produced, S <t< td=""><td colspan="7">Piscine Perciformes</td></t<>	Piscine Perciformes						
Availe califyorme Red GrouseNetwork for the constraint of the constraint	Longfin Damselfish	Isonods	Clutch size	Cheney and Côté (2003)	0 0 13 10 6 6		
Bed Grouse Demande NemandesChrist size, flacking success, # young producedHudsen (1986) Hudsen (1990)0.0.5395, 8.3Columbiformes Control Fight Control FightLiceLatching successClayton et al. (1999)0.3, 41.15, 35, 6Control Fight Pelconformes Control FightTicks# Young producedMcKilligan (1996)0.4, 27.55, 17, 8Pelconformes Eurasian Oyterea Control System Lice, ticksHatching success, # young prod.Norcross and Bolen (2002)0.3, 33.56, 27.25Eurasian Oyterea Eurasian Oyterea Control System Eurasian Oyterea Control SystemNorcross and Bolen (2002)0.3, 33.56, 27.25Eurasian Oyterea Eurasian Oyterea Control System Eurasian Oyterea Control System Apolite SystemNorcross and Bolen (2002)0.3, 33.56, 27.25Eurasian Oyterea Eurasian Oyterea Control System Control System Apolite SystemNorcross and Bolen (2002)0.3, 33.56, 27.25Eurasian Oyterea Eurasian Oyterea Control System Baser System (Hundindoo MitesMoung ProducedWatson unpub. Data0.4, 38.31, 32.15Apolite System Baser System System 	Avian Galliformes	Isopous	clutch size	cheffey and core (2005)	0, 0,15.10, 0, 0		
Name and orderProma producedReduction in Joing ProducedRedu	Red Grouse	Nematode	Clutch size batching success # young produced	Hudson (1986)	0 0 53 95 8 3		
Columbig/memsColumbig functionDescriptionConstructionLiceHatching successChyton et al. (1999)0. 3, 4, 11, 5, 3, 6, 6CiccuifyrmesTicks# Young producedMcKilligan (1996)0. 4, 4, 27, 55, 17, 8Pelicang/memsTicksHatching successNorcross and Bolen (2002)0. 3, 33, 56, 27, 25CharadardignmesLice, ticksHatching success, # young prod.Van Oers et al. (2002)0. 0, 53, 29, 43, 12SystemationNorcross and Bolen (2002)0. 0, 53, 29, 43, 12Systemation0, 4, 83, 13, 21, 15AppliformesLice, ticks# Young ProducedBize et al. (2004)1, 3, 4, 71, 2, 6, 6Barsorfinnes (fundimiduo)Bize et al. (2004)1, 2, 57, 12, 10, 6Barn SwallowMilesClutch size, hatching success, # young producedMoller (1990)1, 2, 57, 12, 10, 6Barn SwallowMilesClutch size, hatching success, # young producedBize et al. (2004)1, 4, 41, 13, 11, 13Barn SwallowMilesClutch size, hatching success, # young producedMoller (1990)1, 2, 42, 59, 12, 31Barn SwallowBigs, rash, liceSuccessfulBrown and Borow (1996)1, 2, 42, 59, 12, 31Barn SwallowBigs, rash, liceSuccessfulBrown and Borow (1996)1, 2, 2, 258, 13, 82Barn SwallowBigs, rash, liceSuccessfulBrown and Borow (1996)1, 2, 2, 258, 13, 82Barn BachingBrow particle size, size size size size size size size size	heu Grouse	Nematodes	# Young produced	Rednath et al. (2006)	0, 0, 55.55, 0, 5		
lock lower (Configures)LeeHatching successClayton et al. (1999)0.3, 41.15, 36, 6Cottel Egret Pellcang/mesTicks# Young producedMcKilligan (1996)0, 4, 22.55, 17, 8Eastern Brown Pellcan Consider (Carted Tern Aphne Surft Loce IcksHatching success, # young prod., \$ succ. Young producedNorcross and Bolen (2002)0, 53.29, 43, 12Crested Tern Aphne SuffLose, Icks# Young producedWaton unpub. Data0, 4, 38.31, 32, 15Aphne Suff Marter Dama SuffLose, Icks# Young ProducedBize et al. (2004)1, 3, 47, 12, 26, 6Bars SvallowMites MitesClutch size, hatching success, # young produced Pape et al. (2005)1, 2, 47, 12, 26, 6Bars SvallowMites MitesClutch size, hatching success, # young produced Survivi ratePape et al. (2004)1, 3, 47, 12, 26, 6Bags, ticksSurvivi rate Survivi rateBrown and Brown (2004) Rest, Each Iching success, # young produced, Rest Clutch size, hatching success, # young produced, Rest Clutch size, hatching success, # young produced, Rest RestMarzal et al. (2005)1, 2, 42, 59, 12, 31House Martin Paser MateriaBigs, malariaSuccessful Successful Paser PorducedMarzal et al. (2005)1, 2, 42, 59, 12, 33Purple Martin Paser MateriaMitesClutch size, hatching success, # young produced, % SuccessfulMarzal et al. (2005)1, 3, 43, 43, 12, 26, 59, 13, 8Sand Martin Paser MateriaFicks, Fice, Rest MateriaSuccessfulMarzel et al. (2007)1, 0, 42, 55, 15, 16, 16, 1	Columbiformes		" Toung produced	neupani et al (2000)			
ContigramesEnd of the second seco	Rock Dove	Lice	Hatching success	Clayton et al. (1999)	0 3 41 15 35 6		
Cartle Foret PerilcandformesTicks# Young producedMcKilligan (1996)0. 4, 27 55, 17, 8PaticandformesTicksHatching successNorcross and Bolen (2002)0, 3, 33 55, 27, 25Patrastan OystercarberNematodes, trematodes, cetodosZuccs, and Bolen (2002)0, 0, 53 28, 43, 12Crested TernLice, ticks# Young producedWarson unpub. Data0, 4, 383, 13, 15ApplofformesSuccs, and Bolen (2002)1, 3, 471, 22, 6, 6Barserifformes (Hinudinide)MitesClutch size, hatching success, # young producedMeller (1900)1, 2, 571, 21, 0, 6Bars SwallowMitesClutch size, hatching success, # young producedMeller (1900)1, 2, 571, 21, 0, 6Bars SwallowMitesClutch size, hatching success, # young producedMeller (1900)1, 2, 44, 13, 11, 5Bars SwallowMitesSuccessfulBrown and Brown (1986)1, 4, 41, 13, 11, 5Bars SwallowBiog fires, liceSuccessfulBrown and Brown (1986)1, 2, 42, 59, 12, 3Tree SwallowBiog fires, liceSuccessfulBrown and Brown (1986)1, 2, 42, 59, 12, 3Bars MartinBugs, malariaClutch size, hatching success, # young produced, %Rendell and Verbeek (1996)1, 2, 38, 50, 51, 2Purple MartinBugs, malariaSuccessfulSuccessfulMarzal et al. (2005)1, 2, 38, 50, 15, 2Purple MartinBlow flySuccessfulSuccessfulRendell and Verbeek (1996)1, 3, 48, 60, 10, 2, 38, 51, 51, 50Sand MartinTicksYoung produced, % you	Ciconiiformes	Lice	hatening success	endyton et an (1000)	0, 0, 1110, 00, 0		
Pelicangiorines ElementationIntermediationIntermediationExtern Rison Picitan ChandrijomesInters0.3.3356, 27.25Chandrijomes Eurasian Oysterache ApoliformesNarcross and Bolen (2002)0.0,5329, 43, 12Crested Tern ApoliformesLick isc, hatching success, # young prod. \$ \$ succ. \$ Young producedWatson unpub. Data0.4,3831, 32, 12, 25, 64Apoliformes ApoliformesLinuse-fles# Young ProducedBize et al. (2004)1.3, 47, 12, 26, 64Bain SwallowMites Bags, icls isClutch size, hatching success, # young producedMeller (1990)1.2, 57, 12, 10, 6Bain SwallowBags, icls isSurvival rateBrown and Brown (1986)1.4, 41, 13, 11, 5Bags, fless, lice Bags, icls isSurvival rateBrown and Brown (1986)1.4, 41, 13, 11, 5Tree SwallowBlow flySuccessful SuccessfulRood et al. (1992)1.2, 24, 25, 12, 3House MartinBugs, sicksSuccessful Success, # young produced, X successfulMarzal et al. (2005)1.2, 33, 85, 0, 15, 2Purple MartinMitesClutch size, hatching success, # young prod. X successfulStep and Meller (1993)1.3, 38, 50, 15, 2Purple MartinBiow flySuccessful Turk secessfulStep and Meller (1993)1.3, 38, 50, 15, 2Purple MartinMitesClutch size, # young produced, XMarzal et al. (2005)1.2, 33, 58, 15, 3Sand MartinTicksHatching success, # young produced, XMose et al. (1996)1.2, 33, 58, 15, 3Sand MartinFless	Cattle Egret	Ticks	# Young produced	McKilligan (1996)	0. 4. 27.55. 17. 8		
issterTicksHatching successNorroass and Baten (2002)0, 3, 33, 56, 27, 25ChrandrijformesCutch size, hatching success, # young prod. x youcVan Oers et al. (2002)0, 0, 53, 28, 43, 12Crested TernLice, ticks# Young producedBize et al. (2004)1, 3, 47, 12, 26, 6Passeriformes (Itrinulation)MitesClutch size, hatching success, # young producedBize et al. (2004)1, 3, 47, 12, 26, 6Passeriformes (Itrinulation)MitesClutch size, hatching success, # young producedBize et al. (2004)1, 3, 47, 12, 26, 6Barn SwallowMitesClutch size, hatching success, # young producedBize et al. (2005)1, 4, 41, 13, 11, 5Bags, floas, liceSurvival rateBown aud flown (1966)1, 2, 42, 59, 12, 3Bags, floas, liceSurvival rateBown aud flown (2004)1, 3, 38, 50, 15, 2Purple MatrinBugs, malariaClutch size, hatching success, # young produced.Rendell and Verbeek (1996)1, 2, 38, 50, 15, 2Purple MatrinBugs, malariaClutch size, hatching success, # young produced.Marzal et al. (2005)1, 2, 38, 50, 15, 2Purple MatrinMitesSuccessfulSuccessfulSuccessful1, 3, 480, 10, 2Sand MarrinBust, malariaSuccessfulSuccessfulRendell et 1999)1, 3, 480, 10, 2Sand MarrinReseriformes (Itrinulate, slow from et al. (1996)1, 2, 38, 51, 53, 53, 53, 53, 53, 53, 53, 53, 53, 53	Pelicaniformes		······································		-, -, , - , - , -		
ChandrafijomesUnit is it is i	Eastern Brown Pelican	Ticks	Hatching success	Norcross and Bolen (2002)	0, 3, 33, 56, 27, 25		
FunctionNematodes, rematodes, constrainting success, # young prod. x succ.Van Oers et al. (2002)0. 0, 53.29, 43.12Crested TermLice, ticks# Young producedWatson unpub. Data0, 4, 38.31, 32, 15ApodiformesLouss-flies# Young ProducedBize et al. (2004)1, 3, 47.12, 26, 6Paseriformer, (Intrimutinitue)MitesClutch size, hatching success, # young producedMale (1990)1, 2, 57.12, 10, 6Barn SwallowMitesClutch size, hatching success, # young producedMape et al. (2005)1, 4, 41.13, 11, 5Bags, flex, liceSurvival rateBrown and Brown (1986)1, 4, 41.13, 11, 5Bags, flex, liceSurvival rateBrown and Brown (2004)3.2.0Pare SwallowBlow fly% SuccessfulRendell and Verbeek (1990)1, 2, 42.59, 12, 3House MartinBugs, malariaClutch size, hatching success, # young produced, %Rendell and Verbeek (1990)1, 3, 435.0, 15, 2Purple MartinBugs, malariaClutch size, hatching success, # young produced, %Narzal et al. (2005)1, 2, 35.89, 13, 8Sand MartinTicks# SuccessfulSource sfulNoss et al. (1966)1, 2, 35.89, 13, 8Sand MartinTicks# SuccessfulRoss et al. (1966)1, 2, 35.89, 13, 9Purple MartinMitesLick hize, strouge produced, %Noss et al. (1992)1, 0, 45.31, 5, 5Purple MartinMitesClutch size, hatching successfulRoss et al. (1996)1, 2, 35.89, 13, 6Sand MartinTicks# SuccessfulRoss et al. (200	Charadriiformes		0		.,.,.,.,		
Certed TermCerted TermCerted TermCerted TermCerted TermApolformesLice, ticks# Young producedBize et al. (2004)1, 3, 47, 12, 26, 6ApolformesMitesClutch size, hatching success, # young producedMaller (1990)1, 2, 57, 12, 10, 6Barn SwallowMitesClutch size, hatching success, # young producedMaller (1990)1, 2, 57, 12, 10, 6Cliff SwallowBugs, ticks% SuccessfulChapman and George (1991)3, 32, 0Bugs, ticksSurvival rateBrown and Brown (1986)1, 2, 44, 13, 11, 5Bugs, ticksSurvival rateBrown and Brown (1996)1, 2, 42, 59, 12, 3Tree SwallowBigs, malariaClutch size, hatching success, # young producedRendell and Verbeek (1996)1, 2, 42, 59, 12, 3House MartinBugs, malariaClutch size, hatching success, # young produced, %Marzal et al. (2005)1, 2, 38, 50, 15, 2Purple MartinMitesHatching success, # young produced, %Marzal et al. (2005)1, 2, 38, 58, 18, 8Sand MartinTicks# Young producedSzép and Maller (1993)1, 3, 48, 08, 10, 2Purple MartinMitesSuccessfulMoss et al. (1966)1, 2, 38, 58, 15, 58Sand MartinTicks# Young producedSzép and Maller (1999)1, 0, 42, 59, 10, 6Passerformes (Paridae)Blow fty% SuccessfulRoby et al. (1992)1, 0, 42, 59, 10, 6Bues filtMitesGlutch size, # young producedRender and Tripe (1999)1, 0, 46, 31, 15, 3Bue TitHea	Eurasian Ovstercatcher	Nematodes, trematodes,	Clutch size, hatching success, # young prod.	Van Oers et al. (2002)	0, 0, 53,29, 43, 12		
Crester Term ApodiformsLice, ticks# Yong producedWatson unpub. Data0, 4, 38, 31, 22, 15Apodiforms Descrifforms (Findmattude)Lousse-flies# Yong ProducedBize et al. (2004)1, 3, 47, 12, 26, 6Barn Swilto Descrifforms (Findmattude)MilesClutch sizeSprung producedMaller (1990) Pape et al. (2005)1, 2, 57, 12, 10, 6Cliff SwallowBugsBugs# Yong ProducedBrown and Brown (1986) Bugs, ticks1, 4, 41, 13, 11, 5Bugs, fleas, liceSurvival rateBrown and Brown (1986) Bugs, fleas, liceSurvival rateBrown and Grown (1996) Roby et al. (1992)1, 2, 42, 59, 12, 3Tree SwallowBiow fly% SuccessfulRoby et al. (1992) Roby et al. (1992)1, 2, 42, 59, 12, 3House MartinBugs Bugs, malariaClutch size, hartoing success, # young produced, % SuccessfulMarzal et al. (2005)1, 2, 32, 58, 13, 8Sand MartinTicksHorng produced, % SuccessfulMarzal et al. (2005)1, 3, 34, 50, 15, 2Purple MartinTicksBugs malariaSuccessfulMorazl et al. (2005)1, 3, 43, 13, 21, 50, 15, 2Purple MartinTicksWong produced, % SuccessfulMorazl et al. (2005)1, 3, 45, 61, 50, 50, 50, 50, 50, 50, 50, 50, 50, 50	5	cestodes	% succ.		.,.,,		
Appel SourceFunctionFunctionFunctionAppine SourceLosse-flies# Young ProducedBize et al. (2004)1, 3, 47.12, 26, 6Barn SwallowMitesClutch size, hatching success, # young producedMeller (1990)1, 2, 57.12, 10, 6Barn SwallowBugs# Young ProducedBrown and Brown (1986)1, 4, 41.11, 15Bugs, ticksSuccessfulCharten size, successfulBrown and Brown (1986)1, 4, 41.11, 15Purper SwallowBlow flySuccessfulBrown and Brown (2004)33.20Tree SwallowBugsSuccessfulRoby et al. (1995)1, 2, 42.59, 12, 3House MartinBugsSuccessfulRoby et al. (1992)1, 2, 42.59, 12, 3House MartinBugsClutch size, hatching success, # young producedMaller (1993)1, 2, 38.50, 15, 2Purple MartinMitesClutch size, hatching success, # young produced, %Mass et al. (1966)1, 2, 38.58, 13, 8Sand MartinTicks# Young producedSuccessfulMoss et al. (1966)1, 2, 38.58, 13, 8Sand MartinTicks# Young producedRoby et al. (1992)1, 0, 46.31, 15, 3Bugs firstMitesClutch size, strucessfulRoby et al. (1991)1, 0, 46.31, 15, 3Bugs firstMitesClutch size, strucessfulSuccessfulSuccessfulBugs firstMitesSuccessfulRoby et al. (2002)40.48Bugs firstMitesSuccessfulSuccessfulSuccessfulBugs firstMitesMites ize, more struc	Crested Tern	Lice, ticks	# Young produced	Watson unpub. Data	0.4.38.31.32.15		
jupinLouse-flies# Young ProducedBize et al. (2004)1, 3, 47.12, 26, 6Preserformer (intradiate)MitesClutch size, hatching success, # young producedMeller (1990)1, 2, 57.12, 10, 6Cliff SwallowBugs# Young ProducedBrown and Brown (1986)1, 4, 41.13, 11, 5Bugs, ticksSuccessfulBrown and Brown (1986)3, 32.0Tree SwallowBlow fly% SuccessfulBrown et al. (1992)1, 2, 42.59, 12, 3Tree SwallowBlow fly% SuccessfulBrown et al. (1992)1, 2, 42.59, 12, 3House MartinBugsClutch size, hatching success, # young prod.Rendell and Verbeek (1996)1, 3, 38.50, 15, 2Purple MartinBugsClutch size, hatching success, # young prod.Marzal et al. (2005)1, 2, 36.58, 13, 8Sand MartinSuccessfulYoung producedMoss et al. (1966)1, 2, 36.58, 13, 8Sand MartinTicks* Young produced, % SuccessfulMoss et al. (1966)1, 0, 42.59, 10, 6Paserformes (Turdide)Ticks* SuccessfulRoby et al. (1992)1, 0, 42.59, 10, 6Buserformes (Turdide)Field% SuccessfulKoine and Triper (1999)1, 0, 43.15, 5Buserformes (Turdide)Field% SuccessfulKoine and Triper (1999)1, 0, 43.15, 5Sand MartinMitesClutch size, Hyoung producedBoushan et al. (2002)36.42Buserformes (Turdide)FieldKisceesfulMerino et al. (2001)40.44Buserformes (Turdide)FieldKisceesfulKisceesful <td< td=""><td>Apodiformes</td><td>,</td><td>01</td><td>r</td><td>., , , . , .</td></td<>	Apodiformes	,	01	r	., , , . , .		
Prospection produced Barn SwallowMite's Mite's Clutch size Autors ize Bugs, stick Bugs, Stick, Stick Bugs, Stick,	Alpine Swift	Louse-flies	# Young Produced	Bize et al. (2004)	1, 3, 47.12, 26, 6		
Barn SwallowMitesClutch sizeHach ling success, # young producedMeller (1990)1, 2, 57.12, 10, 6Cliff SwallowBugsWoung ProducedBrown and Brown (1986)1, 4, 41.13, 15, 3Bugs, ticksSuccessfulBrown and Brown (2004)32.00Tree SwallowBlow flySuccessfulBrown and Brown (2004)1, 2, 42.59, 12, 3Tree SwallowBlow flyV SuccessfulRoby et al. (1992)1, 2, 42.59, 12, 3House MartinBugsKaucess, * successful, # youngRendell and Verbeek (1996)1, 3, 38.50, 15, 2Purple MartinBugsHatching success, * successful, # young prod.Marzal et al. (2005)1, 2, 35.58, 13, 8Sand MartinSucc.Succ.SuccessfulMoss et al. (1966)1, 2, 38.58, 13, 8Sand MartinTicks# Young produced, *Sucja Massel1, 0, 42.59, 10, 6Purple MartinTicks# SuccessfulRoby et al. (1992)1, 0, 42.59, 10, 6Purgle MartinResSuccessfulRoby et al. (1992)1, 0, 42.59, 10, 6Purgle MartinResSuccessfulRoby et al. (1992)1, 0, 42.59, 10, 6Pusserforme (Turdide)ResSuccessfulRoby et al. (1992)1, 0, 42.59, 10, 6Pusserforme (Sturdide)ResSuccessfulRoby et al. (1992)1, 0, 46.31, 15, 3Bule TitReadSuccessfulRicher et al. (1991)1, 0, 46.31, 15, 3Bule TitReadSuccessfulRicher et al. (2002)36.42Bule TitReadSuccessful<	Passeriformes (Hirundinid	lae)			, , , , , ,		
MitesClutch sizePape et al. (2005)Cliff SwallowBugsWong ProducedBrown and Brown (1986)1, 4, 41, 13, 15, 5Bugs, ticks% SuccessfulBrown and Brown (1986)1, 4, 41, 13, 15, 5Prese SwallowBlow fly% SuccessfulBrown and Brown (2004)1, 2, 42, 59, 12, 3Tree SwallowBugsSurvival rateBrown and Brown (2004)1, 2, 42, 59, 12, 3House MartinBugsHatching success, # young prod.Rendell and Verbeek (1996)1, 2, 42, 59, 12, 3House MartinBugsHatching success, # young prod.Kauce.1, 3, 38, 50, 15, 2Purple MartinMitesHatching success, # young prod.Marzal et al. (2005)1, 2, 38, 58, 13, 8Sand MartinTicksHatching success, # young produced, %Moss et al. (1966)1, 2, 38, 58, 13, 8Sand MartinTicks# Young producedSzép and Møller (1999)1, 0, 42, 59, 10, 6Paserifiomes (Turdide)Blow fly% SuccessfulRoby et al. (1992)1, 0, 43, 15, 55Blue TitBlow fly% SuccessfulKoiner and Tripet (1999)1, 0, 39, 45, 15, 55Blue TitFleasClutch size, # young producedBoulsman et al. (2002)40, 48Haematazoa% SuccessfulMarrine et al. (1991)1, 0, 43, 15, 15, 36Paseriformes (Furdide)Heamatazoa% SuccessfulMarrine et al. (2002)40, 48Haematazoa% SuccessfulSom cyriski et al. (2006)51, 47Haematazoa% SuccessfulSom cyriski et al. (2007)40,	Barn Swallow	Mites	Clutch size, hatching success, # young produced	Møller (1990)	1, 2, 57.12, 10, 6		
Cliff SwallowBugs Bugs, licks# Young ProducedBrown and Brown (1986)1, 4, 41.3, 11, 5Bugs, licks, liceSurvival rateBrown et al. (1995)33.20Bugs, fleas, liceSurvival rateBrown et al. (1995)32.20Tree SwallowBlow flyX SuccessfulBrown et al. (1995)1, 2, 42.59, 12, 3House MartinBugsMatching success, # young prod, vsucceRendell and Verbeek (1993)1, 3, 38.50, 15, 2House MartinBugs, malariaClutch size, hatching success, # young prod, vsuccessfulMarzal et al. (2005)1, 2, 38.58, 13, 8SuccessfulMatching success, # young produced, % successfulMoss et al. (1966)1, 2, 38.58, 13, 8Sand MartinTicksHatching success, # young produced, % successfulMoss et al. (1992)1, 0, 42.59, 10, 6Purple MartinMitesHatching success, # young produced, % successfulRoby et al. (1992)1, 0, 42.59, 10, 6Puseriformes (Varidae)Blow fly% SuccessfulRoby et al. (1992)1, 0, 46.31, 15, 3Bue TitHatching success, # young producedBousham et al. (2000)40.48Puseriformes (Varidae)Luch size, # young producedMosina et al. (2002)40.48Bue TitFleasClutch size, # young producedMosina et al. (2002)40.43Puseriformes (Varidae)Luch size, # young producedMorino et al. (2002)40.43Puseriformes (Varidae)Luch size, # young producedMorino et al. (2002)64.24Puseriformes (Varidae)EaseClutch s		Mites	Clutch size	Pap et al. (2005)			
Bugs, ficts, Bugs, ficts, Bugs, ficts, Bugs, ficts, Bugs, ficts, Bugs, ficts, Bugs, Biow fly, Heas Bugs, malariaSuccess, fill Success, fill, Success, fill, succes, fill, succes, fill, groduced, bugs, Succes, fill, succes, success, fill, succes, fill, success, fill, succes, fill, success, fill, success, fill, <b< td=""><td>Cliff Swallow</td><td>Bugs</td><td># Young Produced</td><td>Brown and Brown (1986)</td><td>1, 4, 41.13, 11, 5</td></b<>	Cliff Swallow	Bugs	# Young Produced	Brown and Brown (1986)	1, 4, 41.13, 11, 5		
Bugs, fleas, lice BugsSurvival rate Survival rate Brown and Brown (2004)ITree SwallowBlow fly Fleas% Successful Survival rate Clutch size, hatching success, # young prod., % succ.Rendell and Verbeek (1996)1, 2, 42.59, 12, 3House MartinBugs Bugs, malariaGlutch size, hatching success, # young prod., % succ.Rendell and Verbeek (1996)1, 3, 38.50, 15, 2Purple MartinBugs, malariaClutch size, hatching success, # young prod., % succeMarzal et al. (2005)1, 2, 38.58, 13, 8Sand MartinTicksHatching success, # young produced, % successfulMoss et al. (1966)1, 3, 48.08, 10, 2Passerformes (Kuruldae)Blow fly% SuccessfulSzép and Møller (1999)1, 0, 42.59, 10, 6Passerformes (Kuruldae)Blow fly% SuccessfulRoby et al. (1992)1, 0, 42.59, 10, 6Passerformes (Kuruldae)MitesSuccessfulRoby et al. (1992)1, 0, 43.15, 5Blue TitPleasClutch size, # young producedRichner and Tripet (1999)1, 0, 46.31, 15, 3Blue TitPleas, blow flis, mites% SuccessfulSurvival rateSurvival rateBlue TitFleas, blow flis, mites% SuccessfulSurvival rateMatine al. (2007)40.43Glutch size, # young producedRichner et al. (2007)40.4340.53Glutch size, # young producedSurvival rateSurvival rateMatine al. (2007)40.53Glutch size, # young producedRichner et al. (1993)1, 0, 46.31, 15, 340.53Glutch size, # y		Bugs, ticks	% Successful	Chapman and George (1991)	33.20		
Bugs Tree SwallowBugs BugsSurvival rate Surviced rateBrown and Brown (2004) Roby et al. (1992)1, 2, 42.59, 12, 3Tree SwallowFleas X successful Pusser MartinBugs Bugs, malariaClutch size, hatching success, # young prod., X succ.Rendell and Verbeek (1996)1, 3, 38.50, 15, 2Purple MartinBugs, malariaClutch size, hatching success, # young prod., X Succ.Marzal et al. (2005)1, 2, 38.58, 13, 8Sand MartinTicksHatching success, # young produced, X SuccessfulMoss et al. (1966)1, 2, 38.58, 13, 8Sand MartinTicksWarting producedSzép and Møller (1999)1, 3, 48.08, 10, 2Pusseriformes (Turdidae) Passeriformes (Turdidae)Blow flyX successfulRoby et al. (1992)1, 0, 42.59, 10, 6Pusseriformes (Turdidae) Passeriformes (Turdidae)Hatching success, % successfulRoby et al. (1992)1, 0, 43.55, 5Pusseriformes (Turdidae) Passeriformes (Pardiae)FleasClutch size, # young producedRichner and Tripet (1999)1, 0, 43.1, 5, 3Blue TitFleasClutch size, # young producedBious and al. (2000)40.48Fleas Lobow flies, mites& SuccessfulTomás et al. (2001)40.34Great TitFleasSurvial rateMartine et al. (2007)40.33Great TitFleasSurvial rateMartinez-de la Puente et al.40.31Fleas Lobow flies, mites& Survial rateSurvial rateMartinez-de la Puente et al.40.31Great TitFleasYoung produced, survial rate		Bugs, fleas, lice	Survival rate	Brown et al. (1995)			
Tree SwallowBlow fly Feas% Successful Clutch size, hatching success, # young prod, % succ.Rendell and Verbeek (1996)1, 2, 42.59, 12, 3House MartinBugs Bugs, malariaHatching success, # young prod, Clutch size, hatching success, # young prod, % Succ.de Lope and Møller (1993)1, 3, 38.50, 15, 2Purple MartinMitesClutch size, hatching success, # young produced, % successfulMarzal et al. (2005)1, 2, 38.58, 13, 8Sand Martin Passeriformes (Turdidae)Ticks# Young producedSzép and Møller (1993)1, 3, 48.08, 10, 2Passeriformes (Turdidae)Blow fly% SuccessfulRoby et al. (1992)1, 0, 42.59, 10, 6Passeriformes (Sturnidae)Blow fly% SuccessfulRoby et al. (1992)1, 0, 43.51, 5, 5Passeriformes (Paridae)Hatching success, % usccessfulFauth et al. (1991)1, 0, 39.45, 15, 5Bue TitFeas HaematazoaClutch size, # young produced % SuccessfulMerino et al. (2000)40.48Passeriformes (Paridae)Feas HaematazoaSuccessfulMerino et al. (2002)36.42Great TitFeas Haematazoa% SuccessfulSuccessful % SuccessfulSuccessful Martine- et al. (2002)51.47Great TitFeas Heas Clutch size, # young produced Heamatazoa% Successful % SuccessfulSuccessful % SuccessfulSuccessful Martine- et al. (2002)51.47Great TitFeas Heas Clutch size, # young produced Heas Heas Clutch size, # young produced Heas Heas Clutch size, # young produced Heas Heas<		Bugs	Survival rate	Brown and Brown (2004)			
FleasClutch size, hatching success, # young prod. \$ succ.Rendell and Verbeek (1996) \$ succ.House MartinBugsHatching success, # successful, # young produced Clutch size, hatching success, # young produced, % \$ succ.Marzal et al. (2005)Purple MartinMitesHatching success, # young produced, % successfulMarzal et al. (1966)1, 2, 38.58, 13, 8Sand MartinTicks# Young produced, % successfulMoss et al. (1966)1, 2, 38.58, 13, 8Sand MartinTicks# Young produced, % successfulMoss et al. (1960)1, 0, 42.59, 10, 6Passerformes (Sturnider)Hatching success, % successfulRoby et al. (1992)1, 0, 42.59, 10, 6Pusserformes (Sturnider)Hatching success, % successfulRoby et al. (1991)1, 0, 43.51, 5, 5Pusserformes (Sturnider)Hatching success, % successfulRicher and Tripet (1999)1, 0, 46.31, 15, 3Bule TitHaematzoa% SuccessfulMerino et al. (2000)40.48Bule TitFleas, blow flyClutch size, # young producedBouslam et al. (2001)40.53Great TitFleasNurvial rateSuccessfulSuccessfulSuccessfulGreat TitFleasWong produced, survial rateSuccessfulMartinez-de la Puente et al. (407)40.53Survial rateYoung produced, survial rateSuccessfulSuccessfulSuccessfulMartinez-de la Quol)40.53Great TitFleasNow fleas% successfulSuccessfulSuccessfulSuccessfulSuccesfulSuccesful	Tree Swallow	Blow fly	% Successful	Roby et al. (1992)	1, 2, 42.59, 12, 3		
House MartinBugs% succ. producedde Lope and Møller (1993)1, 3, 38.50, 15, 2 producedPurple MartinMitesClutch size, hatching success, # young prod. & Succ.Marzal et al. (2005)Marzal et al. (2005)Purple MartinMitesHatching success, # young produced, % successfulMoss et al. (1966)1, 2, 38.58, 13, 8 successfulSand Martin Passeriformes (Turdidae)Ticks# Young producedSzép and Møller (1999)1, 3, 48.08, 10, 2Buow fly% SuccessfulRoby et al. (1992)1, 0, 42.59, 10, 6Passeriformes (Sturidae)Blow fly% SuccessfulFauth et al. (1991)1, 0, 39.45, 15, 5Buer fit Baseriformes (Paridae)FleasClutch size, # young producedMicher and Tripet (1999)1, 0, 46.31, 15, 3Bue Tit Haematazoa Fleas, blow flyClutch size, # young producedMicher and Tripet (1999)1, 0, 46.31, 15, 3Great TitFleas Fleas, blow fly% SuccessfulBouslam et al. (2000)40.48Great TitFleas FleasWrong producedMartine- et al. (2001)40.53Great TitFleas FleasWrong producedSuccessfulMartine- et al. (2002)36.42Mountain Hae Nowshoe Hare Nowshoe Hare Rodenia (Ciccridae)Wrong producedNicher et al. (1995)0, 0.46.31, 15, 3Mountain Hae Nountain Hae Nountain Hae Nountain Hae Nountain CiccridaeWrong produced, survival rateBioomer et al. (2002)0, 2, 57.00, 9, 4Sorokhoe Hare Nountain Hae Nountain Hae Nountain Hae Nountain Ha		Fleas	Clutch size, hatching success, # young prod.,	Rendell and Verbeek (1996)			
House MartinBugsHarthing success, % successful, # young producedde Lope and Møller (1993)1, 3, 38.50, 15, 2 producedPurple MartinBugs, malariaClutch size, hatching success, # young prod. % Succ.Marzal et al. (2005) % SuccessfulMarzal et al. (2005)Purple MartinMitesHatching success, # young produced, %Moss et al. (1966)1, 2, 38.58, 13, 8 successfulSand MartinTicksTicksWoung produced, %Moss et al. (1992)1, 0, 42.59, 10, 6Passeriformes (Turdidae)Blow fly& SuccessfulRoby et al. (1992)1, 0, 39.45, 15, 5Passeriformes (Surnidae)MitesHatching success, % successfulRoby et al. (1991)1, 0, 39.45, 15, 5Bugs (Furdiae)FleasClutch size, # young producedRichner and Tripet (1999)1, 0, 46.31, 15, 3Blue TitFleasClutch size, # young producedBousflame at al. (2000)40.48Haematazoa% SuccessfulMerino et al. (2007)36.42HaematazoaClutch size, # young producedBousflame at al. (2007)36.42Great TitFleasWoung producedRichner et al. (1993)1, 0, 46.31, 15, 3Mountain LagomorphaFleasClutch size, # young producedRichner et al. (1993)1, 0, 46.31, 15, 3Mountain LagomorphaSurvival rateMartinez-de la Puente et al. (2010)1, 0, 46.31, 15, 3Great TitFleasYoung produced, survival rateBloomer et al. (1993)1, 0, 46.31, 15, 3Mountain LagomorphaNematodesSurvival rateN			% succ.				
producedproducedPurple MartinBugs, malariaClutch size, hatching success, # young produ, % SuccessfulMarzal et al. (2005) % SuccessfulSand MartinMitesHatching success, # young produced, % successfulMoss et al. (1966)1, 2, 38.58, 13, 8Sand MartinTicks# Young producedSzép and Møller (1999)1, 3, 48.08, 10, 2Passeriformes (Turdido)Blow fly& SuccessfulRoby et al. (1992)1, 0, 42.59, 10, 6Passeriformes (Sturrido)MitesHatching success, % successfulRoby et al. (1991)1, 0, 39.45, 15, 3Passeriformes (Paridoe)Haematazoa% SuccessfulMerino et al. (2000)40.48Passeriformes (Paridoe)Haematazoa% SuccessfulMerino et al. (2000)40.48Passeriformes (Paridoe)Haematazoa% SuccessfulMerino et al. (2000)40.53Passeriformes (Paridoe)Haematazoa% SuccessfulMerino et al. (2000)40.53Passeriformes (Paridoe)HaematazoaSuccessfulMerino et al. (2000)40.53Passeriformes (Paridoe)HaematazoaSuccessfulSuccessfulTomás et al. (2001)40.53Passeriformes (Paridoe)Reas, blow flies, mites% SuccessfulSuccessfulSuccessfulSuccessfulPasseriformes (Paridoe)Reas, blow flies, mites% SuccessfulSuccessfulSuccessfulSuccessfulParidoeClutch size, harching successfulSuccessfulSuccessfulSuccessfulSuccessfulPasseriformes (Paridoe)ReasClut	House Martin	Bugs	Hatching success, % successful, # young	de Lope and Møller (1993)	1, 3, 38.50, 15, 2		
Bugs, malariaClutch size, hatching success, # young prod., % Succ.Marzal et al. (2005) % Succ.Purple MartinMitesHatching success, # young produced, % successfulMoss et al. (1966)1, 2, 38,58, 13, 8 successfulSand MartinTicks# Young producedSzép and Møller (1999)1, 3, 48,08, 10, 2Passerformes (Sturridae)Blow fly% SuccessfulRoby et al. (1992)1, 0, 42,59, 10, 6Passerformes (Sturridae)HesSuccessfulFauth et al. (1991)1, 0, 39,45, 15, 5Bugs finders (Fariade)HesClutch size, # young producedMerino et al. (2000)40,48Passerformes (Fariade)HeamatazoaClutch size, # young producedBouslam et al. (2002)36,42Blue TitFeas, blow flyClutch size, # young producedBouslam et al. (2000)40,48HaematazoaClutch size, # young producedBouslam et al. (2000)40,53Ticks, fleas, blow flyClutch size, # young producedBouslam et al. (2000)40,53HaematazoaClutch size, # young producedBouslam et al. (2000)40,53Great TitFleas, blow flyClutch size, # young producedBouslam et al. (2005)51,47HaematazoaK SuccessfulSourcesfulSourcesful50,53Great TitFleasWaring produced, wurival rateBooner et al. (1993)1, 0, 46,31, 15, 3Martinez-de la Puente et al.(2010)1, 0, 46,31, 15, 346,54Martinez-de la Puente et al.(2010)0, 2, 57,00, 9, 446,54Martinez-d			produced				
Purple Martin% Succ. SuccessfulSand MartinTicksHatching success, # young produced, % successfulMoss et al. (1966)1, 2, 38,58, 13, 8Sand MartinTicks# Young producedSzép and Møller (1999)1, 3, 48,08, 10, 2Passeriformes (Turidiae)Blow fly% SuccessfulRoby et al. (1992)1, 0, 42,59, 10, 6Passeriformes (Sturidiae)MitesHatching success, % successfulFauth et al. (1991)1, 0, 39,45, 15, 5Passeriformes (Paridae)FleasClutch size, # young producedMerino et al. (2000)40,48Passeriformes (Paridae)Heamatazoa% SuccessfulMerino et al. (2001)40,48Passeriformes (Paridae)Fleas, blow flyClutch size, # young producedBouslam at al. (2002)36,42Haematazoa% SuccessfulSlomczyński et al. (2006)51,47Haematazoa% SuccessfulSlomczyński et al. (2006)51,47Haematazoa% SuccessfulSlomczyński et al. (2007)40,53Fleas, blow flies, mites% SuccessfulSlomczyński et al. (2007)40,53Great TitFleasClutch size, # young producedMartinez-de la Puente et al. (2010)40,63Mammalian LogomorterFleasClutch size, # young producedMartinez-de la Puente et al. (2010)40,54Mammalian LogomorterFleasClutch size, # young producedNow young producedNow young young et al. (1993)1, 0, 46,31, 15, 31ModesSurvival rateSurvival rateBloomer et al. (1995)0, 0, 44,18, 5, 1 <td></td> <td>Bugs, malaria</td> <td>Clutch size, hatching success, # young prod.,</td> <td>Marzal et al. (2005)</td> <td></td>		Bugs, malaria	Clutch size, hatching success, # young prod.,	Marzal et al. (2005)			
Purple MartinMitesHatching success, # young produced, % successfulMoss et al. (1966)1, 2, 38.58, 13, 8 successfulSand Martin Passeriformes (Turidate)Ticks# Young producedSzép and Møller (1999)1, 3, 48.08, 10, 2Eastern Bluebird Passeriformes (Sturridate)Blow fly% SuccessfulRoby et al. (1992)1, 0, 42.59, 10, 6European Starling Passeriformes (Paridae)MitesHatching success, % successfulFauth et al. (1991)1, 0, 39.45, 15, 5Blue Tit Passeriformes (Paridae)FleasClutch size, # young producedRichner and Tripet (1999)1, 0, 46.31, 15, 3Haematazoa Fleas, blow flyClutch size, # young producedMerino et al. (2000)40.48Haematazoa Fleas, blow flyClutch size, # young producedNatrinez-de la Uco02)36.42Haematazoa Fleas, blow flies, mites Fleas, blow flies, mites Fleas, blow flies, mites Fleas% SuccessfulSomczyński et al. (2007)36.42Great TitFleas FleasClutch size, # young produced HaematazoaRichner et al. (2007)36.42Great TitFleas FleasClutch size, # young produced FleasRichner et al. (2007)40.53Mammadian LogomorphaSurvival rateBloomer et al. (1993)1, 0, 46.31, 15, 31Mammadian LogomorphaSurvival rateNewey and Thirgood (2004)0, 2, 57.00, 9, 4Nowshoe Hare Rodentia (Cricitalae)NematodesSurvival rateNewey and Thirgood (2004)0, 2, 27.35, 6, 4Cape Ground Squirrel Cape Ground SquirrelTicks, fleas,			% Succ.				
Sand Mari Passeriformes (Turdider Passeriformes (Turdider Eastern Bluebird Passeriformes (Sturnider Buropean Starling Passeriformes (Sturnider Passeriformes (Sturnider Passeriformes (Sturnider Passeriformes (Sturnider Passeriformes (Parider)SuccessfulRoby et al. (1992)1, 0, 42.59, 10, 6Blue TitMitesHatching success, % successfulFauth et al. (1991)1, 0, 39.45, 15, 5Blue TitFleasClutch size, # young produced HaematazoaRichner and Tripet (1999)1, 0, 46.31, 15, 3HaematazoaClutch size, # young produced theamatazoaNerino et al. (2000)40.48FleasClutch size, # young produced theamatazoaNerino et al. (2007)40.53Fleas, blow flies, mites% Successful SuccessfulTomás et al. (2007)40.53FleasClutch size, # young produced theamatazoaSlomczyński et al. (2006)51.47FleasSuccessful Survival rateSlomczyński et al. (2006)51.47Mammalian LagomortheFleasClutch size, # young produced theasRichner et al. (1993)1, 0, 46.31, 15, 31Mountain Hare Rodentia (Cricetidae)NematodesWoung produced, survival rateBloomer et al. (1993)0, 0, 44.18, 5, 1Mountain Hare Rodentia (Cricetidae)NematodesSurvival rateSteen et al. (2002)0, 2, 57.00, 9, 4Cape Ground Squiref Cape Ground SquirefTicks, lice, fleas, worms# Young producedHillegass et al. (2010)1, 2, 27.35, 6, 4Rodentia (Sciuridae)FleasWoung producedHillegass et al. (2010)1, 2, 27.35, 6, 4<	Purple Martin	Mites	Hatching success, # young produced, %	Moss et al. (1966)	1, 2, 38.58, 13, 8		
Sand Martin Passeriformes (Turdiau)Ticks# Young producedSzép and Møller (1999)1, 3, 48.08, 10, 2Passeriformes (Turdiau)Blow fly% SuccessfulRoby et al. (1992)1, 0, 42.59, 10, 6Passeriformes (Sturiidae)Hatching success, % successfulFauth et al. (1991)1, 0, 43.51, 5, 5Passeriformes (Ruriidae)HeasClutch size, # young producedRichner and Tripet (1999)1, 0, 46.31, 15, 3MitesHaematazoa% SuccessfulMerino et al. (2000)40.48Ticks, fleas, blow flyClutch size, # young producedBouslam et al. (2002)36.42HaematazoaClutch size, # young producedBouslam et al. (2007)a40.53HaematazoaClutch size, # young producedBouslam et al. (2007)a40.53HaematazoaSuvival rateSlomczyński et al. (2006)51.47HaematazoaSuvival rate(2010)40.53Great TitFleasMyong producedRichner et al. (1993)1, 0, 46.31, 15, 3Martínez-de la Puente et al. (2010)Clutch size, # young producedRichner et al. (1993)1, 0, 46.31, 15, 3Martínez-de la Puente et al. (2010)FleasClutch size, # young producedNewey and Thirgood (2004)0, 2, 57.00, 9, 4Martínez-de la Puente et al. (2010)Survival rateSteine et al. (2002)1, 0, 49.04, 1, 1Sowshoe Hare Rodentia (Crietidae)NematodesSurvival rateNewey and Thirgood (2004)0, 2, 57.00, 9, 4Townsend's Vole Rodentia (Crietidae)Sot fly, mites, nematodesSurvival rate<			successful				
Passeriformes (Turdidae)Eastern Bluebird Passeriformes (Sturnidae)Blow fly% SuccessfulRoby et al. (1992)1, 0, 42.59, 10, 6European Starling Passeriformes (Parade)MitesHatching success, % successfulFauth et al. (1991)1, 0, 39.45, 15, 5Blue TitFleasClutch size, # young producedRichner and Tripet (1999)1, 0, 46.31, 15, 3Haematazoa% SuccessfulMerino et al. (2000)40.48HaematazoaClutch size, # young producedBouslama et al. (2002)36.42HaematazoaClutch size, # young producedBouslama et al. (2007)40.53Fleas, blow flies, mites% SuccessfulSlomczyński et al. (2006)51.47HaematazoaClutch size, # young producedRichner et al. (2006)51.47HaematazoaClutch size, # young producedRichner et al. (1993)1, 0, 46.31, 15, 3Great TitFleasYoung producedRichner et al. (1993)1, 0, 46.31, 15, 3Mammalian LagomorphaEClutch size, # young producedOpplinger et al. (1994)46.31Mammalian LagomorphaSurvival rateBloomer et al. (1995)0, 0, 44.18, 5, 1Mountain HareNematodesSurvival rateNewey and Thirgood (2004)0, 2, 57.00, 9, 4Rodentia (Cricetidae)Ticks, lice, fleas, worms# Young producedNewey and Thirgood (2004)0, 2, 57.50, 6, 4Rodentia (Scuirdae)Ticks, lice, fleas, worms# Young producedNeuhaus (2003)1, 2, 27.35, 6, 4Rodentia (Scuirdae)Ticks, lice, fleas, wo	Sand Martin	Ticks	# Young produced	Szép and Møller (1999)	1, 3, 48.08, 10, 2		
Eastern BluebirdBlow fly% SuccessfulRoby et al. (1992)1, 0, 42.59, 10, 6Passeriformes (Sturnidae)MitesHatching success, % successfulFauth et al. (1991)1, 0, 39.45, 15, 5Passeriformes (Paridae)FleasClutch size, # young producedRichner and Tripet (1999)1, 0, 46.31, 15, 3Blue TitHaematazoa% SuccessfulMerino et al. (2000)40.48Haematazoa% SuccessfulMerino et al. (2000)40.53Fleas, blow flyClutch size, # young producedBouslama et al. (2002)36.42Haematazoa% SuccessfulTomás et al. (2007)a40.53Fleas, blow flies, mites% SuccessfulSlomczyński et al. (2006)51.47HaematazoaSurvival rate(2010)40.48(2010)FleasClutch size, # young producedRichner et al. (1993)1, 0, 46.31, 15, 3Great TitFleasClutch size, # young producedOpplinger et al. (1993)1, 0, 46.31, 15, 3Mammalian LagomorphaClutch size, # young producedOpplinger et al. (1994)46.31Mountain HareNematodes% Young produced, survival rateBloomer et al. (1995)0, 0, 44.18, 5, 1Nowshoe HareNematodesSurvival rateNewey and Thirgood (2004)0, 2, 57.00, 9, 4Rodentia (Cricetidae)Ticks, lice, fleas, worms# Young producedNewey and Thirgood (2004)0, 2, 57.00, 9, 4Rodentia (Sciuridae)Ticks, lice, fleas, worms# Young producedNeuhaus (2003)1, 2, 27.35, 6, 4Colum, Ground Squirrel<	Passeriformes (Turdidae)						
Passeriformes (Sturnidae)MitesHatching success, % successfulFauth et al. (1991)1, 0, 39.45, 15, 5Blue TitFleasClutch size, # young producedRichner and Tripet (1999)1, 0, 46.31, 15, 3Haematazoa% SuccessfulMerino et al. (2000)40.48Haematazoa% SuccessfulBouslama et al. (2002)36.42HaematazoaClutch size, # young producedBouslama et al. (2006)51.47HaematazoaClutch size, hatching success, % successfulTomás et al. (2006)51.47HaematazoaSurvival rate(2010)40.53Fleas, blow fles, mites% SuccessfulSlomczyński et al. (2006)51.47HaematazoaClutch size, # young producedRichner et al. (1993)1, 0, 46.31, 15, 3HaematazoaClutch size, # young producedRichner et al. (1993)1, 0, 46.31, 15, 3FleasClutch size, # young producedRichner et al. (1993)1, 0, 46.31, 15, 3Marmalian LagomorphaFleasClutch size, # young producedRichner et al. (1993)1, 0, 46.54Marmalian LagomorphaFleasClutch size, # young produced, survival rateBloomer et al. (2004)66.54Mountain HareNematodesSurvival rateNewey and Thirgood (2004)0, 2, 57.00, 9, 4Rodentia (Sciuridae)Ticks, lice, fleas, worms# Young producedNeuhaus (2003)1, 2, 27.35, 6, 4Cape Ground SquirrelTicks, lice, fleas, worms# Young producedNeuhaus (2003)1, 2, 27.35, 6, 4Colum, GroundFleasYoung produced<	Eastern Bluebird	Blow fly	% Successful	Roby et al. (1992)	1, 0, 42.59, 10, 6		
European Starling Passeriformes (Paride)MitesHatching success, % successfulFauth et al. (1991)1, 0, 39.45, 15, 5Blue TitFleasClutch size, # young producedRichner and Tripet (1999)1, 0, 46.31, 15, 3Haematazoa% SuccessfulMerino et al. (2000)40.48Ticks, fleas, blow flyClutch size, # young producedBouslama et al. (2002)36.42Haematazoa% SuccessfulTomás et al. (2007)a40.53Fleas, blow flies, mites% SuccessfulSlomczyński et al. (2006)51.47HaematazoaSurvival rateMartínez-de la Puente et al. (2010)40.53Great TitFleas# Young producedRichner et al. (1993)1, 0, 46.31, 15, 3FleasClutch size, # young producedOpplinger et al. (1994)46.31FleasClutch size, # young producedOpplinger et al. (1994)46.54Marmalian LagomorphaNematodes% urvival rateBloomer et al. (1995)0, 0, 44.18, 5, 1Mountain HareNematodesSurvival rateBloomer et al. (2002)1, 0, 49.04, 1, 1Rodentia (Cricetidae)Ticks, lice, fleas, worms# Young produced, survival rateSteen et al. (2002)1, 0, 49.04, 1, 1Cape Ground SquirrelTicks, lice, fleas, worms# Young producedNeuhaus (2003)1, 2, 27.35, 6, 4Cape Ground SquirrelTicks, lice, fleas, worms# Young producedNeuhaus (2003)1, 2, 27.35, 6, 4Colum. GroundFleas# Young producedNeuhaus (2003)1, 2, 27.35, 6, 4Gape Ground Sq	Passeriformes (Sturnidae)						
Passeriformes (Paridae)Blue TitFleasClutch size, # young producedRichner and Tripet (1999)1, 0, 46.31, 15, 3Haematazoa% SuccessfulMerino et al. (2000)40.48Ticks, fleas, blow flyClutch size, # young producedBouslama et al. (2002)36.42HaematazoaClutch size, hatching success, % successfulTomás et al. (2007)a40.53Fleas, blow flies, mites% SuccessfulSlomczyński et al. (2006)51.47HaematazoaSurvival rateMartínez-de la Puente et al.40.53(2010)FleasClutch size, # young producedRichner et al. (1993)1, 0, 46.31, 15, 3FleasClutch size, # young producedRichner et al. (1994)46.31FleasClutch size, # young producedOpplinger et al. (1994)46.54Mammalian LagomorphaSurvival rateSurvival rateNewey and Thirgood (2004)0, 2, 57.00, 9, 4Mountain HareNematodesSurvival rateSteen et al. (2002)1, 0, 49.04, 1, 1Rodentia (Sciuridae)Ticks, lice, fleas, worms# Young producedHillegass et al. (2002)1, 2, 27.35, 6, 4Colum. GroundFleas# Young producedNeuhaus (2003)1, 2, 57.34, 24, 6SquirrelCaterriodactylaNeuhaus (2003)1, 2, 37.34, 24, 6	European Starling	Mites	Hatching success, % successful	Fauth et al. (1991)	1, 0, 39.45, 15, 5		
Blue TitFleasClutch size, # young producedRichner and Tripet (1999)1, 0, 46.31, 15, 3Haematazoa% SuccessfulMerino et al. (2000)40.48Ticks, fleas, blow flyClutch size, # young producedBouslam et al. (2002)36.42HaematazoaClutch size, hatching success, % successfulTomás et al. (2007)a40.53Fleas, blow flies, mites% SuccessfulSlomczyński et al. (2006)51.47HaematazoaSurvival rateMartínez-de la Puente et al. (2010)46.31, 15, 3Great TitFleas# Young producedRichner et al. (1993)1, 0, 46.31, 15, 3FleasClutch size, # young producedOpplinger et al. (1994)46.31FleasClutch size, # young producedFitze et al. (2004)46.54FleasClutch sizeWoung produced, survival rateBloomer et al. (1995)0, 0, 44.18, 5, 1Snowshoe HareNematodesSurvival rateNewey and Thirgood (2004)0, 2, 57.00, 9, 4Nountain HareNematodesSurvival rateSteen et al. (2002)1, 0, 49.04, 1, 1Rodentia (Sciuridae)Ticks, lice, fleas, worms# Young producedHillegas et al. (2010)1, 2, 27.35, 6, 4Colum. GroundFleasYoung producedNeuhaus (2003)1, 2, 50.00, 11, 3SquirrelCetartiodactylaSurvival rateSchmidt et al. (1979)0, 2, 37.34, 24, 6	Passeriformes (Paridae)						
Haematazoa% SuccessfulMerino et al. (2000)40.48Ticks, fleas, blow flyClutch size, Hyoung producedBouslama et al. (2002)36.42HaematazoaClutch size, hyoung producedBouslama et al. (2002)36.42HaematazoaClutch size, hatching success, % successfulTomás et al. (2002)36.42Fleas, blow flies, mites% SuccessfulSlomczyński et al. (2006)51.47HaematazoaSurvival rateMartínez-de la Puente et al.40.53(2010)FleasClutch size, # young producedRichner et al. (1993)1, 0, 46.31, 15, 3FleasClutch size, # young producedOpplinger et al. (1994)46.31FleasClutch size, # young produced, survival rateFitze et al. (2004)46.54Mammalian LagomorphaSurvival rateBloomer et al. (1995)0, 0, 44.18, 5, 1Mountain HareNematodesSurvival rateNewey and Thirgood (2004)0, 2, 57.00, 9, 4Rodentia (Cricetidae)Townsend's VoleBot fly, mites, nematodesSurvival rateSteen et al. (2002)1, 0, 49.04, 1, 1Rodentia (Sciuridae)Ticks, lice, fleas, worms# Young producedHillegass et al. (2010)1, 2, 27.35, 6, 4Colum. GroundFleas# Young producedNeuhaus (2003)1, 2, 50.00, 11, 3SquirrelCetartiodactylaSurvival rateSchmidt et al. (1979)0, 2, 37.34, 24, 6	Blue Tit	Fleas	Clutch size, # young produced	Richner and Tripet (1999)	1, 0, 46.31, 15, 3		
Ticks, fleas, blow fly HaematazoaClutch size, # young producedBouslame et al. (2002)36.42HaematazoaClutch size, hatching success, % successful HaematazoaTomás et al. (2007)a40.53Haematazoa% Successful Survival rateSlomczyński et al. (2006)51.47Martínez-de la Puente et al. (2010)Haematazoa40.53Great TitFleasW Young produced FleasRichner et al. (1993)1, 0, 46.31, 15, 3FleasClutch size, # young produced FleasClutch size, # young produced FleasOpplinger et al. (1994)46.31Mammalian Lagomorpha Somshoe HareNematodes# Young produced, survival rateBloomer et al. (1995)0, 0, 44.18, 5, 1Mountain Hare Rodentia (Cricetidae)NematodesSurvival rateNewey and Thirgood (2004)0, 2, 57.00, 9, 4Townsend's Vole Bot fly, mites, nematodesSurvival rateSteen et al. (2002)1, 0, 49.04, 1, 1Rodentia (Sciuridae)Ticks, lice, fleas, worms# Young producedHillegass et al. (2010)1, 2, 27.35, 6, 4Colum. Ground Squirrel CetartiodactylaFleasSurvival rateNeuhaus (2003)1, 2, 50.00, 11, 3Sighorn SheepNematodesSurvival rateSchmidt et al. (1979)0, 2, 37.34, 24, 6		Haematazoa	% Successful	Merino et al. (2000)	40.48		
HaematazoaClutch size, hatching success, % successfulTomás et al. (2007)a40.53Fleas, blow flies, mites% SuccessfulSlomczyński et al. (2006)51.47HaematazoaSurvival rateMartínez-de la Puente et al. (2010)40.53Great TitFleas# Young producedRichner et al. (1993)1, 0, 46.31, 15, 3FleasClutch size, # young producedOpplinger et al. (1994)46.31FleasClutch sizeFitze et al. (2004)46.54Mammalian LagomorphaSurvival rateBloomer et al. (1995)0, 0, 44.18, 5, 1Snowshoe HareNematodesSurvival rateNewey and Thirgood (2004)0, 2, 57.00, 9, 4Mountain HareNematodesSurvival rateSteen et al. (2002)1, 0, 49.04, 1, 1Rodentia (Cricetidae)Ticks, lice, fleas, worms# Young producedHillegass et al. (2010)1, 2, 27.35, 6, 4Colum, GroundFleas# Young producedHillegass et al. (2003)1, 2, 50.00, 11, 3SquirrelEtasSurvival rateNeuhaus (2003)1, 2, 50.00, 11, 3SquirrelFleasSurvival rateNeuhaus (2003)1, 2, 50.00, 11, 3SquirrelFleasSurvival rateNeuhaus (2003)1, 2, 50.00, 11, 3SquirrelSurvival rateSurvival rateSurvival rateSurvival rateBiphorn SheepNematodesSurvival rateSchmidt et al. (1979)0, 2, 37.34, 24, 6		Ticks, fleas, blow fly	Clutch size, # young produced	Bouslama et al. (2002)	36.42		
Fleas, blow flies, mites% SuccessfulSlomczyński et al. (2006)51.47HaematazoaSurvival rateMartínez-de la Puente et al. (2010)40.53Great TitFleas# Young producedRichner et al. (1993)1, 0, 46.31, 15, 3FleasClutch size, # young producedOpplinger et al. (1994)46.31FleasClutch sizeFitze et al. (2004)46.54Mammalian LagomorphaU46.54Mountain HareNematodes# Young produced, survival rateBloomer et al. (1995)0, 0, 44.18, 5, 1Mountain HareNematodesSurvival rateNewey and Thirgood (2004)0, 2, 57.00, 9, 4Rodentia (Cricetidae)Townsend's VoleBot fly, mites, nematodesSurvival rateSteen et al. (2000)1, 0, 49.04, 1, 1Rodentia (Sciuridae)Ticks, lice, fleas, worms# Young producedHillegass et al. (2010)1, 2, 27.35, 6, 4Colum. GroundFleas# Young producedNeuhaus (2003)1, 2, 50.00, 11, 3SquirrelEtartiodactylaSurvival rateNeuhaus (2003)1, 2, 50.00, 11, 3Great TitSurvival rateSchmidt et al. (1979)0, 2, 37.34, 24, 6		Haematazoa	Clutch size, hatching success, % successful	Tomás et al. (2007)a	40.53		
HaematazoaSurvival rateMartínez-de la Puente et al. (2010)40.53Great TitFleas# Young producedRichner et al. (1993)1, 0, 46.31, 15, 3FleasClutch size, # young producedOpplinger et al. (1994)46.31FleasClutch sizeFitze et al. (2004)46.54Mammalian LagomorphaESowshoe HareNematodes# Young produced, survival rateBloomer et al. (1995)0, 0, 44.18, 5, 1Mountain HareNematodesSurvival rateNewey and Thirgood (2004)0, 2, 57.00, 9, 4Modentia (Cricetidae)Townsend's VoleBot fly, mites, nematodesSurvival rateSteen et al. (2002)1, 0, 49.04, 1, 1Cape Ground Squirrel Colum. GroundTicks, lice, fleas, worms# Young producedHillegass et al. (2010)1, 2, 27.35, 6, 4Colum. Ground SquirrelFleas# Young producedNeuhaus (2003)1, 2, 50.00, 11, 3Squirrel CetartiodactylaSurvival rateSchmidt et al. (1979)0, 2, 37.34, 24, 6		Fleas, blow flies, mites	% Successful	Slomczyński et al. (2006)	51.47		
Great TitFleas# Young producedRichner et al. (1993)1, 0, 46.31, 15, 3FleasClutch size, # young producedOpplinger et al. (1994)46.31FleasClutch sizeFitze et al. (2004)46.54Mammalian LagomorphaSurvival rateBloomer et al. (1995)0, 0, 44.18, 5, 1Snowshoe HareNematodes# Young produced, survival rateBloomer et al. (1995)0, 0, 44.18, 5, 1Mountain HareNematodesSurvival rateNewey and Thirgood (2004)0, 2, 57.00, 9, 4Rodentia (Cricetidae)Townsend's VoleBot fly, mites, nematodesSurvival rateSteen et al. (2002)1, 0, 49.04, 1, 1Cape Ground SquirrelTicks, lice, fleas, worms# Young producedHillegass et al. (2010)1, 2, 27.35, 6, 4Colum, GroundFleas# Young producedNeuhaus (2003)1, 2, 50.00, 11, 3SquirrelCetartiodactylaSurvival rateSchmidt et al. (1979)0, 2, 37.34, 24, 6		Haematazoa	Survival rate	Martínez-de la Puente et al.	40.53		
Great TitFleas# Young producedRichner et al. (1993)1, 0, 46.31, 15, 3FleasClutch size, # young producedOpplinger et al. (1994)46.31FleasClutch sizeFitze et al. (2004)46.34Mammalian LagomorphaFitze et al. (2004)46.54Snowshoe HareNematodes# Young produced, survival rateBloomer et al. (1995)0, 0, 44.18, 5, 1Mountain HareNematodesSurvival rateNewey and Thirgood (2004)0, 2, 57.00, 9, 4Rodentia (Cricetidae)Townsend's VoleBot fly, mites, nematodesSurvival rateSteen et al. (2002)1, 0, 49.04, 1, 1Cape Ground SquirrelTicks, lice, fleas, worms# Young producedHillegass et al. (2010)1, 2, 27.35, 6, 4Colum. GroundFleas# Young producedNeuhaus (2003)1, 2, 50.00, 11, 3SquirrelCetartiodactylaSurvival rateSchmidt et al. (1979)0, 2, 37.34, 24, 6				(2010)			
Fleas FleasClutch size, # young produced ReasOpplinger et al. (1994)46.31 Fitze et al. (2004)Mammalian LagomorphaFitze et al. (2004)46.54Snowshoe HareNematodes# Young produced, survival rateBloomer et al. (1995)0, 0, 44.18, 5, 1Mountain HareNematodesSurvival rateNewey and Thirgood (2004)0, 2, 57.00, 9, 4Rodentia (Cricetidae)Townsend's VoleBot fly, mites, nematodesSurvival rateSteen et al. (2002)1, 0, 49.04, 1, 1Rodentia (Sciuridae)Ticks, lice, fleas, worms# Young producedHillegass et al. (2010)1, 2, 27.35, 6, 4Colum. GroundFleas# Young producedNeuhaus (2003)1, 2, 50.00, 11, 3SquirrelCetartiodactylaSurvival rateSchmidt et al. (1979)0, 2, 37.34, 24, 6	Great Tit	Fleas	# Young produced	Richner et al. (1993)	1, 0, 46.31, 15, 3		
FleasClutch sizeFitze et al. (2004)46.54Mammalian Lagomorpha		Fleas	Clutch size, # young produced	Opplinger et al. (1994)	46.31		
Mammalian LagomorphaSnowshoe HareNematodes# Young produced, survival rateBloomer et al. (1995)0, 0, 44.18, 5, 1Mountain HareNematodesSurvival rateNewey and Thirgood (2004)0, 2, 57.00, 9, 4Rodentia (Cricetidae)Townsend's VoleBot fly, mites, nematodesSurvival rateSteen et al. (2002)1, 0, 49.04, 1, 1Rodentia (Sciuridae)Ticks, lice, fleas, worms# Young producedHillegass et al. (2010)1, 2, 27.35, 6, 4Cape Ground SquirrelTicks, lice, fleas, worms# Young producedNeuhaus (2003)1, 2, 50.00, 11, 3SquirrelCetartiodactylaESurvival rateSchmidt et al. (1979)0, 2, 37.34, 24, 6		Fleas	Clutch size	Fitze et al. (2004)	46.54		
Snowshoe HareNematodes# Young produced, survival rateBloomer et al. (1995)0, 0, 44.18, 5, 1Mountain HareNematodesSurvival rateNewey and Thirgood (2004)0, 2, 57.00, 9, 4Rodentia (Cricetidae)Townsend's VoleBot fly, mites, nematodesSurvival rateSteen et al. (2002)1, 0, 49.04, 1, 1Rodentia (Sciuridae)Ticks, lice, fleas, worms# Young producedHillegass et al. (2010)1, 2, 27.35, 6, 4Colum. GroundFleas# Young producedNeuhaus (2003)1, 2, 50.00, 11, 3SquirrelCetartiodactylaSurvival rateSchmidt et al. (1979)0, 2, 37.34, 24, 6	Mammalian Lagomorpha						
Mountain Hare Rodentia (Cricetidae)NematodesSurvival rateNewey and Thirgood (2004)0, 2, 57.00, 9, 4Townsend's Vole Rodentia (Sciuridae)Bot fly, mites, nematodesSurvival rateSteen et al. (2002)1, 0, 49.04, 1, 1Cape Ground Squirrel Colum. Ground SquirrelTicks, lice, fleas, worms# Young producedHillegass et al. (2010)1, 2, 27.35, 6, 4Colum. Ground SquirrelFleas# Young producedNeuhaus (2003)1, 2, 50.00, 11, 3CetartiodactylaEEEBighorn SheepNematodesSurvival rateSchmidt et al. (1979)0, 2, 37.34, 24, 6	Snowshoe Hare	Nematodes	# Young produced, survival rate	Bloomer et al. (1995)	0, 0, 44.18, 5, 1		
Rodentia (Cricetiaae)Survival rateSteen et al. (2002)1, 0, 49.04, 1, 1Rodentia (Sciuridae)	Mountain Hare	Nematodes	Survival rate	Newey and Thirgood (2004)	0, 2, 57.00, 9, 4		
I ownsend s vole Rodentia (Sciuridae)Bot IIy, mites, nematodes Survival rateSurvival rateSteen et al. (2002)1, 0, 49.04, 1, 1Rodentia (Sciuridae)Cape Ground Squirrel Colum. GroundTicks, lice, fleas, worms# Young producedHillegass et al. (2010)1, 2, 27.35, 6, 4Squirrel CetartiodactylaFleas# Young producedNeuhaus (2003)1, 2, 50.00, 11, 3Bighorn SheepNematodesSurvival rateSchmidt et al. (1979)0, 2, 37.34, 24, 6	коdentia (Cricetidae)		Complete Landa	(to an at al. (2002)	1 0 40 0 4 4 4		
Kodentia (Scuriade)Cape Ground SquirrelTicks, lice, fleas, worms# Young producedColum. GroundFleas# Young producedSquirrelKetter (Scuriade)CetartiodactylaBighorn SheepNematodesSurvival rateSchmidt et al. (1979)0, 2, 37.34, 24, 6	I ownsend's Vole	Bot fly, mites, nematodes	Survival rate	Steen et al. (2002)	1, 0, 49.04, 1, 1		
Cape Ground SquirreiHillegass et al. (2010)1, 2, 27.35, 6, 4Colum. GroundFleas# Young producedNeuhaus (2003)1, 2, 50.00, 11, 3Squirrei	Kodentia (Sciuridae)	Tislas liss flass success	11 Marca and 1 and 1		1 2 27 25 6 4		
Colum. Ground Squirrelrieas# Young producedNeuhaus (2003)1, 2, 50.00, 11, 3SquirrelCetartiodactylaBighorn SheepNematodesSurvival rateSchmidt et al. (1979)0, 2, 37.34, 24, 6	Cape Ground Squirrel	LICKS, LICE, LIEAS, WORMS	# Young produced	Hillegass et al. (2010)	1, 2, 27.35, 6, 4		
SquitterCetartiodactylaBighorn SheepNematodesSurvival rateSchmidt et al. (1979)0, 2, 37.34, 24, 6	Coulin, Ground	FIEdS	# roung produced	iveuildus (2003)	1, 2, 50.00, 11, 3		
Bighorn SheepNematodesSurvival rateSchmidt et al. (1979)0, 2, 37.34, 24, 6	Squirrei						
Dignorth succey includues survival late Schilling et al. (1973) 0, 2, 37.34, 24, 0	Righorn Sheen	Nematodes	Survival rate	Schmidt et al. (1979)	0 2 37 24 24 6		
	ызноги энеер	inclinatoues		Semmet et di. (1979)	0, 2, 37.34, 24, 0		

meta-analysis. However, because the meta-analysis spans many classes of organism, both as hosts and as parasites, heterogeneity is expected to be high.

# 2.5. Meta-regression

Meta-regression analyses, a tool used to examine the impact of moderator variable on effect sizes, were performed to assess the degree to which certain life-history traits influence the virulent effects of parasites. These life-history traits (living in cavities/hollows, coloniality, latitude, and host life-span) have been identified as possible predictors to parasite virulence (Møller et al., 2009). Cavity living was coded as 0 for species that lived in the open and 1 for species that lived or bred in tree hollows or underground. Coloniality was coded by maximum recorded colony size: 0 for solitary, 1 for 2–10 pairs, 2 for 11–100 pairs, 3 for

101–1000 pairs and 4 for 1001+ pairs. Latitude was entered using information provided in the source article. Host life-span was coded as maximum recorded (from a wild individual where possible; Carey and Judge, 2002) and average (age an individual which reaches breeding age can be expected to live; Robinson, 2005); any gaps in these two databases were filled using the Encyclopedia of Life.

# 3. Results

The comprehensive literature search yielded 38 studies that reported the required statistics (or the required statistic was supplied by the author) and so were used in the meta-analysis (Table 1). These studies comprised 31 on avian hosts, 6 on mammalian hosts and 1 on a fish host. There were no studies of reptiles or amphibians that fitted the parameters of this meta-analysis.

# 3.1. Overall effect and publication bias

The data set were first analysed as a whole (termed combined in Table 1). In order to avoid replication for this combined analysis, one sample was randomly chosen from each study. A forest plot of the effect sizes for all studies showed that twenty-seven reported negative effects of parasites, and eleven showed positive or nil effects (Fig. 1). The mean effects size across all studies was 0.489 (95% CI, 0.220–0.759, n = 38) and was statistically significant from a null effect size (Z = 3.56, p = 0.0004). Additionally, to determine what impact the random sampling might have had on the power of the combined analysis, a meta-analysis was performed on the entire data set resulting in a mean effect size of 0.47 (95% CI, 0.282–0.658, n = 60).

A funnel plot suggested some publication bias (Fig. 2), however, a rank correlation test between precision and effect size (Begg and Mazumdar, 1994) was not statistically significant (Kendall's  $\tau$  = 0.105, *P* = 0.176; one-tailed, with continuity correction). Additionally, the trim-and-fill analysis of the random effects model imputed no missing studies. Despite some evidence to suggest that there was a publication bias, there is much support for the negative effects of parasites at the population level.

# 3.2. Subgroup analyses

As expected, there was significant heterogeneity in effect sizes across studies (Q = 749.54, df = 37, p < 0.0001), thus, subgroup analyses on response variables were analysed, both to examine possible variables influencing the results and to examine the data from a biologically relevant point of view. The complete data set (not the randomly selected subset) were separated into the response variable measured—clutch size (n = 12), percent hatching success (n = 11), number of young produced (n = 20), percent breeding success (n = 12), and survival rate (n = 7). A meta-analysis was performed on each group (Table 2) and revealed significant negative effects of parasites on clutch size, hatching success, and young produced, but not overall breeding success or survival rate.

#### 3.3. Meta-regression of life history traits

The effect sizes from the complete data set (n = 60; not the randomly sampled subset used in the overall meta-analysis) were regressed against five moderator variables—cavities/hollow living, coloniality, latitude (chosen from Møller et al. (2009) paper on variables that significantly impact chick survival), maximum host life-span, and average host life-span (chosen as a more precise measure of intrinsic host mortality than survival rate used by Møller et al., 2009). The proportion of variance explained by all



**Fig. 1.** Forest plot of effect sizes (rectangles) and confidence intervals (bars) for each study and the effect averaged across all studies (diamond).



**Fig. 2.** Funnel plot of effect size (Hedges' g) by standard error (SE). The white circles represent studies included in the meta-analysis. The black circles represent missing imputed studies. The white diamond represents overall effect size as calculated in the meta-analysis, and the black diamond represents the corrected effect size.

#### Table 2

The influence of response variable measured on population-level host response to parasites. Data points represent mean effect sizes (Hedges *g*) and their 95% confidence intervals (CI), as estimated in the meta-analyses. Combined refers to an overall averaged effect size from randomly taking one response from each study. Positive values indicate that the parasite had a negative effect on the host, while negative numbers indicate that the parasite had a neutral to positive effect on the host. Where 95% CI do not include zero, the effect can be considered to be statistically significant.

Response variable	Mean ± SE	95% CI	Z-Value	<i>p</i> -Value	Number of studies
Clutch size	$0.365 \pm 0.14$	0.094-0.636	2.636	0.008	12
Hatching success	$0.310 \pm 0.11$	0.097-0.515	2.873	0.004	11
Young produced	0.596 ± 0.16	0.286-0.906	3.772	0.0002	20
% Breeding success	$0.219 \pm 0.34$	-0.447 to 0.886	0.644	0.520	12
Survival rate	0.672 ± 0.35	-0.007 to 1.351	1.939	0.053	7
Combined	$0.489 \pm 0.14$	0.220-0.759	3.56	0.0004	38

#### Table 3

Meta-regression (random-effects model) results for moderator variables as a function of the effects of parasites. The influence of response variable measured on population-level host response to parasites. Point estimates are for intercepts and the Z-test is used to test that slope is not zero.

Moderator variable	Point estimate ± SE	95% CI	Z-Value	p-Value
Cavity/hollow living	$0.0005 \pm 0.01$	-0.029-0.030	0.034	0.97
Coloniality	$0.008 \pm 0.02$	-0.034 - 0.050	0.36	0.72
Latitude	$-0.01 \pm 0.01$	-0.038 - 0.008	-1.30	0.19
Maximum lifespan	$-0.01 \pm 0.01$	-0.034 - 0.005	-1.44	0.15
Average lifespan	$-0.05 \pm 0.02$	-0.094 - 0.00064	-1.93	0.05



**Fig. 3.** A meta-regression (random effects model) of effect size against host average lifespan using the complete dataset (n = 60). The slope of this regression is significant (p = 0.05).

these moderator variables was nonsignificant except for average age (significant at p = 0.05) (Table 3; Fig. 3).

# 4. Discussion

A meta-analysis of 38 experimental studies of the costs of parasites to population-level measures of natural, free-ranging hosts revealed an overall effect size, g, of 0.49. These parasites, therefore, produced a moderate (as defined by Cohen, 1988) negative effect. This effect size can be interpreted as an average difference of 0.49 standard deviations between parasitised and non-parasitised individuals. This effect is as strong as the reported effect sizes of predators on populations. Côté and Sutherland (1997) quantified, using a meta-analysis, the effect size of predation upon population size in birds. The summary effect size was either 0.34 or 0.95 depending on the way the population size was measured (either post-breeding or overall population size). Gurevitch et al. (2000) examined the combined effects of predation and competition on population sizes of anurans in field experiments. In this case, the summary effect size is obfuscated by interactions between predation and competition, but the authors state that "the average overall effects of predator exclusion were very large" and the average effect of competitor removal in the presence of predators on survival was -0.35 (negatively effecting survival). Given the summary effect size reported in this study, the indication is that parasites may be at least as important as predation (or predation combined with competition) in their effects on populations. It is important to include parasites in future research that records demographic information. By incorporating parasite removal experiments into predation- or competition-based experiments, the interactions between three demographic forces will yield a broader understanding of host-parasite interactions (e.g. Holt and Roy, 2007).

Meta-analyses of the response variables indicated that clutch size, hatching success, and number of young produced were all significantly reduced in parasitised individuals. The only response variables that was not significantly affected by parasites was breeding success (defined variously as percentage of young produced, fledged or survived during the study period) and survival (although sample size was very low for survival rate, p = 0.053, thus more studies may indicate that survival is indeed significantly reduced by parasites). Further analyses using meta-regression to determine the key life-history traits that may be driving the observed population-level effects of parasite on its host was host life-span. Other variables previously suggested (Møller et al., 2009) as determinants of virulence—cavity/hollow living, coloniality or latitude were not significant.

There are strongly suggestive mathematical models (Anderson, 1978; Anderson and May, 1978; May and Anderson, 1978) and some empirical evidence (Gregory, 1991; Hudson et al., 1998) that parasites can regulate host populations and cycles. The large effect size revealed in this meta-analysis supports the idea that parasites are a major force in population regulation in wild, free-ranging vertebrate host populations. Support for the idea of the importance of parasites has far-reaching implications in both ecological and conservation-based science. If parasites are such strong regulators, why are some species seemingly untouched by the effects of parasites despite large parasite loads? Are parasites simply another form of predation? Should parasites be removed in populations needing conservation regulation, or, conversely, added to invasive populations? Unfortunately, before drawing a longbow based

around this meta-analysis, it is important to examine the taxonomy of the host species that went into the model. While this meta-analysis does include studies from twenty-four different species, they are mainly clustered within one order of one class of host study organism. The taxonomic bias of host species studied must temper any conclusions—these results may only be applicable to the hosts used in the meta-analysis. It may be that the effects of parasites as measured here are inflated compared to other sorts of hosts and the actual overall effects of natural parasites are much less.

Given these caveats, the information provided from this metaanalysis still lends itself to hypothesis generation and testing around the life-history traits that drive the evolution of a parasite to cause damage to its host. The results of the meta-regression, which refuted all previous predictions regarding the determinants of parasite virulence, suggest that intrinsic host mortality (lifespan) is the key to understanding why and how parasites evolve to either harm or be benign to their host. Although the significance of this result is not high, it may suggest why observed parasite virulence varies so widely between host species. The evolutionary idea that background host mortality may explain an increase in virulence has been demonstrated in the laboratory (Nidelet et al., 2009). Additionally, longer host lifespan have been shown to evolve under high condition dependent morality (Williams and Troy, 2003; Dowling, 2012). Combining these two ideas with the results of this meta-analysis and meta-regression suggests that we should expect long-lived hosts to have non-virulent parasites except when the host's condition is poor. Moreover, short-lived hosts should show increased responses to parasites regardless of their own condition. Therefore, in order to increase our understanding of the effects of parasites on wild populations, focused studies on long-lived hosts are vital. Especially, where long-lived and short-lived examples can be found within the same taxonomic group.

The surprising lack of support for the hypotheses that parasites should be more virulent with cavity/hollow living, higher numbers of individuals living or breeding together, and in tropical latitudes is illustrative of the conundrum of mixing the results of observational studies with experimental ones. Intuitively, one expects that species living or breeding in hollows, underground or in a colony would experience greater abundance and prevalence of parasites due to repeated use of the living area. However, the number of parasites on an individual host does not necessarily indicate an increased effect of that parasite on the host. Additionally, when one considers observational data, the researcher is asking if parasitised individuals are more affected by parasites than those individuals who are naturally uninfected, while an experimental study seeks to understand if parasites have more effects regardless of the chance or reason for having become infected in the first place.

In conclusion, this study provides a quantitative test of the effects of parasites to their wild, free-ranging vertebrate hosts. The results suggest that parasites are indeed drivers of population-level life-history traits, as has been advocated for over thirty years. However, the results are heavily taxonomically biased, and therefore, may only be applicable to a limited number of species and scenarios. Interrogation of the data using meta-regression revealed that the one life-history trait that appears to drive the capacity of a parasite to negatively impact its host is intrinsic host lifespan. However, it is difficult to separate the relative importance of these life-history traits in shaping parasite virulence, and more data are needed to understand these phenomena. An examination of the effects of parasites on long-lived hosts is warranted to understand fully the magnitude and extent of the effects of parasites in natural situations.

# References

- Albon, S.D., Stien, A., Irvine, R.J., Langvatn, R., Ropstad, E., Halvorsen, O., 2002. The role of parasites in the dynamics of a Reindeer population. Proceedings of the Royal Society of London B 269, 1625–1632.
- Anderson, R.M., 1978. The regulation of host population growth by parasitic species. Parasitology 76, 119–157.
- Anderson, R.M., May, R.M., 1978. Regulation and stability of host-parasite population interactions: I. Regulatory processes. Journal of Animal Ecology 47, 219–247.
- Begg, C.B., Mazumdar, M., 1994. Operating characteristics of a rank correlation test for publication bias. Biometrics 50, 1088–1101.
- Bize, P., Roulin, A., Tella, J.L., Bersier, L.-F., Richner, H., 2004. Additive effects of ectoparasites over reproductive attempts in the long-lived Alpine Swift. Journal of Animal Ecology 73, 1080–1088.
- Bize, P., Jeanneret, C., Klopfenstein, A., Roulin, A., 2008. What makes a host profitable? Parasites balance host nutritive resources against immunity. The American Naturalist 171, 107–118.
- Bloomer, S.E.M., Willebrand, T., Keith, I.M., Keith, L.B., 1995. Impact of helminth parasitism on a snowshoe hare population in central Wisconsin: a field experiment. Canadian Journal of Zoology 73, 1891–1898.
- Borenstein, M., Hedges, L.V., Higgins, J.P.T., Rothstein, H.R., 2006. Comprehensive Meta-Analysis (Version 2.2.064) [Computer software]. Englewood, NJ: Biostat.
- Borenstein, M., Hedges, L.V., Higgins, J.P.T., Rothstein, H.R., 2009. Introduction to Meta-Analysis. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd., West Sussex, UK.
- Bouslama, Z., Lambrechts, M.M., Ziane, N., Djenidi, R., Chabi, Y., 2002. The effect of nest-ectoparasites on parental provisioning in a north-African population of the Blue Tit Parus caeruleus. Ibis 144, E73–E78.
- Brown, C.R., Brown, M.B., 1986. Ectoparasitism as a cost of coloniality in Cliff Swallows (*Hirundo pyrrhonota*). Ecology 67, 1206–1218.
- Brown, C.R., Brown, M.B., Rannala, B., 1995. Ectoparasites reduce long-term survival of their avian host. Proceedings of the Royal Society of London B 262, 313–319.
- Brown, C.R., Brown, M.B., 2004. Group size and ectoparasitism affect daily survival probability in a colonial bird. Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology 56, 498–511.
- Carey, J.R., Judge, D.S., 2002. Longevity Records: Life Spans of Mammals, Birds, Amphibians, Reptiles, and Fish. Odense University Press, Odense.
- Casadevall, A., Pirofski, L.-A., 1999. Host-pathogen interactions: redefining the basic concepts of virulence and pathogenicity. Infection and Immunity 67, 3703– 3713.
- Chapman, B.R., George, J.E., 1991. The effects of ectoparasites on Cliff Swallow growth and survival. In: Loye, J.E., Zuk, M. (Eds.), Bird–Parasite Interactions: Ecology, Evolution and Behaviour. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Cheney, K.L., Côté, I.M., 2003. The ultimate effect of being cleaned: does ectoparasite removal have reproductive consequences for Damselfish clients? Behavioral Ecology 14, 892–896.
- Clayton, D.H., Lee, P.L.M., Tompkins, D.M., Brodie III, E.D., 1999. Reciprocal natural selection on host-parasite phenotypes. The American Naturalist 154, 261–270.
- Cohen, J., 1988. Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioural Sciences, second ed. Academic Press, New York.
- Combes, C., 2005. The Art of Being a Parasite (trans. by D Simberloff). University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Côté, I.M., Sutherland, W.J., 1997. The effectiveness of removing predators to protect bird populations. Conservation Biology 11, 395–405.
- de Lope, F., Møller, A.P., 1993. Effects of ectoparasites on reproduction of their swallow hosts: a cost of being multi-brooded. Oikos 67, 557–562.
- Diamond, J.M., 1983. Laboratory, field and natural experiments. Nature 304, 586– 587.
- Dowling, D.K., 2012. Ageing: evolution of life span revisited. Current Biology 22, R947–R949.
- Duval, S.J., Tweedie, R.L., 2000. Trim and fill: a simple funnel-plot-based method of testing and adjusting for publication bias in meta-analysis. Biometrics 56, 455–463.
- Dybdahl, M.F., Storfer, A., 2003. Parasite local adaptation: Red Queen versus Suicide King. Trends in Ecology and Evolution 18, 523–530.
- Encyclopedia of Life. Available from <http://www.eol.org>
- Ewald, P.W., 1983. Host-parasite relations, vectors, and the evolution of disease severity. Annual Review of Ecology, Evolution, and Systematics 14, 465–485.
- Fauth, P.T., Krementz, D.G., Hines, J.E., 1991. Ectoparasitism and the role of green nesting material in the European Starling. Oecologia 88, 22–29.
- Fitze, P.S., Tschirren, B., Richner, H., 2004. Life history and fitness consequences of ectoparasites. Journal of Animal Ecology 73, 216–226.
- Gregory, R.D., 1991. Parasite epidemiology and host population growth: *Heligmosomoides polygyrus* (Nematoda) in enclosed Wood Mouse populations. Journal of Animal Ecology 60, 805–821.
- Grissom, R.J., Kim, J.J., 2005. Effect Sizes for Research. Taylor and Francis, New York. Gulland, F.M.D., 1992. The role of nematode parasites in Soay Sheep (*Ovis aries* L.) mortality during a population crash. Parasitology 105, 493–503.
- Gurevitch, J., Hedges, L.V., 1999. Statistical issues in conducting ecological metaanalyses. Ecology 80, 1142–1149.
- Gurevitch, J., Morrison, J.A., Hedges, L.V., 2000. The interaction between competition and predation: a meta-analysis of field experiments. The American Naturalist 155, 435–453.
- Hedges, L.V., Olkin, I., 1985. Statistical Methods for Meta-Analysis. Academic Press, London.

- Hillegass, M.A., Waterman, J.A., Roth, J.D., 2010. Parasite removal increases reproductive success in a social African Ground Squirrel. Behavioral Ecology 21, 696–700.
- Holmes, J.C., 1983. Evolutionary relationships between parasitic helminths and their hosts. In: Futuyma, D.J., Slatkin, M. (Eds.), Coevolution. Sinauer Associates, Inc., Sunderland, MA.
- Holt, R.D., Roy, M., 2007. Predation can increase the prevalence of infectious disease. The American Naturalist 169, 690–699.
- Hudson, P.J., 1986. The effect of a parasitic nematode on the breeding production of Red Grouse. Journal of Animal Ecology 55, 85–92.
- Hudson, P.J., Dobson, A.P., Newborn, D., 1998. Prevention of population cycles by parasite removal. Science 282, 2256–2258.
- Hullett, C.R., Levine, T.R., 2003. The overestimation of effect sizes from *F* values in meta-analysis: the cause and a solution. Communication Monographs 70, 52–67.
- Irvine, R.J., 2006. Parasites and the dynamics of wild mammal populations. Animal Science 82, 775–781.
- Lailvaux, S.P., Kasumovic, M.M., 2011. Defining individual quality over lifetimes and selective contexts. Proceedings of the Royal Society of London B 211, 321–328.
- Lehmann, T., 1993. Ectoparasites: direct impact on host fitness. Parasitology Today 9, 8–13.
- Martínez-de la Puente, J., Merino, S., Tomás, G., Moreno, J., Morales, J., Lobato, E., García-Fraile, S., Belda, E.J., 2010. The blood parasite *Haemoproteus* reduces survival in a wild bird: a medication experiment. Biology Letters 6, 663–665.
- Marzal, A., de Lope, F., Navarro, C., Møller, A.P., 2005. Malarial parasites decrease reproductive success: an experimental study in a passerine bird. Oecologia 142, 541–545.
- May, R.M., Anderson, R.M., 1978. Regulation and stability of host-parasite population interactions: II. Destabilizing processes. Journal of Animal Ecology 47, 249–267.
- McCallum, H., 1995. Modelling wildlife-parasite interactions to help plan and interpret field studies. Wildlife Research 22, 21–29.
- McKilligan, N.G., 1996. Field experiments on the effect of ticks on breeding success and chick health of Cattle Egrets. Australian Journal of Ecology 21, 442–449.
- Merino, S., Moreno, J., Sanz, J.J., Arriero, E., 2000. Are avian blood parasites pathogenic in the wild? A medication experiment in Blue Tits (*Parus caeruleus*). Proceedings of the Royal Society of London B 267, 2507–2510.
- Michalakis, Y., Olivieri, I., Renaud, F., Raymond, M., 1992. Pleiotropic action of parasites: how to be good for the host. Trends in Ecology and Evolution 7, 59–62.
- Møller, A.P., 1990. Effects of parasitism by a haematophagous mite on reproduction in the Barn Swallow. Ecology 71, 2345–2357.
- Møller, A.P., 1997. Parasitism and the evolution of host life history. In: Clayton, D.H., Moore, J. (Eds.), Host-parasite Evolution: General Principals and Avian Models. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Møller, A.P., 1998. Evidence of larger impact of parasites on hosts in the tropics: investment in immune function within and outside the tropics. Oikos 82, 265– 270.
- Møller, A.P., 2002. Temporal change in mite abundance and its effect on Barn Swallow reproduction and sexual selection. Journal of Evolutionary Biology 15, 495–504.
- Møller, A.P., 2005. Parasitism and the regulation of host populations. In: Thomas, F., Renaud, F., Guégan, J.-F. (Eds.), Parasitism and Ecosystems. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Møller, A.P., Arriero, E., Lobato, E., Merino, S., 2009. A meta-analysis of parasite virulence in nestling birds. Biological Reviews 84, 567–588.
- Moss, W.W., 1966. The biological and systematic relationships of the Martin Mite, Dermanyssus prognephilus Ewing. Unpublished PhD Thesis. The University of Kansas: Lawrence, Kansas, USA.
- Neuhaus, P., 2003. Parasite removal and its impact on litter size and body condition in Columbian Ground Squirrels (*Spermophilus columbianus*). Proceedings of the Royal Society of London B 270, S213–S215.
- Newey, S., Thirgood, S.J., 2004. Parasite-mediated reduction in fecundity of Mountain Hares. Proceedings of the Royal Society of London B 271, S413–S415. Newton. J., 1998. Population Limitation in Birds. Academic Press. London.

- Nidelet, T., Koella, J.C., Kaltz, O., 2009. Effects of shortened host life span on the evolution of parasite life history and virulence in a microbial host-parasite system. BMC Evolutionary Biology 9, 65.
- Norcross, N.L., Bolen, E.G., 2002. Effectiveness of nest treatments on tick infestations in the Eastern Brown Pelican. Wilson Bulletin 114, 73–78.
- Opplinger, A., Richner, H., Christe, P., 1994. Effect of an ectoparasite on lay date, nest-site choice, desertion, and hatching success in the Great Tit (*Parus major*). Behavioral Ecology 5, 130–134.
- Pap, P.L., Tökölyi, J., Szép, T., 2005. Host-symbiont relationship and abundance of feather mites in relation to age and body condition of the Barn Swallow (*Hirundo rustica*): an experimental study. Canadian Journal of Zoology 83, 1059– 1066.
- Poulin, R., 2007. Are there general laws in parasite ecology? Parasitology 134, 763-776.
- Redpath, S.M., Mougeot, F., Leckie, F.M., Elston, D.A., Hudson, P.J., 2006. Testing the role of parasites in driving the cyclic population dynamics of a gamebird. Ecology Letters 9, 410–418.
- Renaud, F., de Meeüs, T., 1991. A simple model of host-parasite evolutionary relationships. Parasitism: compromise or conflict? Journal of Theoretical Biology 152, 319–327.
- Rendell, W.B., Verbeek, N.A.M., 1996. Old nest material in nestboxes of Tree Swallows: effects on reproductive success. Condor 98, 142–152.
  Richner, H., Tripet, F., 1999. Ectoparasitism and the trade-off between current and
- future reproduction. Oikos 86, 535–538. Richner, H., Oppliger, A., Christe, P., 1993. Effect of an ectoparasite on reproduction
- in Great Tits. Journal of Animal Ecology 62, 703–710.
- Robinson, R.A., 2005. BirdFacts: profiles of birds occurring in Britain and Ireland (BTO Research Report 407). BTO, Thetford. Available from: <a href="http://www.bto.org/birdfacts">http://www.bto.org/birdfacts</a>.
- Roby, D.D., Brink, K.L., Wittmann, K., 1992. Effects of bird Blow Fly parasitism on Eastern Bluebird and Tree Swallow nestlings. Wilson Bulletin 104, 630–643.
- Rosenberg, M.S., 2005. The file-drawer problem revisited: a general weighted method for calculating fail-safe numbers in meta-analysis. Evolution 59, 464–468.
- Schmidt, R.L., Hibler, C.P., Spraker, T.R., Rutherford, W.H., 1979. An evaluation of drug treatment for lungworm in Bighorn Sheep. Journal of Wildlife Management 43, 461–467.
- Schmidt-Hempel, P., 2003. Variation in immune defence as a question of evolutionary ecology. Proceedings of the Royal Society of London B 270, 357– 366.
- Seitz, A., Ratte, H.T., 1991. Aquatic ecotoxicology: on the problems of extrapolation from laboratory experiments with individuals and populations to community effects in the field. Comparative Biochemistry and Physiology C: Toxicology and Pharmacology 100, 301–304.
- Slomczyński, R., Kaliński, A., Wawrzyniak, J., Bańbura, M., Skwarska, J., Zieliński, P., Bańbura, J., 2006. Effects of experimental reduction in nest micro-parasite and macro-parasite loads on nesting hemoglobin level in Blue Tits *Parus caeruleus*. Acta Oecologica 30, 223–227.
- Steen, H., Taitt, M., Krebs, C.J., 2002. Risk of parasite-induced predation: an experimental field study on Townsend's Voles (*Microtus townsendii*). Canadian Journal of Zoology 80, 1286–1292.
- Stewart, G., 2010. Meta-analysis in applied ecology. Biology Letters 6, 78-81.
- Szép, T., Møller, A.P., 1999. Cost of parasitism and host immune defence in the Sand Martin *Riparia riparia*: a role for parent-offspring conflict? Oecologia 119, 9–15. Tomás, G., Merino, S., Moreno, J., Morales, J., 2007. Consequences of nest reuse for
- parasite burden and female health and condition in Blue Tits, *Cyanistes caeruleus*. Animal Behaviour 73, 805–814.
- Tompkins, D.M., Begon, M., 1999. Parasites can regulate wildlife populations. Parasitology Today 15, 311–313.
- Tummers, B., 2006. DataThief III version 1.6. Available from: <htp://datathief.org/>.Vandegrift, K.J., Raffel, T.R., Hudson, P.J., 2008. Parasites prevent summer breeding in white-footed mice, *Peromyscus leucopus*. Ecology 89, 2251–2258.
- Van Oers, K., Heg, D., Quenec'hdu, S.L.D., 2002. Anthelminthic treatment negatively affects chick survival in the Eurasian Oystercatcher *Haematopus ostralegus*. Ibis 144. 509–517.
- Williams, P.D., Troy, D., 2003. Antagonistic pleiotropy, mortality source interactions, and the evolutionary theory of senescence. Evolution 57, 1478–1488.