

Research Article

Cite this article: Krasnov BR, Grabovsky VI, Korallo-Vinarskaya N, Vinarski MV, Robles Fernandez AL, Khokhlova I (2025) Geographic variation in the determinants of ectoparasite faunas' species richness: fleas and gamasid mites parasitic on small mammals from 6 biogeographic realms. *Parasitology*, 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0031182025100371>

Received: 7 April 2025

Revised: 20 May 2025

Accepted: 23 May 2025

Keywords:

biogeographic realms; fleas; mammals; mites; parasite sharing; species richness

Corresponding author: Boris R. Krasnov;

Email: krasnov@bgu.ac.il

Geographic variation in the determinants of ectoparasite faunas' species richness: fleas and gamasid mites parasitic on small mammals from 6 biogeographic realms

Boris R. Krasnov¹ , Vasily I. Grabovsky², Natalia Korallo-Vinarskaya³, Maxim V. Vinarski⁴, Angel Luis Robles Fernandez⁵ and Irina Khokhlova¹

¹Mitrani Department of Desert Ecology, Swiss Institute for Dryland Environmental and Energy Research, Jacob Blaustein Institutes for Desert Research, Ben-Gurion University of the Negev, Sede Boqer Campus, Midreshet Ben-Gurion, Israel; ²French Associates Institute for agriculture and Biotechnology of Drylands, Jacob Blaustein Institutes for Desert Research, Ben-Gurion University of the Negev, Sede Boqer Campus, Midreshet Ben-Gurion, Israel; ³Laboratory for the Study of Parasitic Arthropods, Zoological Institute of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Saint-Petersburg, Russian Federation; ⁴Laboratory of Macroecology and Biogeography of Invertebrates, Saint-Petersburg State University, Saint-Petersburg, Russian Federation and ⁵Kansas Biological Survey & Center for Ecological Research, The University of Kansas, Lawrence, KS 66047 USA

Abstract

We investigated the effects of body mass, geographic range size, the within-range richness of host assemblages (diversity field) and the habitat breadth of small mammalian hosts from 6 biogeographic realms on the species richness of their flea and gamasid mite faunas. We also tested whether the probability of between-host ectoparasite sharing is related to host phylogenetic relatedness, trait similarity or geographic distance/environmental dissimilarity between their ranges. We asked whether the effects of host-associated determinants of ectoparasite richness and the probability of ectoparasite sharing differ between (1) biogeographic realms and (2) fleas and mites. Whenever significant effects of host body mass on ectoparasite richness were found, they were negative, whereas the significant effects of geographic range size, diversity field and habitat breadth were positive. The occurrence of each determinant's effects on ectoparasite species richness differed (1) within fleas or mites between realms and (2) between fleas and mites within a realm. In all realms, the probability of a flea or a mite species being shared between hosts decreased with a decrease in the hosts' phylogenetic relatedness, trait similarity, geographic distance between ranges or environmental similarity. The probabilities of an ectoparasite species being shared between hosts were most strongly related to the hosts' trait similarity and were least related to the environmental similarity. We conclude that caution is needed in making judgements about the generality of macroecological patterns related to parasites based on the investigations of these patterns in limited numbers of localities and when pooling data on various taxa.

Introduction

Parasites represent a large (if not the largest) component of global biodiversity (Poulin, 1996; Poulin and Morand, 2004; Dobson et al., 2008; Okamura et al., 2018). One of the most fundamental challenges in ecological parasitology is elucidating the determinants of parasite species richness (Poulin, 1997; Morand, 2015; Carlson et al., 2020; Dallas et al., 2020). Given that hosts represent the ultimate resource for parasites, the search for factors explaining variation in parasite species richness has mostly focused on variation in host-associated attributes (Kamiya et al., 2014; Morand, 2015). Among these attributes, parasite richness has most often been studied in relation to host body size (e.g., Morand and Poulin, 1998), density (e.g., Morand, 2000), longevity (e.g., Cooper et al., 2012a), level of sociality (e.g., Bordes et al., 2007), the number of host species cohabitating with a target host (e.g., Krasnov et al., 2004a) and geographic range size (e.g., Dáttilo et al., 2020).

The effect of some host features, such as geographic range size, on their parasites' species richness has been found to be consistent in many host and parasite taxa, in many regions and across multiple scales (Feliu et al., 1997; Krasnov et al., 2004a; Lindenfors et al., 2007; Dáttilo et al., 2020). However, the relationships between parasite species richness and many other host traits have appeared to be variable. For example, no effect of host body size on parasite species richness was found for helminths in various terrestrial mammals (Morand and Poulin, 1998)

© The Author(s), 2025. Published by Cambridge University Press. This is an Open Access article, distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution licence (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>), which permits unrestricted re-use, distribution and reproduction, provided the original article is properly cited.

or for fleas parasitic on rodents and shrews (Krasnov *et al.*, 2004a), whereas this effect was found to be positive for various parasite taxa in ungulates (Ezenwa *et al.*, 2006). Higher host assemblage species richness promoted the parasite species richness of individual host species in some, but not other, regions (Krasnov *et al.*, 2004a vs Dáttilo *et al.*, 2020).

The contradictory findings regarding the links between parasite species richness and host characteristics suggest that these relationships may vary between host–parasite associations. For example, Sasal *et al.* (1997) reported a positive association between fish body size and the species richness of monogeneans, but not of gastrointestinal helminths, explaining this difference via the differential ways fish hosts acquire ecto- and endoparasites. Other likely reasons for the above-mentioned contradictions include the study's considered scale and geographic region. Given that parasite communities are fragmented among host individuals, populations and species, the host-associated determinants of parasite species richness have been considered at various scales, from individual hosts (infracommunities; e.g., Spickett *et al.*, 2017) via host populations (component communities; e.g., Morand *et al.*, 2000a) to host species (parasite faunas; e.g., Kennedy and Bush, 1992). Parasite communities at different scales substantially differ in their longevity and assembly mechanisms, with an infracommunity being ephemeral and assembled during an individual host's lifespan via epidemiological and ecological mechanisms, whereas the persistence of a parasite fauna (i.e., a set of parasites exploiting a host species across its geographic range) is much longer, being formed during the host species' long phylogenetic history via evolutionary processes (Poulin, 1996). From this perspective, a parasite fauna seems to be the most suitable scale for investigating the host determinants of parasite species richness, especially given that parasite infra- and component communities are obviously not appropriate for studying parasite richness in relation to some host traits, such as geographic range size. Many studies on the association between host traits and parasite species richness have been carried out at the global scale (Morand and Poulin, 1998; Nunn *et al.*, 2003; Ezenwa *et al.*, 2007; Dallas *et al.*, 2019). To the best of our knowledge, the revealed patterns have never been compared between the same parasite–host associations from different biogeographic realms. However, parasite–host relationships in different realms have different evolutionary histories (e.g., Medvedev, 2005; Lei *et al.*, 2024), which can cause between-realm variation in the responses of parasite species richness to the same or different host traits.

The effects of host traits on parasite communities could be realized not only via the number of parasite species but also via their identities. This is because parasites coevolved with their hosts (e.g., Brooks, 1979), adapting to species-specific host traits for the sake of successfully extracting resources from the hosts (e.g., Morand *et al.*, 2000b). This results in similarities in parasite species composition between hosts possessing similar traits (Huang *et al.*, 2014; Lahun *et al.*, 2024). Given that many traits are usually more similar between phylogenetically close species than between phylogenetically distant species, due to a shared evolutionary history (Blomberg and Garland, 2002; Losos, 2008 and references therein), the trait-based between-host similarity in parasite species composition leads to a tight link between the similarity of parasite species composition and hosts' phylogenetic relatedness (Poulin, 2010; Krasnov *et al.*, 2010; Huang *et al.*, 2014). If a parasite species can exploit a set of functionally similar and phylogenetically related hosts, it can thus alternate between these hosts, provided they

spatially co-occur. In other words, a sharing of parasites between hosts is expected based on their trait and/or phylogenetic similarity (Cooper *et al.*, 2012b; Clark *et al.*, 2018; Dallas *et al.*, 2019). Analogously to host determinants of parasite species richness, the probability of sharing parasites in dependence on similarity in traits or phylogenetic positions can vary geographically because of the environmental variation, biogeographic barriers and differences in the evolutionary histories of parasite–host associations (Clark *et al.*, 2018; Gupta *et al.*, 2019).

An additional factor that may affect a host's parasite species richness and a parasite's probability of being shared between hosts is the hosts' spatial co-occurrence. First, the richer species composition of a host assemblage increases the probability of the lateral transfer of parasites and, consequently, a host's parasite richness (Combes, 2001; but see Dáttilo *et al.*, 2020). Second, similar parasite species compositions and the probability of parasite sharing are obviously either more probable or can only occur, respectively, between co-occurring hosts, all else being equal (Krasnov *et al.*, 2004a; Davies and Pedersen, 2008). These patterns, again, may vary geographically.

Here, we used data on 2 taxa of arthropod ectoparasites (fleas and gamasid mites), harboured by small mammalian hosts across their geographic ranges (i.e., flea and mite faunas), from 6 biogeographic realms. First, we tested whether ectoparasite species richness correlates positively with host body mass, geographic range size, the number of co-occurring hosts within a focal host's geographic range and the number of habitats occupied by a host. Larger hosts are expected to harbour richer parasite assemblages than smaller hosts because of their greater longevity (facilitating parasite accumulation) and larger space and higher number of niches provided for parasites (Poulin, 1995, 2004). Hosts possessing larger geographic ranges and/or occupying multiple habitats have greater chances of encountering more parasite species (Combes, 2001), whereas the reason for hosts in richer assemblages to have richer parasite fauna has been mentioned earlier. Second, we tested whether the probability of ectoparasite sharing is higher for hosts that (1) are phylogenetically close, (2) are similar in their traits, (3) are geographically close and (4) inhabit similar environments. Finally, we asked whether the results of the above-mentioned tests differ between (1) fleas and mites and (2) within fleas and mites between biogeographic realms.

Materials and methods

Data on fleas and gamasid mites recorded on small mammalian hosts

We used various literature sources (including many 'grey' publications) to obtain data on the species composition of fleas and parasitic gamasid mite harboured by small mammalian hosts (Dasyuromorphia, Paramelemorphia, Diprotodontia, Macropodiformes, Didelphimorphia, Paucituberculata, Microbiotheria, Macroscelidea, Afrosoricida, Scandentia, Notoryctemorphia, Eulipotyphla, Rodentia and the ochotonid Lagomorpha) from 6 biogeographic realms (the Afrotropics, the Australasia, the Indomalaya, the Nearctic, the Neotropics and the Palearctic) (see references for data on fleas in Krasnov *et al.*, 2022a and on mites in Supplementary material, Appendix 1). We focused on studies that aimed to compile the most complete lists of fleas or mites on a given host species in a region or an entire continent. In total, we used data on 1090 host species infested by

Table 1. Summary of the best generalized linear models with negative binomial distributions of the effects of host body mass (BM), geographic range size (GR), diversity field (DF; see the text for explanation) and habitat breadth (HB) on the species richness of a host's flea fauna (FSR)

Realm	Equation FSR =	ED	R ²
Afrotropics	$-1.15 - 0.22 * BM + 0.23 * GR + 0.39 * DF$	23.82	0.27
Australasia	$-4.78 + 0.22 * GR + 0.91 * DF + 0.29 * HB$	29.75	0.13
Indomalaya	$-2.70 - 0.23 * BM + 0.26 * GR + 0.65 * DF$	26.85	0.30
Nearctic	$-1.99 + 0.21 * GR + 0.42 * DF$	11.79	0.13
Neotropics	$0.18 * GR + 0.15 * HB$	15.47	0.17
Palaearctic	$-2.58 - 0.1 * BM + 0.24 * GR + 0.66 * DF + 0.13 * HB$	31.68	0.38

Note: All coefficients are significant ($P < 0.05$).
ED, percentage of explained deviance; R², pseudo Nagelkerke's R².

Table 2. Summary of the best generalized linear models with negative binomial distributions of the effects of host body mass (BM), geographic range size (GR), diversity field (DF; see the text for explanation) and habitat breadth (HB) on the species richness of a host's mite fauna (MSR)

Realm	Equation MSR =	ED	R ²
Afrotropics	$-2.17 + 0.12 * GR + 0.45 * DF + 0.23 * HB$	21.50	0.23
Australasia	$-2.06 + 1.33 * GR + 0.71 * DF + 0.22 * HB$	32.74	0.35
Indomalaya	$-1.88 - 0.23 * BM + 0.34 * GR$	21.92	0.24
Nearctic	$-4.37 + 0.28 * GR + 0.55 * DF + 0.12 * HB$	36.30	0.44
Neotropics	$-2.58 - 0.15 * BM + 0.34 * GR$	23.54	0.25
Palaearctic	$-4.98 - 0.13 * BM + 0.35 * GR + 0.89 * DF + 0.11 * HB$	54.68	0.72

Note: All coefficients are significant ($P < 0.05$).
ED, percentage of explained deviance; R², pseudo Nagelkerke's R².

1174 flea species and 884 host species infested by 643 mite species (Supplementary material, Appendix 2). Ubiquitous host species (*Mus musculus*, *Rattus rattus* and *Rattus norvegicus*) were not considered in the analyses.

Host-associated determinants of ectoparasite species richness

Data on host body mass and habitat breadth (number of distinct suitable level 1 IUCN habitats) were obtained from the COMBINE database (Soria et al., 2021). Geographic host ranges were taken from Digital Distribution Maps downloaded from the IUCN database (IUCN, 2024), and a 1° × 1° cell grid was overlaid onto these maps. Then, geographic range sizes were calculated using the 'lets.range' function (with the 'meters' option) of the R package 'letsR' (Vilela and Villalobos, 2015). Values of geographic range size were ln-transformed prior to further analyses. To estimate the tendency of a host species to co-occur with many or a few other species (Villalobos et al., 2013), we followed Dáttilo et al. (2020) and calculated the diversity field of each host (Arita et al., 2008; Villalobos and Arita, 2010; Villalobos et al., 2013) within a respective realm. The diversity field of a species is defined as the mean number of other species that co-occur within its range. To calculate the diversity field of a focal host, we took into consideration all small mammal species that co-occurred with this host within its range, independent of whether any flea or gamasid mite was recorded on these species. Diversity

fields were calculated using the function 'lets.field' of the 'letsR' package.

Distance matrices

We constructed pairwise between-host phylogenetic, trait-based, geographic and environmental distance matrices, separately for flea and mite faunas and for each realm. Host phylogenetic trees (topology and branch lengths) were taken as 1000 random subsets from the 10°000 species-level birth-death tip-dated completed trees for 5911 mammal species of Upham et al. (2019). Consensus trees for each realm were built with the 'consensus.edge' function of the 'phytools' package (Revell, 2012), implemented in the R Statistical Environment (R Core Team, 2024). Each resulting tree was then ultrametrized using the 'force.ultrametric' function (with the method = 'extend' option) of the 'phytools' package, and polytomies were resolved using the 'fix.poly' function of the R package 'RRphylo' (Castiglione et al., 2018). Phylogenetic distance matrices were constructed using the 'cophenetic.phylo' function of the R package 'ape' (Paradis and Schliep, 2019).

Trait-based between-host distance matrices were based on 18 species-specific trait values, including adult body mass, relative brain mass, maximal longevity, age at first reproduction, gestation time, litter size, number of litters per year, interbirth interval (time between reproduction events), weaning age, generation length (average age of parents of the current cohort), dispersal distance (the distance an animal travels between its place of birth to the place of reproduction), hibernation or torpor (yes or no), fossoriality (ground/fossorial or above-ground dwelling), trophic level (omnivore, herbivore or insectivore), foraging stratum (ground level, scansorial or arboreal), activity cycle (nocturnal, diurnal or cathemeral), habitat breadth (number of distinct suitable level 1 IUCN habitats) and geographic range size. Values for the former 17 traits were taken from the COMBINE database (Soria et al., 2021), whereas geographic range sizes were calculated as described earlier. The values of 12 continuous traits were normalized to range from zero to unity. We constructed the trait-based distance matrices from these data using the Gower distance coefficient with the 'gowdis' function of the R package 'FD' (Laliberté and Legendre, 2010).

To build the geographic between-host distance matrices, we first overlaid a grid of 1° × 1° cells onto the distributional maps of hosts (see above), separately for each realm, and then assembled host × cell presence-absence matrices using the 'lets.presab' function of the 'letsR' package. We then determined the centroids of each species' geographic range, using the 'lets.midpoint' function implemented in the 'letsR' package, and calculated pairwise haversine distances using the 'geodist' function of the R package 'geodist' (Padgham and Sumner, 2024).

To calculate environmental dissimilarity between the geographic ranges of host species separately for each realm, 12 environmental variables (isothermality, temperature seasonality, mean daily air temperatures of the warmest and coldest quarters, annual precipitation amount, precipitation seasonality, mean monthly precipitation amount of the warmest and coldest quarters, mean monthly climate moisture index, mean near-surface relative humidity, mean potential evapotranspiration and net primary productivity) were averaged across 1 km × 1 km grids around the centroid of a given host's geographic range, with a 100-km buffer. These variables presumably affect ectoparasite distribution because fleas and mites are sensitive to ambient temperature and relative




Figure 1. Relationships between flea species richness and (A) host body mass in the Indomalaya, (B) mean number of small mammals cohabitating with a focal host (diversity field) in the Australasia, (C) host habitat breadth in the Palearctic and (D) host geographic range in the Nearctic.

humidity. Environmental data were obtained from the CHELSA 2.1 datasets (Karger *et al.*, 2017, 2021). Because of the high correlation between many of the environmental variables, we first extracted from them 2 (for the Australasia and the Palearctic) or 3 (for the remaining realms) principal components that explained from 78.84% (in the Palearctic) to 89.70% (in the Indomalaya) of the environmental variation. Then, we used the scores of these principal components to compute the classical Euclidean distance between each pair of hosts as a measure of environmental distance. For all distance matrices, the distances were normalized to range from zero to unity.

Data analysis: determinants of ectoparasite species richness

To understand the relationships between flea or mite species richness and host body mass, diversity field (reflecting the species richness of assemblages containing a focal host), geographic range size and habitat breadth (reflecting the degree of a host's ecological specialization), we ran generalized linear models with a negative binomial distribution and a log-link function because ectoparasite species richness is a count variable. Values of host body mass, diversity field and geographic range size were ln-transformed. Prior to running the models, we tested for phylogenetic signals in flea or mite species richness within each realm, using the K^* -statistic of Blomberg *et al.* (2003), calculated with the 'phyloSignal' function of the R package 'phylosignal' (Keck *et al.*, 2016). No significant phylogenetic signal was detected in any realm (Blomberg *et al.*'s

$K^* = 0.08\text{--}0.14$, $P > 0.10$ for all), and we ran models without correction for the potential confounding effect of phylogeny. The models were fitted using the 'glm.nb' function of the R package 'MASS' (Venables and Ripley, 2002). Initially, we fitted models with all possible combinations of the explanatory variables and then selected the best model based on the Akaike information criterion using the 'model.sel' function of the R package 'MuMIn' (Bartoń, 2024). The pseudo- R^2 for each best model was calculated as Nagelkerke's (1991) R^2 using the 'pR2' function of the R package 'modEva' (Barbosa *et al.*, 2013).

Data analysis: probability of ectoparasite species sharing

We calculated the probability of sharing ectoparasite species between hosts in dependence on their phylogenetic, trait-based, geographic and environmental distances, following Gilbert *et al.* (2012), Ál and Lira-Noriega (2017) and Dáttilo *et al.* (2020). This was done for ectoparasite species recorded on at least 6 host species. In brief, an incidence matrix with ectoparasites in rows and hosts in columns was constructed for each realm. Each host species was considered as the source of the parasite species that interacted with it and the source for a random sample of the other hosts [see details in Ál and Lira-Noriega (2017) and Dáttilo *et al.* (2020)]. Then, we calculated the coefficients of logistic regressions (intercept and slope) relating ectoparasite–host incidences to phylogenetic, trait-based, geographic or environmental distances between hosts as explanatory variables. This was done both for




Figure 2. Relationships between mite species richness and (A) host body mass in the Indomalaya, (B) mean number of small mammals cohabitating with a focal host (diversity field) in the Nearctic, (C) host habitat breadth in the Australasia and (D) host geographic range in the Neotropics.

each ectoparasite species and for the entire set of ectoparasites. In the latter case, coefficients were calculated 1000 times with a random set of ectoparasite species, producing the general tendency of each coefficient distribution. Finally, the probability (P) of host species sharing flea or mite species in dependence on between-host phylogenetic, trait-based or geographic distances was calculated as $P = 1/(1 + e^{-a+b \cdot D})$, where a is the mean intercept, b is the mean slope and D is the respective between-host distance (Ál and Lira-Noriega, 2017). These analyses were carried out using the R package 'geotax' (Ál and Lira-Noriega, 2017) and the R functions and code compiled by ALRF.

Results

Determinants of ectoparasite species richness

Generalized linear models demonstrated that the host-associated determinants of flea and mite species richness differed between realms (Tables 1–2). In 3 of the 6 realms, the species richness of flea and mite faunas varied between hosts depending on their body mass. Whenever the effect of host body mass on ectoparasite species richness was significant, it was negative, reflecting a lower number of flea or mite species on larger hosts (see illustrative examples for flea and mite faunas in the Indomalaya in Figure 1A and 2A, respectively). Flea and mite species richness correlated positively with host diversity field in 5 (for fleas) and 4 (for mites) realms, increasing with the number of small mammal species cohabitating with a focal host (see illustrative examples for

flea faunas in the Australasia in Figure 1B and for mite faunas in the Nearctic in Figure 2B). Positive relationships between flea and mite faunas and host habitat breadth were detected in 3 and 4 realms, respectively (Tables 1–2; see illustrative examples for flea faunas in the Palearctic in Figure 1C and mite faunas in the Nearctic in Figure 2C). Host geographic range affected its flea and mite species richness in all realms, with greater numbers of flea or mite species harboured by broadly, as compared with narrowly, distributed hosts (see illustrative examples for flea faunas in the Nearctic in Figure 1D and mite faunas in the Neotropics in Figure 2D).

Probability of ectoparasite species sharing

The coefficients of the logistic regressions of ectoparasite–host incidences, in relation to the phylogenetic, trait-based, geographic and environmental distances between hosts, were negative in the majority of ectoparasite species, although not in all (Tables 3–4). In other words, the probability of sharing the majority of ectoparasites between hosts increased with a decrease in hosts' phylogenetic relatedness, trait similarity, geographic distance between ranges and environmental similarity (Figures 3–4). The mean values of the intercepts and slopes of the effects of phylogenetic, trait, geographic and environmental distances differed between realms, with mean slopes being consistently negative (Tables 3–4). This resulted in somewhat different shapes of the relationships between the probability of ectoparasite sharing and its determinants in some realms,

Table 3. Mean values of the intercept and slope coefficient of the logistic regressions relating flea species incidences on hosts to phylogenetic (PD), trait-based (TD), geographic (GD) and environmental (ED) distances between host species and the proportion of flea species recorded on at least 6 host species with negative slope coefficients (PNS)

Realm	Number of flea species	Distance	Intercept	Slope	PNS
Afrotropics	94	PD	−0.93	−4.65	0.99
		TD	1.50	−5.64	0.94
		GD	−1.11	−7.28	1.00
		ED	−1.57	−5.14	0.97
Australasia	37	PD	−0.60	−27.50	0.47
		TD	1.25	−5.11	0.89
		GD	−1.19	−7.95	0.94
		ED	−1.12	−5.37	0.94
Indomalaya	47	PD	−1.99	−1.84	0.87
		TD	7.21	−13.11	1.00
		GD	−1.24	−15.60	1.00
		ED	−1.74	−3.63	0.87
Nearctic	93	PD	−0.73	−8.25	0.79
		TD	1.62	−5.44	0.74
		GD	−1.07	−11.43	0.97
		ED	−2.38	−0.33	0.58
Neotropics	81	PD	−1.76	−13.61	0.77
		TD	−1.04	−2.51	0.78
		GD	−0.89	−12.52	1.00
		ED	−2.00	−3.24	0.92
Palearctic	137	PD	−2.79	−1.09	0.63
		TD	0.15	−4.17	0.77
		GD	−1.24	−8.85	1.00
		ED	−2.78	−1.10	0.62

except for the effects of geographic distance, which were similar (Figures 3–4). In general, the highest probability of a flea and a mite species to be shared between hosts was related to hosts' trait similarity (Figures 3–4), except in the Neotropics where geographic proximity played a stronger role (Figure 3). The effect of environmental similarity on the probability of ectoparasite sharing was lower than the effects of phylogenetic relatedness, trait similarity and geographic distance, except in the Palearctic where this effect was relatively strong (Figure 4).

Discussion

We found consistent patterns of ectoparasite species richness variation along the gradients of host body size, geographic range, diversity field and habitat specialization. The species richness of both fleas and mites was higher in smaller hosts that were broadly distributed, occurred in species-rich assemblages and occupied several habitat types. As mentioned earlier, richer parasite faunas in larger hosts are expected because of parasite accumulation due to these hosts' longer lifespans and the greater space they provide for parasites, which may result in higher numbers of niches available for parasites (Poulin, 1995; Poulin and Morand, 2004).

Positive relationships between parasite species richness and host body mass have been found in some parasite–mammal associations (Vitone *et al.*, 2004; Ezenwa *et al.*, 2006; Lindenfors *et al.*, 2007), whereas in other associations, the relationship between host body mass and parasite richness was either absent (Morand and Poulin, 1998; Nunn *et al.*, 2003; Krasnov *et al.*, 2004a) or negative (Dáttilo *et al.*, 2020; Villalobos-Segura *et al.*, 2020). Studies that reported a negative association between parasite richness and host body mass noted that this pattern was mainly characteristic of small-bodied hosts, such as rodents and chiropterans; this was explained by differences in sampling efforts, with smaller hosts being more exhaustively sampled so that the chances to record rare parasite species are higher for smaller than for larger hosts (Villalobos-Segura *et al.*, 2020). Another explanation was that smaller mammals are usually characterized by higher population densities, causing a kind of parasite species 'dilution' among host species (Dáttilo *et al.*, 2020). Here, we propose an additional explanation for the negative association between host body mass and parasite richness found in our study. As mentioned earlier, the parasite taxa under consideration (fleas and gamasid mites) are predominantly nidicolous, and most of their lives are spent in their hosts' burrows and nests (Radovsky, 1985; Krasnov, 2008).

Table 4. Mean values of the intercept and slope coefficient of the logistic regressions relating mite species incidences on hosts to phylogenetic (PD), trait-based (TD), geographic (GD) and environmental (ED) distances between host species and the proportion of mite species recorded on at least 6 host species with negative slope coefficients (PNS)

Realm	Number of mite species	Distance	Intercept	Slope	PNS
Afrotropics	30	PD	-1.20	-3.39	0.92
		TD	0.34	-3.68	0.71
		GD	-1.51	-6.22	0.97
		ED	-2.16	-0.45	0.67
Australasia	24	PD	-2.18	-2.05	0.62
		TD	0.77	-4.32	0.71
		GD	-1.35	-3.43	1.00
		ED	-1.90	-1.84	0.82
Indomalaya	39	PD	-2.56	-0.84	0.71
		TD	1.11	-4.54	0.85
		GD	-1.17	-10.20	0.89
		ED	-1.51	-4.17	0.92
Nearctic	41	PD	-1.00	-6.84	1.00
		TD	2.45	-6.46	0.80
		GD	-1.11	-10.43	0.98
		ED	-1.46	-5.02	0.93
Neotropics	41	PD	-2.14	-12.95	0.76
		TD	0.79	-4.81	0.73
		GD	-1.64	-6.20	0.90
		ED	-1.79	-5.01	0.90
Palearctic	73	PD	-0.87	-8.50	0.97
		TD	0.76	-3.81	0.76
		GD	-0.82	-7.31	0.99
		ED	-0.87	-8.86	0.97

Furthermore, the pre-imaginal development of the absolute majority of flea species takes place in hosts' burrows/nests (Krasnov, 2008). Smaller mammals usually construct deep burrows, with more complex architecture than those of larger mammals (even within a 2.5–5000-g mass range, which is the definition for a 'small mammal'; Degen, 1997) (Kucheruk, 1983). These burrows represent hotspots of flea and mite diversity (Holland, 1964), leading to an increase in flea and/or mite species richness in the burrows' owners (Krasnov et al., 2004b).

Positive relationships between flea and mite species richness and host geographic range size and/or the number of occupied habitats are not especially surprising. The effect of host geographic range size and habitat generalism has been repeatedly shown for various parasites and host taxa (e.g., Morand, 2000, 2015; Torres et al., 2006; Costello, 2016). The most likely mechanism behind this pattern is that hosts that have large geographical ranges or persist in many habitats accumulate large numbers of parasite species because of their higher probabilities to encounter many parasite species (Combes, 2001; Morand, 2015). In addition, a larger geographic range and/or habitat generalism likely results in higher probabilities to encounter many other host species, which might facilitate the between-host exchange of parasites. In the

case of nidicolous ectoparasites, this exchange may be realized via visiting each other's burrows (Krasnov, 2008) or via direct contact between individual hosts belonging to different species (Krasnov and Khokhlova, 2002). As a result, parasite species richness increases in broadly distributed, habitat-generalist hosts occurring in species-rich host assemblages (measured via the mean number of cohabitating hosts, i.e., diversity field), as was found in our study [see also Krasnov et al. (2004a) for fleas in a subset of 92 Holarctic hosts]. However, Dáttilo et al. (2020) found a positive effect of host geographic range on ectoparasite species richness in mammals in Mexico, but no relationship between ectoparasite richness and host diversity field. This contradiction between our results and those of Dáttilo et al. (2020) may be associated with differences in the scale of the analyses (a biogeographic realm versus a single country), as well as with the fact that we considered 2 distinct taxa of ectoparasites feeding either obligatorily or facultatively on host blood, while Dáttilo et al. (2020) considered data pooled on all ectoparasite taxa, using data from Whitaker and Morales-Malacara (2005). The latter included lice (Phthiraptera), which are strictly host-specific (e.g., Light et al., 2010) and usually do not switch host species, as well as a variety of phoretic, predatory and saprophagous arthropods that are not parasitic.




Figure 3. Relationships between the phylogenetic distance, trait dissimilarity, geographic distance and environmental dissimilarity between hosts and their probability to share a flea species. Lines represent mean coefficients from the logistic regressions carried out for all flea species recorded on at least 6 hosts.

Furthermore, we found that ectoparasite species richness was driven by host-associated variables differently (1) in different biogeographic realms and (2) between fleas and mites within the same realm. For example, the host diversity field did not explain either flea or mite species richness in the Neotropics, but it did so in other realms (for at least 1 of the 2 ectoparasite taxa) (Tables 1–2). Host body mass predicted flea species richness in the Afrotropical, Indomalayan and Palearctic, but not in the Australasian, Nearctic and Neotropical hosts. The effect of host body mass on mite species richness was detected in the Australasia, Neotropics and Palearctic, but not in the Afrotropics, Indomalaya or the Nearctic. Flea vs mite differences can be exemplified by the effect of host body mass on flea, but not mite, species richness in the Afrotropics or the effect of host habitat breadth on mite, but not flea, species richness in the Nearctic. One of the most likely reasons for these differences is between-realm differences in the species compositions of hosts, fleas and mites that resulted from the differential histories of hosts, parasites and their interactions (e.g., Medvedev, 2005; Zhu *et al.*,

2015 for fleas). The responses of host-associated variables may vary between different flea or mite species, leading to the between-realm variation in the host drivers of parasite species richness. Moreover, the between-realm variation in the average degree of flea or mite host specificity might also cause differences in the relationships between their species richness and host-associated predictors. For example, flea–host interactions in the Palearctic appeared to be relatively more specialized than those in the Nearctic, resulting in each flea species interacting with fewer host species in the former than in the latter (Krasnov *et al.*, 2007). This might be one of the reasons behind the effect of host body mass on flea species richness in the Palearctic but not in the Nearctic. The difference between the predictors of flea and mite richness in the same realm could be somehow associated with the differential life histories of these taxa. In particular, fleas are obligate haematophages, but their pre-imagoes (except for a few species) are not parasitic, whereas in many mites, the pre-imagoes are also blood-feeding, but some species only feed on a host's blood facultatively. The level of mite




Figure 4. Relationships between the phylogenetic distance, trait dissimilarity, geographic distance and environmental dissimilarity between hosts and their probability to share a gamasid mite species. Lines represent mean coefficients from the logistic regressions carried out for all mite species recorded on at least 6 hosts.

host specificity is much lower than that of fleas (Vinarski et al., 2007). These life history differences have been proposed as factors that may cause differences between the 2 taxa in a number of ecological and biogeographic patterns within the same biogeographic realm (Krasnov et al., 2004a vs Korralo et al., 2007; Krasnov et al., 2005 vs Vinarski et al., 2007).

We found that the probability of a flea or a mite species being shared between hosts decreased with an increase in the between-host phylogenetic distance, trait dissimilarity, geographic distance and environmental dissimilarity. The most likely reasons behind the effect of phylogenetic relatedness and trait similarity are that (1) ectoparasites select hosts with traits that allow parasites to successfully extract resources from these hosts (Krasnov et al., 2016) and (2) phylogenetically close relatives are often more similar to each other than distant relatives are (phylogenetic trait conservatism; Blomberg and Garland, 2002; Losos, 2008). In addition, a parasite may originate on a given host and then does not speciate following its host's speciation, resulting in the same parasite being present on multiple daughter lineages of the original host (a so-called

'inertia event') (Paterson and Banks, 2001). Nevertheless, trait resemblance appeared to be the most important factor facilitating ectoparasite sharing, with the negative effect of host trait dissimilarity on ectoparasite sharing being much stronger than that of host phylogenetic distance (except for the Neotropical fleas). This is counterintuitive given the above-mentioned phylogenetic trait conservatism. However, phylogenetic trait conservatism may not always be the case, especially for cohabitating close relatives. Limiting similarity theory (MacArthur and Levins, 1967) states that interspecific competition increases with an increase in niche similarity, ultimately leading to co-occurring species possessing dissimilar niches, which in turn, represents an outcome of trait differences. Assuming trait similarity between close relatives, one of the predictions of this theory is that competition exclusion results in the unlikelihood of the co-occurrence of closely related species (e.g., Webb et al., 2002). However, Mayfield and Levine (2010) demonstrated that, in some cases, competition can lead to the exclusion of less related species. This can be due to either trait similarity in distant relatives or no association

between trait similarity and phylogenetic relatedness (e.g., Uriarte et al., 2010).

The higher probability of ectoparasite sharing being more strongly determined by trait similarity than by phylogenetic relatedness may be the result of the process known as ‘ecological fitting’ (Janzen, 1985). Ecological fitting represents a situation in which an organism (e.g., a parasite) interacts with its environment (e.g., a host) in a way that might suggest a shared evolutionary history, whereas in reality, the traits relevant to the interaction evolved elsewhere and in response to a different set of conditions. When parasites depend on the resource rather than a specific host, and when phylogenetically distant hosts share this resource, host-switching becomes likely. A new host may be unrelated to the parasite’s original host species (Brooks et al., 2006; D’Bastiani et al., 2023). In the case of nidicolous ectoparasites, a necessary resource possessed by many related and unrelated host species is their burrows/nests where (1) the majority of fleas and mites spend the main part of their lives and (2) most pre-imaginal development occurs. In the Neotropical hosts, however, the probability of sharing a flea species, but not a mite species, was almost equally determined by phylogenetic relatedness and trait similarity. This might somehow be associated with the fact that the Neotropical flea–host associations have a longer evolutionary history than those in the remaining realms. This is because fleas most likely originated in Gondwana (the former South America and Australia connected via Antarctica until the late Eocene) became first associated with aboriginal hosts and then dispersed with their hosts from the Laurasian North America (periodically connected with South America via a Caribbean land bridge during the Late Cretaceous) (Zhu et al., 2015).

The effect of geographic distance between host ranges on the probability of ectoparasite sharing might most likely be associated with either a higher probability of cohabitating hosts to harbour the same parasites (e.g., Davies and Pedersen, 2008) or the above-mentioned ecological fitting or both. Environmental similarity could result in similar microclimatic conditions in the burrows of different host species (Degen, 1997). These similar conditions would allow nidicolous arthropods sensitive to air temperature and relative humidity (Marshall, 1981) to inhabit these burrows and exploit their owners.

In conclusion, the host-associated determinants of the probability of sharing ectoparasite species were, in general, similar between (1) fleas and mites and (2) geographic realms. However, this was not the case for the determinants of the species richness of flea and mite faunas. Therefore, our findings indicate that caution is warranted when generalizing macroecological patterns in parasites – particularly when such patterns are inferred from studies with limited geographic scope or by pooling data across diverse parasite taxa. Our results demonstrate that evolutionary contingencies – shaped by regional biogeographic histories and parasite life-history strategies – can override large-scale ecological predictions. Consequently, studies extrapolating parasite macroecological patterns from restricted taxonomic or geographic sampling risk oversimplifying these complex biological systems.

Future research should employ comparative frameworks incorporating phylogenetic and biogeographic contexts to advance a more robust, nuanced understanding of parasite biodiversity patterns.

Supplementary material. The supplementary material for this article can be found at <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0031182025100371>.

Data availability statement. Raw data on flea and host species at the scale of biogeographic realms are contained in the sources cited in Krasnov et al. (2022a) and the Supplementary material. Custom R functions and the R Code can be obtained from A.L.R.-F. (a474r867@ku.edu) upon request.

Acknowledgements. We thank Fabricio Villalobos for his help with the R code.

Author contributions. B.R.K. conceived and designed the study. All authors collected the data. B.R.K., V.I.G. and A.L.R.-F. performed statistical analyses. B.R.K. wrote the first draft of the article. All authors finalized the article.

Financial support. This study was partly supported by the Israel Science Foundation (grant no. 548/23 to B.R.K. and I.S.K.). N.P.K. is supported by the Zoological Institute of the Russian Academy of Sciences (the state budgetary project no. 125013001089-0).

Competing interests. The authors declare there are no conflicts of interest.

Ethical standards. This study is based on published data, and therefore, ethical standards are not applicable.

References

- Ál R-F and Lira-Noriega A (2017) Combining phylogenetic and occurrence information for risk assessment of pest and pathogen interactions with host plants. *Frontiers in Applied Mathematics and Statistics* 3, 17. doi:[10.3389/fams.2017.00017](https://doi.org/10.3389/fams.2017.00017)
- Arita HT, Christen JA, Rodríguez P and Soberón J (2008) Species diversity and distribution in presence-absence matrices: Mathematical relationships and biological implications. *American Naturalist* 172, 519–532. doi:[10.1086/590954](https://doi.org/10.1086/590954)
- Barbosa AM, Real R, Munoz AR and Brown JA (2013) New measures for assessing model equilibrium and prediction mismatch in species distribution models. *Diversity and Distributions* 19, 1333–1338. doi:[10.1111/ddi.12100](https://doi.org/10.1111/ddi.12100)
- Bartoń K (2024) MuMIn: Multi-model inference. R package version 1.48.4. Available at <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=MUMIN> (accessed 20 December 2024).
- Blomberg SP and Garland T (2002) Tempo and mode in evolution: Phylogenetic inertia, adaptation and comparative methods. *Journal of Evolutionary Biology* 15, 899–910. doi:[10.1046/j.1420-9101.2002.00472.x](https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1420-9101.2002.00472.x)
- Blomberg SP, T G Jr and Ives AR (2003) Testing for phylogenetic signal in comparative data: Behavioral traits are more labile. *Evolution* 57, 717–745. doi:[10.1111/j.0014-3820.2003.tb00285.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0014-3820.2003.tb00285.x)
- Bordes F, Blumstein DT and Morand S (2007) Rodent sociality and parasite diversity. *Biology Letters* 3, 692–694. doi:[10.1098/rsbl.2007.0393](https://doi.org/10.1098/rsbl.2007.0393)
- Brooks DR (1979) Testing the context and extent of host-parasite coevolution. *Systematic Biology* 28, 299–307. doi:[10.1093/sysbio/28.3.299](https://doi.org/10.1093/sysbio/28.3.299)
- Brooks DR, León-Régagnon V, McLennan DA and Zelmer D (2006) Ecological fitting as a determinant of the community structure of platyhelminth parasites of anurans. *Ecology* 87, S76–S85. doi:[10.1890/0012-9658](https://doi.org/10.1890/0012-9658)
- Carlson CJ, Dallas TA, Alexander LW, Phelan AL and Phillips AJ (2020) What would it take to describe the global diversity of parasites? *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London B* 287, 20201841. doi:[10.1098/rspb.2020.1841](https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2020.1841)
- Castiglione S, Tesone G, Piccolo M, Melchionna M, Mondanaro A, Serio C, Di Febbraro M and Raia P (2018) A new method for testing evolutionary rate variation and shifts in phenotypic evolution. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution* 9, 974–983. doi:[10.1111/2041-210X.12954](https://doi.org/10.1111/2041-210X.12954)
- Clark NJ, Clegg SM, Sam K, Goulding W, Koane B and Wells K (2018) Climate, host phylogeny and the connectivity of host communities govern regional parasite assembly. *Diversity and Distributions* 24, 13–23. doi:[10.1111/ddi.12661](https://doi.org/10.1111/ddi.12661)
- Combes C (2001) *Parasitism. The Ecology and Evolution of Intimate Interactions*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Cooper N, Griffin R, Franz M, Omotayo M and Nunn CL (2012b) Phylogenetic host specificity and understanding parasite sharing in primates. *Ecology Letters* 15, 1370–1377. doi:[10.1111/j.1461-0248.2012.01858.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1461-0248.2012.01858.x)

- Cooper N, Kamilar JM and Nunn CL (2012a) Host longevity and parasite species richness in mammals. *PLoS One* 7, e42190. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0042190
- Costello MJ (2016) Parasite rates of discovery, global species richness and host specificity. *Integrative and Comparative Biology* 56, 588–599. doi:10.1093/icb/icw084
- Dallas TA, Han BA, Nunn CL, Park AW, Stephens PR and Drake JM (2019) Host traits associated with species roles in parasite sharing networks. *Oikos* 128, 23–32. doi:10.1111/oik.05602
- Dallas T, Holian LA and Foster G (2020) What determines parasite species richness across host species? *Journal of Animal Ecology* 89, 1750–1753. doi:10.1111/1365-2656.13276
- Dáttilo W, Barrozo-Chávez N, Lira-Noriega A, Guevara R, Villalobos F, Santiago-Alarcon D, Neves FS, Izzo T and Ribeiro SP (2020) Species-level drivers of mammalian ectoparasite faunas. *Journal of Animal Ecology* 89, 1754–1765. doi:10.1111/1365-2656.13216
- Davies TJ and Pedersen AB (2008) Phylogeny and geography predict pathogen community similarity in wild primates and humans. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London B* 275, 1695–1701. doi:10.1098/rspb.2008.0284
- D’Bastiani E, Principe D, Marquitti FMD, Boeger WA, Campião KM and Araujo SBL (2023) Effect of host-switching on the ecological and evolutionary patterns of parasites. *Systematic Biology* 72, 912–924. doi:10.1093/sysbio/syad022
- Degen AA (1997) *Ecophysiology of Small Desert Mammals*. Heidelberg: Springer Berlin.
- Dobson A, Lafferty KD, Kuris AM, Hechinger RF and Jetz W (2008) Homage to Linnaeus: How many parasites? How many hosts? *Proceedings of the National Academy of Science of the USA* 105, 11482–11489. doi:10.1073/pnas.0803232105
- Ezenwa VOP, Altizer SA, S VND and Cook KC (2006) Host traits and parasite species richness in even and odd-toed hoofed mammals, Artiodactyla and Perissodactyla. *Oikos* 115, 526–536. doi:10.1111/j.2006.0030-1299.15186.x
- Feliu C, Renaud F, Catzeffis F, Durand P, Hugot J-P and Morand S (1997) A comparative analysis of parasite species richness of Iberian rodents. *Parasitology* 115, 453–466. doi:10.1017/S0031182097001479
- Gilbert GS, Magarey R, Suiter K and Webb CO (2012) Evolutionary tools for phytosanitary risk analysis: Phylogenetic signal as a predictor of host range of plant pests and pathogens. *Evolutionary Applications* 5, 869–878. doi:10.1111/j.1752-4571.2012.00265.x
- Gupta P, Vishnudas CK, Ramakrishnan U, Robin VV and Dharmarajan G (2019) Geographical and host species barriers differentially affect generalist and specialist parasite community structure in a tropical sky-island archipelago. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London B* 286, 20190439. doi:10.1098/rspb.2019.0439
- Holland GP (1964) Evolution, classification, and host relationships of Siphonaptera. *Annual Review of Entomology* 9, 123–146. doi:10.1146/annurev.en.09.010164.001
- Huang S, Bininda-Emonds OR, Stephens PR, Gittleman JL and Altizer S (2014) Phylogenetically related and ecologically similar carnivores harbour similar parasite assemblages. *Journal of Animal Ecology* 83, 671–680. doi:10.1111/1365-2656.12160
- IUCN (2024) *The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species*. Version 2024-2. <http://www.iucnredlist.org> (accessed 25 December 2024).
- Janzen DH (1985) On ecological fitting. *Oikos* 45, 308–310. doi:10.2307/3565565
- Kamiya T, O’Dwyer K, Nakagawa S and Poulin R (2014) What determines species richness of parasitic organisms? A meta-analysis across animal, plant and fungal hosts. *Biological Reviews* 89, 123–134. doi:10.1111/brev.12046
- Karger DN, Conrad O, Böhner J, Kawohl T, Kreft H, Soria-Auza RW, Zimmermann NE, Linder HP and Kessler M (2017) Climatologies at high resolution for the earth’s land surface areas. *Scientific Data* 4, 170122. doi:10.1038/sdata.2017.122
- Karger DN, Conrad O, Böhner J, Kawohl T, Kreft H, Soria-Auza RW, Zimmermann NE, Linder HP and Kessler M (2021) Data from: Climatologies at high resolution for the earth’s land surface areas. *EnviDat*. doi:10.16904/enviDat.228.v2.1
- Keck F, Rimet F, Bouchez A and Franc A (2016) phylSignal: An R package to measure, test, and explore the phylogenetic signal. *Ecology and Evolution* 6, 2774–2780. doi:10.1002/ece3.2051
- Kennedy CR and Bush AO (1992) Species richness in helminth communities: the importance of multiple congeners. *Parasitology* 104, 189–197. doi:10.1017/S0031182000060935
- Korallo NP, Vinarski MV, Krasnov BR, Shenbrot GI, Mouillot D and Poulin R (2007) Are there general rules governing parasite diversity? Small mammalian hosts and gamasid mite assemblages. *Diversity and Distributions* 13, 353–360. doi:10.1111/j.1472-4642.2007.00332.x
- Krasnov BR (2008) *Functional and Evolutionary Ecology of Fleas. A Model for Ecological Parasitology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Krasnov BR and Khokhlova IS (2002) The effect of behavioural interactions on the exchange of flea (Siphonaptera) between two rodent species. *Journal of Vector Ecology* 26, 181–190.
- Krasnov BR, Khokhlova IS and Shenbrot GI (2004b) Sampling fleas: The reliability of host infestation data. *Medical and Veterinary Entomology* 18, 232–240. doi:10.1111/j.0269-283X.2004.00500.x
- Krasnov BR, Mouillot D, Shenbrot GI, Khokhlova IS, Vinarski MV, Korallo-Vinarskaya NP and Poulin R (2010) Similarity in ectoparasite faunas of Palaearctic rodents as a function of host phylogenetic, geographic or environmental distances: Which matters the most? *International Journal for Parasitology* 40, 807–817. doi:10.1016/j.ijpara.2009.12.002
- Krasnov BR, Shenbrot GI and Khokhlova IS (2022a) Regional flea and host assemblages form biogeographic, but not ecological, clusters: Evidence for a dispersal-based mechanism as a driver of species composition. *Parasitology* 149, 1450–1459. doi:10.1017/S0031182022000907
- Krasnov BR, Shenbrot GI, Khokhlova IS and Degen AA (2004a) Flea species richness and parameters of host body, host geography and host “milieu.” *Journal of Animal Ecology* 73, 1121–1128. doi:10.1111/j.0021-8790.2004.00883.x
- Krasnov BR, Shenbrot GI, Khokhlova IS and Degen AA (2016) Trait-based and phylogenetic associations between parasites and their hosts: A case study with small mammals and fleas in the Palearctic. *Oikos* 125, 29–38. doi:10.1111/oik.02178
- Krasnov BR, Shenbrot GI, Khokhlova IS and Poulin R (2007) Geographical variation in the ‘bottom-up’ control of diversity: Fleas and their small mammalian hosts. *Global Ecology and Biogeography* 16, 179–186. doi:10.1111/j.1466-8238.2006.00273.x
- Krasnov BR, Shenbrot GI, Mouillot D, Khokhlova IS and Poulin R (2005) Spatial variation in species diversity and composition of flea assemblages in small mammalian hosts: Geographical distance or faunal similarity? *Journal of Biogeography* 32, 633–644. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2699.2004.01206.x
- Kucheruk VV (1983) Mammal burrows: Their structure, topology and use. *Fauna and Ecology of Rodents* 15, 5–54. in Russian.
- Laliberté E and Legendre P (2010) A distance-based framework for measuring functional diversity from multiple traits. *Ecology* 91, 299–305. doi:10.1890/08-2244.1
- Legendre P, Lapointe F-J, and Casgrain P (1994) Modeling brain evolution from behavior: A permutational regression approach. *Evolution* 48, 1487–1499. doi:10.1111/j.1558-5646.1994.tb02191.x (accessed 3 January 2025).
- Lehun AL, Muniz CM, Silva JOS, Cavalcanti LD and Takemoto RM (2024) The functional traits of host fish can act as good predictors for parasite composition in a neotropical floodplain. *Journal of Fish Biology* 104, 206–215. doi:10.1111/jfb.15576
- Lei HP, Jakovlić I, Zhou S, Liu X, Yan C, Jin X, Wang B, Li W-X, Wang G-T and Zhang D (2024) Geography, phylogeny and host switch drive the coevolution of parasitic *Gyrodactylus* flatworms and their hosts. *Parasites and Vectors* 17, 42. doi:10.1186/s13071-023-06111-6
- Light JE, Smith VS, Allen JM, Durden LA and Reed DL (2010) Evolutionary history of mammalian sucking lice (Phthiraptera: Anoplura). *BMC Evolutionary Biology* 10, 292. doi:10.1186/1471-2148-10-292
- Lindenfors P, Nunn CL, Jones KE, Cunningham AA, Sechrest W and Gittleman JL (2007) Parasite species richness in carnivores: Effects of host body mass, latitude, geographical range and population density. *Global Ecology and Biogeography* 16, 496–509. doi:10.1111/j.1466-8238.2006.00301.x

- Losos JB** (2008) Phylogenetic niche conservatism, phylogenetic signal and the relationship between phylogenetic relatedness and ecological similarity among species. *Ecology Letters* **11**, 995–1007. doi:10.1111/j.1461-0248.2008.01229.x
- MacArthur R and Levins R** (1967) The limiting similarity, convergence, and divergence of coexisting species. *American Naturalist* **101**, 377–385. doi:10.1086/282505
- Marshall AG** (1981) *The Ecology of Ectoparasitic Insects*. London: Academic Press.
- Mayfield MM and Levine JM** (2010) Opposing effects of competitive exclusion on the phylogenetic structure of communities. *Ecology Letters* **13**, 1085–1093. doi:10.1111/j.1461-0248.2010.01509.x
- Medvedev SG** (2005) An Attempted System Analysis of the Evolution of the Order of Fleas (Siphonaptera). *Lectures in Memoriam N. A. Kholodkovsky No. 57*. Saint Petersburg: Russian Federation, Russian Entomological Society and Zoological Institute of Russian Academy of Sciences (in Russian).
- Morand S** (2000) Wormy world: Comparative tests of theoretical hypotheses on parasite species richness. In Poulin R, Morand S and Skorpung A (eds.), *Evolutionary Biology of Host-Parasite Relationships: Theory Meet Reality*. Amsterdam: Elsevier, 63–79.
- Morand S** (2015) (macro-) Evolutionary ecology of parasite diversity: From determinants of parasite species richness to host diversification. *International Journal for Parasitology: Parasites and Wildlife* **4**, 80–87. doi:10.1016/j.ijppaw.2015.01.001
- Morand S, Cribb TH, Kulbicki M, Rigby MC, Chauvet C, Dufour V, Faliex E, Galzin R, Lo CM, Lo-Yat A, Pichelin S and Sasal P** (2000a) Endoparasite species richness of New Caledonian butterfly fishes: Host density and diet matter. *Parasitology* **121**, 65–73. doi:10.1017/s0031182099006058
- Morand S, Hafner MS, Page RDM and Reed DL** (2000b) Comparative body size relationships in pocket gophers and their chewing lice. *Biological Journal of the Linnean Society* **70**, 239–249. doi:10.1006/bjil.1999.0370
- Morand S and Poulin R** (1998) Density, body mass and parasite species richness of terrestrial mammals. *Evolutionary Ecology* **12**, 717–727. doi:10.1023/A:1006537600093
- Nunn CL, Altizer S, Jones KE and Sechrest W** (2003) Comparative tests of parasite species richness in primates. *American Naturalist* **162**, 597–614. doi:10.1086/378721
- Okamura B, Hartigan A and Naldoni J** (2018) Extensive uncharted biodiversity: The parasite dimension. *Integrative and Comparative Biology* **58**, 1132–1145. doi:10.1093/icb/icy039
- Padgham M, and Sumner M** (2024) geodist: Fast, dependency-free geodesic distance calculations. R package version 0.1.0. <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=geodist> (accessed 20 December 2024).
- Paradis E and Schliep K** (2019) ape 5.0: An environment for modern phylogenetics and evolutionary analyses in R. *Bioinformatics* **35**, 526–528. doi:10.1093/bioinformatics/bty633
- Paterson AM and Banks J** (2001) Analytical approaches to measuring cospeciation of host and parasites: Through a glass, darkly. *International Journal for Parasitology* **31**, 1012–1022. doi:10.1016/s0020-7519(01)00199-0
- Poulin R** (1995) Phylogeny, ecology, and the richness of parasite communities in vertebrates. *Ecological Monographs* **65**, 283–302. doi:10.2307/2937061
- Poulin R** (1996) How many parasite species are there: Are we close to answers? *International Journal for Parasitology* **26**, 1127–1129. doi:10.1016/S0020-7519(96)80014-2
- Poulin R** (1997) Species richness of parasite assemblages: Evolution and patterns. *Annual Review of Ecology, Evolution, and Systematics* **28**, 341–358. doi:10.1146/annurev.ecolsys.28.1.341
- Poulin R** (2004) Macroecological patterns of species richness in parasite assemblages. *Basic and Applied Ecology* **5**, 423–434. doi:10.1016/j.baae.2004.08.003
- Poulin R** (2010) Decay of similarity with host phylogenetic distance in parasite faunas. *Parasitology* **137**, 733–741. doi:10.1017/S0031182009991491
- Poulin R and Morand S** (2004) *Parasite Biodiversity*. Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution Books.
- Radovsky FJ** (1985) Evolution of mammalian mesostigmatid mites. In Kim KC (ed.), *Coevolution of Parasitic Arthropods and Mammals*. New York: Wiley, 441–504.
- R Core Team** (2024) *R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing*. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. Available at <https://www.R-project.org/>
- Revell LJ** (2012) phytools: An R package for phylogenetic comparative biology (and other things). *Methods in Ecology and Evolution* **3**, 217–223. doi:10.1111/j.2041-210X.2011.00169.x (accessed 15 December 2024).
- Sasal P, Morand S and Guégan J-F** (1997) Determinants of parasite species richness in Mediterranean marine fishes. *Marine Ecology Progress Series* **149**, 61–71. doi:10.3354/MEPS149061
- Soria CD, Pacifici M, Di Marco M, Stephen SM and Rondinini C** (2021) COMBINE: A coalesced mammal database of intrinsic and extrinsic traits. *Ecology* **102**, e03344. doi:10.1002/ecy.3344
- Spickett A, Junker K, Krasnov BR, Haukisalmi V and Matthee S** (2017) Helminth parasitism in two closely related South African rodents: Abundance, prevalence, species richness and impinging factors. *Parasitol Research* **116**, 1395–1409. doi:10.1007/s00436-017-5419-9
- Torres J, Miquel J, Casanova JC, Ribas A, Feliu C and Morand S** (2006) Endoparasite species richness of Iberian carnivores: Influences of host density and range distribution. *Biodiversity and Conservation* **15**, 4619–4632. doi:10.1007/s10531-005-5824-8
- Upham NS, Esselstyn JA and Jetz W** (2019) Inferring the mammal tree: Species-level sets of phylogenies for questions in ecology, evolution, and conservation. *PLoS Biology* **17**, e3000494. doi:10.1371/journal.pbio.3000494
- Uriarte M, Swenson NG, Chazdon RL, Comita LS, John Kress W, Erickson D, Forero-Montaña J, Zimmerman JK and Thompson J** (2010) Trait similarity, shared ancestry and the structure of neighbourhood interactions in a subtropical wet forest: Implications for community assembly. *Ecology Letters* **13**, 1503–1514. doi:10.1111/j.1461-0248.2010.01541.x
- Venables WN and Ripley BD** (2002) *Modern Applied Statistics with S*, 4th edn. New York: Springer.
- Vilela B and Villalobos F** (2015) letsR: A new R package for data handling and analysis in macroecology. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution* **6**, 1229–1234. doi:10.1111/2041-210X.12401
- Villalobos F and Arita HT** (2010) The diversity field of New World leaf-nosed bats (Phyllostomidae). *Global Ecology and Biogeography* **19**, 200–211. doi:10.1111/j.1466-8238.2009.00503.x
- Villalobos F, Rangel TF and Diniz-Filho JAF** (2013) Phylogenetic fields of species: Cross-species patterns of phylogenetic structure and geographical coexistence. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London B* **280**, 20122570. doi:10.1098/rspb.2012.2570
- Villalobos-Segura MDC, García-Prieto L and Rico-Chávez O** (2020) Effects of latitude, host body size, and host trophic guild on patterns of diversity of helminths associated with humans, wild and domestic mammals of Mexico. *International Journal for Parasitology: Parasites and Wildlife* **13**, 221–230. doi:10.1016/j.ijppaw.2020.10.010
- Vinarski MV, Korralo NP, Krasnov BR, Shenbrot GI and Poulin R** (2007) Decay of similarity of gamasid mite assemblages parasitic on Palaearctic small mammals: Geographic distance, host-species composition or environment. *Journal of Biogeography* **34**, 1691–1700. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2699.2007.01735.x
- Vitone ND, Altizer S and Nunn CL** (2004) Body size, diet and sociality influence the species richness of parasitic worms in anthropoid primates. *Evolutionary Ecology Research* **6**, 183–199.
- Webb CO, Ackerly DD, McPeck MA and Donoghue MJ** (2002) Phylogenies and community ecology. *Annual Review of Ecology, Evolution, and Systematics* **33**, 475–505. doi:10.1146/annurev.ecolsys.33.010802.150448
- Whitaker JO Jr and Morales-Malacara JB** (2005) Ectoparasites and other associates (Ectodytes) of mammals of Mexico. In Sánchez-Cordero V and Medellín R (eds), *Contribuciones Mastozoológicas en Homenaje a Bernardo Villa*. Mexico City, Mexico: Instituto de Biología, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, Comisión Nacional para el Uso y Conocimiento de la Biodiversidad, 535–665.
- Zhu Q, Hastriter MW, Whiting MF and Dittmar K** (2015) Fleas (Siphonaptera) are cretaceous, and evolved with Theria. *Molecular Phylogenetic and Evolution* **90**, 129–139. doi:10.1016/j.ympev.2015.04.027