

Incorporating host-parasite biotic factors in species distribution models: Modelling the distribution of the castor bean tick, *Ixodes ricinus*.

Sinead McDonough¹ and Paul Holloway^{1,2*}

¹Department of Geography, University College Cork, Western Road, Cork.

²Environmental Research Institute, University College Cork, Lee Road, Cork.

First received: 30 August 2019

Accepted for publication: 14 October 2020

Abstract: Understanding where ticks are found, and the drivers of their geographic distributions is imperative for successful epidemiological precautions. Predictive models of tick distributions are often projected using solely abiotic (e.g. climate) variables, despite the strong biotic interaction that host species undoubtedly have with parasitic species. We used species distribution modelling to project the distribution of *Ixodes ricinus* in Ireland and the United Kingdom using different combinations of abiotic, biotic, and abiotic-biotic variables. We found that models parameterised solely on abiotic variables generally reported lower accuracy and ecological realism than models that incorporated biotic factors alongside climate. We also investigated representation of host distribution in models, testing four different methods (habitat suitability of individual hosts, presence-absence of individual hosts, ensembled habitat suitability, and ensembled presence-absence). Biotic representations of ensembled host distributions alongside abiotic variables reported the highest accuracy, with the variable representing host diversity (e.g. number of host species) the most important variable when measured using a jackknife test. Moreover, our results suggested how host distributions are represented (i.e. presence-absence, habitat suitability) greatly impacted results, with differences reported among habitat specialists and generalists. Results suggest that it is now imperative for projections of parasitic species to include a representation of biotic factors with host species. This research has improved our understanding of the drivers of tick distributions in a national context, and the investigation of biotic representation should foster discussion among researchers working in species distribution modelling and the wider biogeography discipline.

Keywords: *biotic interactions; host species; parasitism; species distribution modelling; ticks*

* paul.holloway@ucc.ie (corresponding author)

Introduction

Ticks are one of the most important global vectors in the transmission of disease (Kelly *et al.* 2001), known to carry a wider variety of infectious agents compared to other arthropods (Soenshine, 1991). Within Europe *Ixodes ricinus* is the most common arthropod vector (Parola & Raoult, 2001), with the ability to transmit various pathogens, including *Borrelia burgdorferi* (Lyme disease – Pietzsch *et al.* 2005). Global incidence rates of Lyme disease vary, but most reported cases are found in Europe and North America, with research indicating increasing incidence rates (Mead, 2018). In Ireland, varied incidence and infection rates across both space and time have been reported (Gray *et al.*, 1996; McKeown and Garvey, 2009; Cullen, 2010; Lambert *et al.*, 2019), with the crude incidence rate of Lyme neuroborreliosis progressively increasing towards the south and west of the country (HSE, 2019). Reports in the UK have identified an increase from 693 cases in 2005 to 1,310 cases in 2016 (Lorenc *et al.*, 2017). Due to increasing incidence rates and the spatial variability in reports, understanding where ticks are found, and the drivers of their geographic distributions is imperative for successful epidemiological precautions.

In Ireland and the UK studies have predominantly focused on reporting the presence and density of tick species at a national scale using fieldwork and location maps (Martyn, 1988; Kirstein *et al.*, 1997; Kelly *et al.*, 2001; Dobson *et al.*, 2011a; Medlock and Leach, 2015; Zintl *et al.*, 2017). For example, both Kirstein *et al.* (1997) and Kelly *et al.* (2001) produced location maps indicating presence of tick species from field studies in Ireland, while in the UK, Martyn (1988) published the first atlas of tick distributions, with the tick surveillance scheme continued by Public Health England. Most recently, Zintl *et al.* (2017) reported 151 tick observations from 26 sites across Ireland. Such studies improve our understanding of the environmental drivers of tick abundance and densities, but are often restricted spatially to specific locations.

Species distribution models (SDMs) are one of the most important GIScience research areas in biogeography, and a powerful spatial ecological tool for studying the geographic distribution of plants, animals, and other taxa (Franklin 2009; Peterson *et al.* 2011). The modelling framework provides a methodology for researchers and practitioners to quantitatively assess the relationship between species distributions and environmental factors, having been widely used for various applications including predicting disease spread (Peterson *et al.*, 2004; Crawl *et al.*, 2008; Bhatt *et al.*, 2013). In Europe, tick SDMs have primarily been undertaken at a continental scale. For example, Alkishe *et al.* (2017) modelled the current and future (2050 and 2070) distribution of *I. ricinus* based on several climatic factors and identified that distributions are expected to increase in area under all future climate scenarios. Similarly, Williams *et al.* (2015) identified a shift to higher latitudes for eight European tick species for 2050 and 2098. Several other studies have undertaken distribution projections for ticks at regional (De Clercq *et al.*, 2015; Raghavan *et al.*, 2016; St John *et al.*, 2016), continental (Springer *et al.*, 2015; Rubel *et al.*, 2016; Hahn *et al.*, 2016; Sage *et al.*, 2017), and even global (Alkishe *et al.*, 2020)

scales. All studies identified the importance of climatic factors, with many outlining the potential risk associated with increased human exposure to such a prevalent disease vector.

Climatic factors are an important determinant of species distributions; however, they are not the sole driver. The 'BAM' framework (Figure 1), developed by Soberón and Peterson (2005), illustrates the individual and joint effects of the three most important factors in determining a species distribution. Biotic (**B**) factors represent interactions with other species (e.g. competition, parasitism), abiotic (**A**) factors represent the physiological tolerances of the species (e.g. temperature, precipitation), and movement (**M**) factors represent the ability of a species to access the habitats (e.g. dispersal, foraging). The importance of all three factors is well recognised, yet in the majority of the aforementioned studies projecting tick distributions, models were parameterised on only abiotic factors. The fact that ticks have a wide range of hosts, which often lack good-quality occurrence data, as well as uncertainty in how best to incorporate such data into model parameterisation, have been cited as rationale for focusing on climatic factors when projecting tick distributions (Alkishe *et al.*, 2020). Moreover, abiotic factors have often superseded biotic factors in SDMs due in part to the fact that abiotic factors often influence species at a broader spatial extent (Wisz *et al.*, 2013; Miller and Holloway, 2015). Despite this, distribution studies that have included biotic factors have observed increases in model accuracy (Araújo and Luoto, 2007; Heikkinen *et al.*, 2007; Kissling *et al.*, 2008; Wisz *et al.*, 2013; Raath *et al.*, 2018), meaning distribution models could be improved by explicitly incorporating biotic factors.




Figure 1. The BAM diagram, which depicts the interaction between biotic (**B**), abiotic (**A**), and movement (**M**) factors. Three areas are depicted: **G** the geographical space within which analyses are developed, G_o = the occupied distributional area, and G_i = the invadable or potential distribution or **BA**. Modified from Soberón (2007).

Studies have emerged that incorporate both abiotic and biotic factors when projecting tick distributions, often resulting in improved accuracy and ecological realism (Medlock *et al.*, 2013; Donaldson *et al.*, 2016; Estrada-Peña and de la Fuente, 2017). For example, in a study predicting *Ornithodoros turicata* distribution in the continental USA, Donaldson *et al.* (2016) overlaid the predicted tick distribution with the distributions of 58 host species, and identified areas of significant overlap that could identify principal hosts. Similarly, Estrada-Peña and de la Fuente (2017) incorporated probabilities of occurrence of host species in their tick distribution models, finding significant tick-host relationships among the complex communities of host species. The importance of incorporating biotic factors as covariates in any statistical models projecting species distributions is well established; however, it is perhaps more pertinent for parasite species that have such a strong dependence on hosts (Wisz *et al.*, 2013). Recent reviews (Wisz *et al.*, 2013; Dormann *et al.*, 2018; Blanchet *et al.*, 2020) have outlined several challenges associated with incorporating biotic factors within SDMs, one of which is the method through which the biotic factors are represented. Raath *et al.* (2018) recently compared four methods of incorporating biotic factors (host plant distribution) in SDMs projecting the distribution of the African silk moth in sub-Saharan Africa. They found that the method with which biotic factors were represented in the statistical model (e.g. presence-absence of individual hosts, habitat suitability of individual hosts, combined presence-absence of all hosts, and combined habitat suitability of all hosts) greatly affected the predictive ability of the models, yet there was inconsistency among representations, suggesting a need for further research.

With the incorporation of biotic factors (i.e. host distributions) as environmental covariates in statistical models shown to improve projections of tick distributions, coupled with the fact that several tick SDM studies still neglect host distribution altogether, there persists a need to investigate the methods of representing biotic factors within SDM, and how their incorporation impacts the current geographic predictions of ticks. In this study, we investigated the role of biotic (**B**) and abiotic (**A**) factors in determining the distribution of *I. ricinus* in Ireland and the UK focusing on two specific research questions: 1) How do different 'BAM' scenarios (e.g. **A**, **B**, **BA**) affect the accuracy and ecological realism of *I. ricinus* projections in Ireland and the UK? and 2) How do different representations of host species (e.g. **B**) affect the accuracy and ecological realism of the projections?

Methodology

Data Collection

We acquired 172 primary occurrence records for *I. ricinus* across Ireland and the UK since 2000 from the Global Biodiversity Information Facility (GBIF, 2020). Following GBIF data cleaning recommendations (Chapman, 2005), incomplete points and duplicates were removed, resulting in 132 occurrence records for use in the statistical models. Data for 16 primary host species were also obtained from GBIF (2019). Climate data was obtained from WorldClim (Fink and Hijmans *et al.*, 2017) and resampled using cubic convolution

to 1000m. Corine land cover (EEA, 2018) data was used to calculate the percentage of arable, forest, grass, pasture, urban, and water cover within a corresponding 1000m resolution.

Species Distribution Modelling

SDMs generate a prediction of habitat suitability in both environmental and geographic space. The most common response variables used are data representing species presence-absence or presence-only, which are coupled with a set of corresponding and georeferenced environmental variables. Species-environment relationships are then estimated using a range of statistical approaches. These species-environment relationships can be extrapolated in space and time generating a habitat suitability map that identifies the probability that the environmental conditions at that location are favourable for the study species. To create a categorical representation of habitat suitability, a threshold that delineates between presence-absence can be selected, with habitat suitability values above and below this predicted as present and absent, respectively. The choice of response data, environmental data, and statistical models are all related to hypotheses derived from the underlying niche concept. As outlined above, the choice of environmental variables can have substantial implications on model output. Here, we investigated three different ‘BAM’ scenarios. Each scenario incorporates different methodologies to derive environmental variables based on the ‘BAM’ diagram (Figure 1). Figure 2 provides a methodological workflow of the SDM steps used in this study.

Maximum entropy (MaxEnt) was chosen as the statistical method to model the species-environment relationships for all scenarios (Phillips *et al.*, 2006). MaxEnt selects suitable environmental variables by measuring how well they delineate between the recorded presence and pseudo-absence observations. The method chooses the split in environmental variables (e.g. temperature) that records the purest split between values in the binary response variable (e.g. presence and pseudo-absence). This method has been found to outperform other presence-only methods in an extensive comparison study (Elith and Graham, 2009). Moreover, MaxEnt is robust to variable collinearity in model training and the removal of highly correlated variables prior to model parameterisation has little impact due to the fact the algorithm removes redundant variables (Feng *et al.*, 2019), meaning MaxEnt is a robust method to evaluate different combinations of multiple environmental variables. However, the potential for spurious results and overfitting still exists and results need to be underpinned with a mechanistic understanding related to their contribution in determining tick distributions (Holloway *et al.*, 2018). To do this, we implemented the jackknife test to measure variable importance and explore the impact of variable representation on results. In the final MaxEnt model, the maximum number of iterations was set to 5,000 to allow model convergence, the number of pseudo-absences was set at 10,000 (following Barbet-Massin *et al.*, 2012), and the model incorporated only linear and quadratic features to avoid over-fitting.

To account for unequal survey coverage in the species data, each SDM was fit with a bias grid to control for any violation in the assumption of independence in the response

data that would increase the likelihood of type I errors (Fourcarde *et al.*, 2014). A bias grid is the equivalent of a sampling probability surface, where the cell values reflect sampling effort and provides a weight to the pseudo-absence data used in modelling. Following Elith *et al.* (2010), a Gaussian kernel density map of the occurrence locations within 10km was derived and divided by the weighted number of terrestrial cells in the neighbourhood in order to avoid the edge effects at the coastline. This was then rescaled so that values varied between 1 and 20 in order to control for the impact of extreme variation. Bias grids are presented in Supplementary Information 1 to provide an overview of the spatial bias in occurrence records.




Figure 2. Conceptual workflow of the methodological steps

Scenario A

Abiotic factors represent the physiological tolerances of species (i.e. temperature, precipitation) meaning climate variables best represent these factors. WorldClim v2.1 has interpolations of observed data from ~1970-2000, with 19 bioclimatic variables derived from the monthly temperature and rainfall values (Fick and Hijmans, 2017). The 15 abiotic variables used by Alkishe *et al.* (2017) were used within this study to allow for a direct comparison with recent European continental predictions, with variables 8-9 and 18-19 removed due to spatial artefacts. See Table 1 for variable code and description.

Table 2. Description of the abiotic representations used within parameterised models

Code	Variable
Bio1	Annual mean temperature
Bio2	Mean diurnal range
Bio3	Isothermality
Bio4	Temperature seasonality
Bio5	Maximum temperature of warmest month
Bio6	Minimum temperature of coldest month
Bio7	Temperature annual range
Bio8	Mean temperature of wettest quarter
Bio9	Mean temperature of driest quarter
Bio10	Mean temperature of warmest quarter
Bio11	Mean temperature of coldest quarter
Bio12	Annual precipitation
Bio13	Precipitation of wettest month
Bio14	Precipitation of driest month
Bio15	Precipitation seasonality
Bio16	Precipitation of wettest quarter
Bio17	Precipitation of driest quarter
Bio18	Precipitation of warmest quarter
Bio19	Precipitation of coldest quarter

Scenario B

Biotic factors represent interactions with other species (i.e. parasitism, competition). As ticks are dependent on host species, the biotic factors in this study consisted of the distributions of sixteen mammalian hosts. Of the 27 host species listed by Kelly *et al.* (2001), nine were excluded due to their domestication which would prevent reliable habitat suitability predictions. Humans were excluded as a host species, due to the obvious clustering in urban areas, and two other species (goat, mink) were excluded due to inadequate observations in GBIF (2019). The final list of mammalian species consisted of: hedgehog, pygmy shrew, rabbit, grey squirrel, red squirrel, bank vole, wood mouse, brown rat, fox, pine marten, stoat, badger, fallow deer, red deer, sika deer, and hare. The distribution of these sixteen species was predicted using the observed locations from GBIF (2019) since 2000, the fifteen abiotic variables (Fink and Hijmans, 2017), the land cover data (EEA 2018), and projected using MaxEnt with the same settings and bias grids outlined above.

Recent research has indicated different predictive accuracies in using presence-absence of host species compared to habitat suitability (Raath *et al.*, 2018). Therefore, four methods of incorporating biotic factors were investigated (Table 2). Both habitat suitability (hs.ind) and presence-absence (pa.ind) of all sixteen species were incorporated as individual explanatory variables, as well as an ensemble model (i.e. average or

summation of multiple projections) of both habitat suitability (hs.ens) and presence-absence (pa.ens). Thresholds for generating binary presence-absence models from habitat suitability were calculated using maximum sensitivity plus specificity.

Table 2. Description of the biotic representations used within parameterised models

Biotic Representation	Explanation
hs.ind	Individual maps of habitat suitability for all 16 host species
pa.ind	Individual maps of presence-absence for all 16 host species
hs.ens	Ensemble map of habitat suitability projections. The mean habitat suitability of all 16 host species
pa.ens	Ensemble map of presence-absence projections. Sum of all presence-absence maps for the 16 host species. Equivalent of projected host diversity

Scenario BA

This scenario projects the potential distribution in the BAM framework. Both abiotic (i.e. the fifteen bioclimatic variables) and biotic (i.e. distributions of the sixteen host species) variables were used as the input variables in the statistical model. Again, all four methods of incorporating biotic factors were included in different iterations of the statistical model.

Model Evaluation

Model evaluation in SDM focuses on quantifying prediction accuracy to ascertain model validity. To test our models, we withheld 20% of the 132 tick occurrence records from training the statistical model for testing as is common practice in SDM research when independent test data are lacking (Franklin, 2009). This testing dataset was then used to evaluate the performance of our models. We used three accuracy metrics that are best suited for presence-only data; lowest possible threshold (LPT), minimum predicted area (MPA) and the Boyce Index (BI). LPT is the value that results in zero omission errors, with higher values indicating a better model. MPA represents the area encompassing a predefined proportion of observed species occurrences (in this case 90 percent), with a lower value (measured in geographic area) representing a more parsimonious model (Engler *et al.*, 2004). The BI implements a moving window analysis across the predicted values, using Spearman rank correlation coefficient to measure the monotonic increase in the predicted-to-expected frequency ratio with increasing habitat suitability (Boyce *et al.*, 2002). This method was undertaken using the *ecospat* package (Broenniman *et al.*, 2014) in R 3.6.1 (R Development Core Team, 2008) using default settings, with values ranging from -1 to 1, with higher values representing more parsimonious models, and 0 indicating predictions indifferent from a random model.

Results

The projected tick distributions and subsequent model accuracies varied substantially across the different implementations of **A**, **B**, and **BA** (Figure 3, Table 3). The model parameterised only on **A** (Figure 3a) reported high probability (>0.5) for the south and west of Ireland, as well as Wales, the south, southwest and northwest of England, and eastern Scotland, with low probability (<0.5) of occurrence for the remainder of Ireland and eastern England. Models parameterised including representations of host species (**B**, **BA**) consistently projected the southwest of the UK as suitable, with much wider spatial variation elsewhere. When the percentage contribution and permutation importance of the host species was explored in models that incorporated biotic factors (Table 4), the distribution of sika deer and bank voles was continually high across all models (10-40%), as well as contributing to large gains in the final models (Supplementary Information 2), suggesting the distribution of these host species may be an important driver in determining tick distributions and supporting the high probability within the southwest regions of the study area. For **B** (pa.ens) and **B** (hs.ens) where only the ensembled representation of biotic factors were used in model parameterisation, clear overfitting of the data occurred, with large swaths of the study area projected as suitable (Figure 3d-e). The **BA** models appear to have much more localised areas of high suitability (>0.5) across all counties in Ireland and the UK, which most likely reflects a more ecologically realistic distribution.

Table 3. The three accuracy metrics used to evaluate model performance; lowest possible threshold (LPT), minimum predicted area (MPA) and the Boyce Index (BI). Three 'BAM' scenarios were explored; biotic (B), abiotic (A) and biotic-abiotic (BA) scenarios, and four representations of biotic factors. The four representations are individual habitat suitability maps of all hosts (hs.ind), individual presence-absence maps of all hosts (pa.ind), ensemble map of mean habitat suitability for all hosts (hs.ens), and ensemble map representing summation of all binary presence-absence maps (pa.ens).

	LPT	MPA	BI
A	0.250	214066	0.896
B (hs.ind)	0.238	147349	0.769
B (pa.ind)	0.252	145331	0.727
B (hs.ens)	0.540	241599	0.842
B (pa.ens)	0.327	220647	0.879
BA (hs.ind)	0.278	112787	0.664
BA (pa.ind)	0.247	171757	0.873
BA (hs.ens)	0.151	92740	0.925
BA (pa.ens)	0.262	110689	0.934




Figure 3. Distribution maps for *Ixodes ricinus* in Ireland and the UK. Models parameterized on a) abiotic variables, b) biotic (hs.ind), c) biotic (pa.ind), d) biotic (hs.ens), e) biotic (pa.ens), f) biotic-abiotic (hs.ind), g) biotic-abiotic (pa.ind), h) biotic-abiotic (hs.ens), and i) biotic-abiotic (pa.ens).

Certain species were reported as contributing heavily to the projections when measured using one representation, but not the other (Table 4, Supplementary Information 2). For example, rabbit and hare distributions had higher gains for models when measured using habitat suitability compared to presence-absence (Supplementary Information 2), and contributed more to final models when represented as habitat suitability, with rabbits contributing 0% to the final models when represented as presence-absence (Table 4). Alternatively, red deer distributions contributed more when measured using presence-absence compared to habitat suitability (Table 4).

There was discrepancy in model validity when measured using the different accuracy metrics, with LPT, MPA, and BI indicating the most accurate models as **B** (hs.ens), **BA** (hs.

ens), and **BA** (pa.ens) respectively (Table 3). LPT rewards correct prediction of presences, often resulting in a high commission error (i.e. high false positive rate), which aligns with the observed overfitting for models **B** (pa.ens) and **B** (hs.ens) (Figure 3d-e). MPA and BI both attempt to control omission errors (i.e. false negatives), with the BI considered the more robust metric due to its ability to measure the monotonic increase in the predicted-to-expected frequency ratio with increasing habitat suitability (Hirzel *et al.*, 2006). Models **BA** (hs.ens) and **BA** (pa.ens) both reported BI values above 0.9 and low MPA values suggesting a combination of abiotic variables with only one variable representing host diversity reports the most valid projection of tick distributions. Jackknife testing was used to evaluate variable importance to the final models, with the ensemble representations of host species reporting the highest gain in model performance when used in isolation for the **BA** (pa.ens) parameterisations and the largest decrease in gain in model performance when removed from both the **BA** (pa.ens) and **BA** (hs.ens) parameterisations (Figure 4).




Figure 4. Regularised training gain from the jackknife test of variable importance. The environmental variable with the highest gain has the most useful information when models are parameterised solely on that variable. The environmental variable with the largest decrease in gain when omitted from model parameterisation has the most information that is not present in the other variables.

Table 4: Percent Contribution (PC) and Permutation Importance (PI) of the different environmental variables used in the final models. The four representations are individual habitat suitability maps of all hosts (hs.ind), individual presence-absence maps of all hosts (pa.ind), ensemble map of average habitat suitability for all hosts (hs.ens), and ensemble map representing summation of all binary presence-absence maps (pa.ens). Biotic representations using ensembles B (hs.ens) and B (pa.ens) are not included in table as they only contain one variable, which contributes 100% to the final models. See Table 1 for a description of the abiotic (A) codes.

	Abiotic (A)		Biotic (hs.ind)		Biotic (pa.ind)		Biotic Abiotic (hs.ind)		Biotic Abiotic (pa.ind)		Biotic Abiotic (hs.ens)		Biotic Abiotic (pa.ens)	
	PC	PI	PC	PI	PC	PI	PC	PI	PC	PI	PC	PI	PC	PI
A (bio1)	27.3	19.4					0.2	0.0	0.5	11.3	20.6	18.4	11.1	17.5
A (bio2)	1.5	9.5					2.8	1.1	0.7	9.1	1.2	13.6	0.7	10.0
A (bio3)	9.9	0.4					5.3	4.6	15.8	0.0	15.2	0.0	21.8	0.3
A (bio4)	3.7	7.9					0.0	0.0	1.3	10.3	6.6	5.1	6.5	7.8
A (bio5)	1.0	10.5					0.0	0.0	0.3	5.2	3.3	1.4	2.1	7.5
A (bio6)	4.2	8.1					0.2	2.2	0.4	5.8	7.3	12.8	1.2	9.9
A (bio7)	0.0	0.0					0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
A (bio10)	0.4	0.0					0.9	0.0	2.0	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
A (bio11)	0.0	0.0					0.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
A (bio12)	0.2	2.6					3.1	0.0	0.4	3.9	0.7	7.6	0.5	3.6
A (bio13)	0.3	0.0					0.6	6.1	0.4	2.4	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.0
A (bio14)	19.2	22.8					3.5	17.2	6.7	21.9	14.5	18.7	11.6	18.9
A (bio15)	14.8	1.3					0.4	1.8	1.3	0.4	7.6	0.0	5.1	0.0
A (bio16)	0.0	0.0					0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
A (bio17)	17.7	17.6					1.0	16.1	4.8	18.5	8.5	14.8	9.2	17.2
B (ensemble)											13.8	7.5	30.2	7.4
B (fox)			0.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.9	0.8	0.0	0.0				
B (sika deer)			37.0	17.9	21.4	16.5	32.6	0.5	13.5	1.0				
B (red deer)			2.7	8.8	11.8	11.4	0.9	6.8	7.6	1.0				
B (fallow deer)			1.1	0.7	2.2	0.0	1.6	0.0	1.3	0.0				
B (hare)			7.1	15.4	4.4	5.5	1.9	2.3	1.9	0.0				
B (wood mouse)			0.0	0.0	5.9	5.9	0.3	0.0	4.4	0.8				
B (pygmy shrew)			2.0	4.2	1.2	2.3	0.1	0.7	0.2	0.0				
B (grey squirrel)			1.6	8.9	1.6	4.1	3.5	8.8	3.6	1.6				
B (red squirrel)			3.9	18.1	7.3	8.8	1.8	13.8	5.8	3.8				
B (bank vole)			15.0	16.2	33.3	27.6	12.8	14.5	21.2	1.2				
B (pine marten)			0.1	1.8	7.1	9.8	0.9	0.0	2.9	0.0				
B (rat)			3.0	6.0	1.3	1.8	2.5	0.0	0.1	0.0				
B (rabbit)			10.0	0.2	0.0	0.0	6.2	0.0	0.0	0.0				
B (stoat)			0.9	1.0	2.5	6.4	0.5	2.5	2.8	1.5				
B (badger)			0.1	0.7	0.0	0.0	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.0				
B (hedgehog)			15.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	13.4	0.0	0.0	0.0				

Discussion

The aim of this study was to investigate the role of abiotic and biotic factors in determining tick distributions in Ireland and the UK, comparing methods of incorporating biotic variables into SDMs. From examining the models (Figure 3), it is evident that there are certain regions that are more suitable for *I. ricinus* when the roles of **B**, **A**, and **BA** are compared. The most suitable areas in Ireland appear to be in the south, west, southeast, and north, while in the UK the most suitable areas are the south-west region of England, Wales, and western Scotland, although we did identify high probabilities for suitable habitat in every county of Ireland and the UK (Figure 3). However, these areas do vary depending on the choice of environmental variables incorporated in the model. Previous continental scale projections of *I. ricinus* have identified the importance of abiotic variables in determining both current and future distributions (e.g. Alkishe *et al.*, 2017), with our result identifying the importance of mean annual temperature and precipitation of the driest month as important variables (Figure 4, Table 4, Supplementary Information 2); however, the results of this study also highlight the need to incorporate factors related to the distribution of host species.

The relatively lower accuracy of *I. ricinus* projections for models parameterised solely on abiotic (**A**) factors compared to both biotic and abiotic (**BA**) factors (Table 3) suggests that abiotic factors alone do not adequately capture the drivers of tick distributions. Due to the strong dependence of ticks on host species, we expected that tick distributions would exhibit positive relationships with host distributions. The presence of large mammals (e.g. sika deer, red deer) were often important in the final entropy models, while smaller mammals (e.g. bank voles) were also shown to be important to the relative percentage contribution and regularised training gain in the final models (Table 4, Supplementary Information 2). Improvements in model accuracy (Table 3) and ecological realism (Figure 3) corroborate other studies that have included explicit variables measuring biotic factors (e.g. Kissling *et al.*, 2008; Donaldson *et al.*, 2016), and our results suggest that to accurately and realistically ascertain the distribution of parasitic species, variables that account for such relationships must be included.

The models parameterised on the different representations of **B** varied greatly, highlighting the need for continued research into how such conceptualisations can affect results. We found that **BA** (pa.ens) was the most accurate when the BI was used as the accuracy metric (Table 3), corroborating the findings of Raath *et al.* (2018) who also found that a combined presence-absence map was the most accurate representation of **B** in their study of African silk moths. This variable represents the total number of projected host species in that grid (i.e. equivalent of host species richness). Subsequently, this model may outperform others due to its ability to incorporate information on all host species, rather than assuming dependence on only one or a handful of species. The areas predicted as highly suitable by this model (Figure 3e) correspond with areas that were projected to support 12-16 host species. Subsequently, a variable representing the host diversity in the model potentially captures the parasite-host relationships more realistically than individual habitat suitability maps of all host species or an average

habitat suitability of all hosts. Moreover, when each variable was tested for its importance to the final model through the jackknife test, the ensemble representations of host species reported the highest gain in model performance when used in isolation for **BA** (pa.ens) parameterisations, and the largest decrease in gain in model performance when removed from both the **BA** (pa.ens) and **BA** (hs.ens) parameterisations (Figure 4). Tick interactions with mammals such as sika deer (Kimura *et al.*, 1995; Gray *et al.*, 1999; Bratickov *et al.*, 2019), red deer (Gray *et al.*, 1999; Zintl *et al.*, 2011; Razanske *et al.*, 2019), foxes (Lappin, 2016; D'Amico *et al.*, 2017; Sándor *et al.*, 2017) and small rodents (Cayol *et al.*, 2017; Cull *et al.*, 2018) are well established, meaning the dependence of *I. ricinus* on multiple host species is best represented through a measure of diversity and distribution rather than as a series of individual host distributions.

Unsurprisingly many host distributions were continuously important in final models, both through the combined representation of host diversity, but also when included as individual species (Table 4, Supplementary Information 2). Sika deer and bank voles were consistently reported as important variables in final models, with these species exhibiting a strong positive relationship with forest cover (results not shown). The importance of vegetation cover for tick distributions and abundance is well established (Dobson *et al.*, 2011a, 2011b), meaning there is the potential that our models confounded the importance of host distribution with land cover. To investigate this, we parameterised a model using the abiotic variables and land cover (Supplementary Information 3). This model performed poorly (LPT 0.299, MPA 150787, BI 0.727) compared to models parameterised with host distributions, highlighting the importance of considering the full ecological niche requirements of host species when projecting tick distributions.

Moreover, the relative contribution and subsequent regularised training gain of biotic variables altered for individual species depending on whether the variable was represented as continuous habitat suitability or categorical presence-absence (Table 4, Supplementary Information 2). The preference for binary representations appeared to occur for habitat specialist species (e.g. red deer, wood mouse, bank vole, stoat), suggesting that delineating the most suitable habitat from lesser habitat into presence-absence improves projections of parasite-host relationships. A continuous representation favoured more habitat generalists (e.g. grey squirrel, rat, rabbit), in part due to their ubiquitous distributions, meaning binary representations predicted them as present throughout the study area. Therefore, for generalist species a continuous variable that captures nuances in the habitat suitability improves models when compared to a thresholded presence-absence map, although generalist species continually reported low contributions and gains to final models (Table 4, Supplementary Information 2). This should have important considerations for future SDM research when study species may only have one or two primary biotic interactions determining their potential distributions.

Our results highlight the substantial impact of user decisions in how biotic factors are represented (Tables 3-4, Figures 3-4), and subsequently we have refrained from making grandiose statements considering our projections to be the definitive distribution of *I. ricinus* in Ireland and the UK. Research using such approaches for epidemiologically

important vector species must be aware of such uncertainties in model parameterisations and strive to incorporate or quantify these in projections (see Alkishe *et al.*, 2020 for a comprehensive assessment of model uncertainty projecting global tick distributions). Similarly, while spatial bias in response data was controlled for by using a bias grid (Supplementary Information 1), the tick data (GBIF 2020) does vary spatially with a wider coverage of the UK (particularly England and Scotland) and a lower number of observations in Ireland and Wales, with a higher reporting of occurrence in coastal regions (i.e. four observations on the Aran Islands alone). Future research collecting verified tick locations that are made available through open data repositories is needed to improve model calibration and tick predictions, and supports recent calls for more comprehensive surveys, particularly in Ireland (Zintl *et al.*, 2017). Despite these caveats, we do report high accuracy values (Table 3), allowing confidence in the discussion of the important environmental drivers of *I. ricinus* distributions.

The importance of considering environmental variables, particularly in the context of the 'BAM' framework (Figure 1) is therefore imperative for distribution studies; however, we did not incorporate movement factors (**M**) in our models. **M** refers to the area that has been or will be accessible to a species within a certain timeframe. The majority of SDM research only incorporates movement when investigating response to climate change (Franklin, 2010; Holloway *et al.*, 2016; Holloway and Miller, 2017). Recent research on tick distributions incorporating movement has identified the role of temporal variation in mammal movements resulting from land cover, and that such movements can have implications for tick distributions (Martin *et al.*, 2018). Similarly, Halsey and Miller (2018) developed a spatial agent-based model to explore host-tick interactions, highlighting the possibility to combine such approaches and better inform on host-tick movements and interactions. Such approaches combining SDM and agent-based models are beginning to emerge that could create finer scale distribution models that can account for all three 'BAM' factors (e.g. Holloway 2018), meaning future research should continue to explore the inter-linked relationships between biotic, abiotic, and movement variables.

Finally, there persists a need to explore habitat suitability of *I. ricinus* in conjunction with other measures of biodiversity and epidemiology. It is important to note that ground feeding species of birds (e.g. blackbirds, redwings) have been found to be important hosts for *Ixodes* ticks, with some rural populations reportedly having infestation rates as high as 74% (Gregoire *et al.*, 2002; Singh and Girshick, 2003). We opted only to investigate the role of mammalian host species; however, future research should look to incorporate information on avian distributions when projecting the geographic ranges of ticks. Similarly, we should also note that high habitat suitability does not necessarily indicate presence of breeding populations of ticks or Lyme disease. For example, Talleklint and Jaenson (1996) found a significant relationship between tick density and infection rates (of Lyme disease) at lower tick densities, while Gray *et al.* (1999) found that tick infection rates were inversely related to tick abundance. Dobson *et al.* (2011a) also found spatial variability in the abundance of ticks across recreational areas in the UK, recording uniform presence across vegetation types, but higher densities in plots which contained

trees. Healy and Bourke (2004) note that clusters of ticks and larvae should be used to identify breeding populations, which contradicts the predominant method in SDM of using binary representation of presence-absence. New methods, such as Poisson point process models, are emerging as suitable tools to predict the distribution and abundance of species from presence-only data (Warton and Shepherd, 2010; Renner and Warton, 2013; Schank *et al.*, 2017), and given the uncertain relationships identified, future studies should focus on developing predictions of both the distribution and density of ticks to inform epidemiological research.

Conclusion

Understanding the drivers of tick distributions is imperative for successful epidemiological precautions. Previous research has tended to focus only on the role of abiotic variables in determining tick distributions, and while research is beginning to emerge that highlights the importance of biotic variables (e.g. host distributions), there persists a need for the combined influence of **A** and **B** to be investigated together, as well as exploration into how best to represent biotic factors within SDM. Large differences in accuracy (Table 3) and area (Figures 3) were identified depending on the combination of ‘BAM’ variables used during model parameterisation. Representations of **B** varied substantially with results suggesting that a variable of host diversity captures the parasite-host relationships most accurately when coupled with abiotic factors (**BA**). The representation of host distribution also appeared to differ for habitat specialists and generalists (Table 4, Supplementary Information 2), suggesting use of a binary presence-absence conceptualisation and a continuous habitat suitability conceptualisation for specialist and generalist host species, respectively. There is now a minimum requirement for any research into tick distributions to explicitly incorporate biotic factors, as excluding the host-parasite relationship masks the true distribution of species and does not capture an ecological realistic distribution of a species’ habitat suitability.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank Ronan Foley and anonymous reviewers for their comments and suggestions.

References

- Alkishe, A., Townsend Peterson, A., and Samy, A., 2017. Climate change influences on the potential geographic distribution of the disease vector tick *Ixodes ricinus*. *PLoS ONE*, 12 (12), <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0189092>.
- Alkishe, A., Cobos, M.E., Townsend Peterson, A., and Samy, A.M., 2020. Recognising sources of uncertainty in disease vector ecological niche models: An example with the tick *Rhipicephalus sanguineus sensu lato*. *Perspectives in Ecology and Conservation*, xx.
- Araújo, M.B. and Luoto, M., 2007. The importance of biotic interactions for modelling species distributions under climate change. *Global Ecology and Biogeography*, 16(6), 743-53, <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1466-8238.2007.00359.x>.
- Barbet-Massin, M., F. Jiguet., C.H. Albert., and Thuiller, W., 2012. Selecting pseudo-absences for species distribution models: how, where and how many? *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*, 3(2): 327-38, <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2041-210X.2011.00172.x>.
- Bhatt, S., Gething, P.W., Brady, O.J., Messina, J.P., Farlow, A.W., Moyes, C.L., Drake, J.M., Brownstein, J.S., Hoen, A.G., Sankoh, O. and Myers, M.F., 2013. The global distribution and burden of dengue. *Nature*, 496(7446), 504, <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature12060>.
- Blanchet, F.G., Cazelles, K., Gravel, D., 2020. Co-occurrence is not evidence of ecological interactions. *Ecology Letters*, 23, 1050-63, <https://doi.org/10.1111/ele.13525>.
- Boyce, M.S., P.R. Vernier., S.E. Nielsen., and Schmiegelow, F.K., 2002. Evaluating resource selection functions. *Ecological modelling*, 157(2), 281-300, [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0304-3800\(02\)00200-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0304-3800(02)00200-4).
- Bratcikov, M., Paulauskas, A., Rosef, O., Ražanskė, I., Gričiuvienė, L. and Radzijeuskaja, J., 2019. Prevalence and co-infection with tick-borne Anaplasma phagocytophilum and Babesia spp. in red deer (Cervus elaphus) and roe deer (Capreolus capreolus) in Southern Norway. *International journal for parasitology: parasites and wildlife*, 8, 127-34, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijppaw.2019.01.003>.
- Broenniman, O., Petitpierre, B., Randin, C. and 19 others, 2014. *ecospat: Spatial ecology miscellaneous methods*. R package version 1.0.
- Cayol, C., Koskela, E., Mappes, T., Siukkola, A. and Kallio, E.R., 2017. Temporal dynamics of the tick *Ixodes ricinus* in northern Europe: epidemiological implications. *Parasites & vectors*, 10(1), 166, <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13071-017-2112-x>.
- Chapman A.D., 2005. *Principles and Methods of Data Cleaning – Primary Species and Species-Occurrence Data*. version 1.0. Report for the Global Biodiversity Information Facility, Copenhagen. Available online at http://www.gbif.org/orc/?doc_id=1262.
- Crowl, T.A., Crist, T.O., Parmenter, R.R., Belovsky, G. and Lugo, A.E., 2008. The spread of invasive species and infectious disease as drivers of ecosystem change. *Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment*, 6(5), 238-46, <https://doi.org/10.1890/070151>.
- Cull, B., Pietzsch, M.E., Hansford, K.M., Gillingham, E.L. and Medlock, J.M., 2018. Surveillance of British ticks: An overview of species records, host associations, and new records of *Ixodes ricinus* distribution. *Ticks and tick-borne diseases*, 9(3), 605-14, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ttbdis.2018.01.011>.
- Cullen, E., 2010. Lyme disease and climate change. *Irish Medical Journal*. 103:1, 1-2.
- D'Amico, G., Juránková, J., Tăbăran, F.A., Frgelecová, L., Forejtek, P., Matei, I.A., Ionică, A.M., Hodžić, A., Modrý, D. and Mihalca, A.D., 2017. Occurrence of ticks in the subcutaneous tissue of red foxes, *Vulpes vulpes* in Czech Republic and Romania. *Ticks and tick-borne diseases*, 8(2), 309-12, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ttbdis.2016.12.004>.
- De Clercq, E.M., Leta, S., Estrada-Peña, A., Madder, M., Adehan, S. and Vanwambeke, S.O., 2015. Species distribution modelling for *Rhipicephalus microplus* (Acari: Ixodidae) in Benin, West Africa: Comparing datasets and modelling algorithms. *Preventive veterinary medicine*, 118(1), 8-21, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.prevetmed.2014.10.015>.
- Dobson., A.D.M., Taylor, J.L., and Randolph, S.E., 2011a. Ticks (*Ixodes ricinus*) abundance and seasonality at recreational sites in the UK: Hazards in relation to fine-scale habitat types revealed by complimentary sampling methods. *Ticks and Tick-borne Diseases*, 2, 67-74, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ttbdis.2011.03.002>.

- Dobson, A.D.M., Finnie, T.J.R., and Randolph, S.E., 2011b. A modified matrix model to describe the seasonal population ecology of the European tick *Ixodes ricinus*. *Journal of Applied Ecology*, 48, 1017-28, <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2664.2011.02003.x>.
- Donaldson, T.G., de Leon, A.A.P., Li, A.I., Castro-Arellano, I., Wozniak, E., Boyle, W.K., Hargrove, R., Wilder, H.K., Kim, H.J., Teel, P.D. and Lopez, J.E., 2016. Assessment of the geographic distribution of *Ornithodoros turicata* (Argasidae): climate variation and host diversity. *PLoS neglected tropical diseases*, 10(2), e0004383, <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pntd.0004383>.
- Dormann, C.F., Bobrowski, M., Dehling, D.M., Harris, D.J., Hartig, F., Lischke, H., Moretti, M.D., Pagel, J., Pinkert, S., Schleuning, M. and Schmidt, S.I., 2018. Biotic interactions in species distribution modelling: 10 questions to guide interpretation and avoid false conclusions. *Global ecology and biogeography*, 27(9), 1004-16, <https://doi.org/10.1111/geb.12759>.
- EEA 2018. Corine Land Cover (CLC) 2018, Version 20b2. Release Date: 21-12-2018. European Environment Agency. <https://land.copernicus.eu/pan-european/corine-land-cover/clc2018>.
- Elith, J., and Graham, C.H., 2009. Do they? How do they? WHY do they differ? On finding reasons for differing performances of species distribution models. *Ecography*, 32(1), 66-77, <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-0587.2008.05505.x>.
- Elith, J., Kearney, M., and Phillips, S., 2010. The art of modelling range-shifting species. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*, 1, 330-442, <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2041-210X.2010.00036.x>.
- Engler, R., Guisan, A. and Rechsteiner, L., 2004. An improved approach for predicting the distribution of rare and endangered species from occurrence and pseudo-absence data. *Journal of Applied Ecology*, 41, 263-74, <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0021-8901.2004.00881.x>.
- Estrada-Peña, A. and de la Fuente, J., 2017. Host distribution does not limit the range of the tick *Ixodes ricinus* but impacts the circulation of transmitted pathogens. *Frontiers in Cellular and Infection Microbiology*, 7, 405, <https://doi.org/10.3389/fcimb.2017.00405>.
- Feng, X., Park, D.S., Liang, Y., Pandey, R. and Papes, M., 2019. Collinearity in ecological niche modeling: Confusions and challenges. *Ecology and evolution*, 9, 10365-76, <https://doi.org/10.1002/ece3.5555>.
- Fourcade, Y., J.O. Engler., D. Rödder., and Secondi, J., 2014. Mapping Species Distributions with MAXENT Using a Geographically Biased Sample of Presence Data: A Performance Assessment of Methods for Correcting Sampling Bias. *PLoS One*, 9(5): e97122, <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0097122>.
- Franklin, J., 2009. *Mapping Species Distributions: Spatial Inference Prediction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Franklin, J., 2010. Moving beyond static species distribution models in support of conservation biogeography. *Diversity and Distributions*, 16 (3), 321-30, <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1472-4642.2010.00641.x>.
- GBIF, 2019. *GBIF Occurrence Download*, <https://doi.org/10.15468/dl.wxxwh9>.
- GBIF, 2020. *GBIF Occurrence Download*, <https://doi.org/10.15468/dl.zkqf26>.
- Gray, J.S., Cutler, S., Robertson, J. and O'Connell, S., 1996. Lyme disease in the Republic of Ireland. WHO Workshop on Lyme Borreliosis diagnosis and surveillance: WHO/CDS/VPH/95.141, 20-22 June 1995. Warsaw: WHO, 6.
- Gray, J.S., Kirstein, F., Robertson, J.N., Stein, J. and Kahl, O., 1999. *Borrelia burgdorferi sensu lato* in *Ixodes ricinus* ticks and rodents in a recreational park in south-western Ireland. *Experimental and Applied Acarology*, 23(9), 717-29, <https://doi.org/10.1023/a:1006233700194>.
- Gregoire, A., Faivre, B., Heeb, P. and Cezilly, F., 2002. A comparison of infestation patterns by *Ixodes* ticks in urban and rural populations of the Common Blackbird *Turdus merula*. *Ibis*, 144(4), 640-45, <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1474-919X.2002.00102.x>.
- Hahn, M.B., Jarnevich, C.S., Monaghan, A.J. and Eisen, R.J., 2016. Modeling the geographic distribution of *Ixodes scapularis* and *Ixodes pacificus* (Acari: Ixodidae) in the contiguous United States. *Journal of medical entomology*, 53(5), 1176-91, <https://doi.org/10.1093/jme/tjw076>.
- Halsey, S.J. and Miller, J.R., 2018. A spatial agent-based model of the disease vector *Ixodes scapularis* to explore host-tick associations. *Ecological modelling*, 387, 96-106, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolmodel.2018.09.005>.
- Healy, J.A.E. and Bourke, P., 2004. Field evidence for aggregating behaviour in the tick *Ixodes ricinus* L. *Acarologia*, 44(1-2), 3-13.

- Heikkinen, R.K., Luoto, M., Virkkala, R., Pearson, R.G. and Körber, J.H., 2007. Biotic interactions improve prediction of boreal bird distributions at macro-scales. *Global Ecology and Biogeography*, 16(6), 754-63, <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1466-8238.2007.00345.x>.
- Hirzel, A.H., G. Le Lay, V. Helfer., C. Randin., and Guisan, A. 2006. Evaluating the ability of habitat suitability models to predict species presences. *Ecological Modelling*, 199(2): 142-52, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolmodel.2006.05.017>.
- Holloway, P., 2018. Simulating movement-related resource dynamics to improve species distribution models: a case study with oilbirds in Northern South America. *The Professional Geographer*, 70(4), 528-40, <https://doi.org/10.1080/00330124.2018.1479972>.
- Holloway, P., and Miller, J.A., 2017. A quantitative synthesis of the movement concepts used in species distribution modelling. *Ecological Modelling*, 356, 91-103, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolmodel.2017.04.005>.
- Holloway, P., Kudenko, D., and Bell, J., 2018. Dynamic selection of environmental variables to improve the prediction of aphid phenology: A machine learning approach. *Ecological Indicators*, 88; 512-21, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2017.10.032>.
- Holloway, P., Miller, J.A. and Gillings, S., 2016. Incorporating movement in species distribution models: how do simulations of dispersal affect the accuracy and uncertainty of projections? *International Journal of Geographical Information Science*, 30(10), 2050-74, <https://doi.org/10.1080/013658816.2016.1158823>.
- HSE, 2019. Primary Prevention and Surveillance of Lyme Borreliosis in Ireland. Report of the Lyme Borreliosis Subcommittee of the Scientific Advisory Committee of the Health Protection Surveillance Centre. Available at: <https://www.hpsc.ie/a-z/vectorborne/lymedisease/informationforhealthcareprofessionals/>. Accessed on 29th June 2020.
- Kelly, T. C., Sleeman, D.P., Fennessy, G.J., Dillon, A., Walton, G.A. and Gray, J., 2001. The mammal ticks (Acari: Ixodoidea) of Ireland: Their distribution and hosts. *Irish National Journal*. 26(3), 63-70, .
- Kimura, K., Isogai, E., Isogai, H., Kamewaka, Y., Nishikawa, T., Ishii, N. and Fujii, N., 1995. Detection of Lyme disease spirochetes in the skin of naturally infected wild sika deer (*Cervus nippon yesoensis*) by PCR. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.*, 61(4), 1641-2, <https://doi.org/10.1128/AEM.61.4.1641-1642.1995>.
- Kirsten, F., Rijpkema, S., Molkenboer, M. & Gray, J.S., 1997. The distribution and prevalence of *Burgdorferi* genospecies in *Ixodes ricinus* ticks in Ireland. *European Journal of Epidemiology*, 13, 67, <https://doi.org/10.1023/a:1007360422975>.
- Kissling, W.D., R. Field., and Böhning-Gaese, K., 2008. Spatial patterns of woody plant and bird diversity: functional relationships or environmental effects? *Global Ecology and Biogeography*, 17(3), 327-39, <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1466-8238.2007.00379.x>.
- Lambert, J.S., Cook, M.J., Healy, J.E., Murtagh, R., Avramovic, G. and Lee, S.H., 2019. Metagenomic 16S rRNA gene sequencing survey of *Borrelia* species in Irish samples of *Ixodes ricinus* ticks. *PLoS one*, 14(4), <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0209881>.
- Lappin, J.W.E., 2016. *Ixodid ticks: vectors for emerging diseases in Northern Ireland*. Ph.D., Queen's University Belfast.
- Lorenc, T., Jones-Diette, J., Blanchard, L., Sutcliffe, K., Stansfield, C., Harden, M., Sowden, A. and Thomas, J., 2017. *Incidence and surveillance of Lyme disease*. London: EPPI-Centre, Social Science Research Unit, UCL Institute of Education, University College London.
- Martin, J., Vourc'h, G., Bonnot, N., Cargnelutti, B., Chaval, Y., Lourtet, B., Goulard, M., Hoch, T., Plantard, O., Hewison, A.M. and Morellet, N., 2018. Temporal shifts in landscape connectivity for an ecosystem engineer, the roe deer, across a multiple-use landscape. *Landscape Ecology*, 33(6), 937-54, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10980-018-0641-0>.
- Martyn, K.P., 1988. *Provisional atlas of the ticks (Ixodoidea) of the British Isles*. Biological Records Centre Institute of Terrestrial Ecology. Abbots Ripton: Huntingdon.
- McKeown, P. and Garvey, P., 2009. Lyme disease often under diagnosed says HPSC. *Epi-Insight*, 10, 1-5.
- Mead, P.S., 2018. Global Epidemiology of *Borrelia burgdorferi* Infections. In: J.J. Halperin (ed.) *Lyme Disease: an Evidence-based Approach*. Cambridge: CABI, 76.
- Medlock, J.M. and Leach, S.A., 2015. Effect of climate change on vector-borne disease risk in the UK. *The Lancet Infectious Diseases*, 15(6), 721-30, [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099\(15\)70091-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099(15)70091-5).

- Medlock, J.M., Hansford, K.M., Bormane, A., Derdakova, M., Estrada-Peña, A., George, J.C., Golovljova, I., Jaenson, T.G., Jensen, J.K., Jensen, P.M. and Kazimirova, M., 2013. Driving forces for changes in geographical distribution of *Ixodes ricinus* ticks in Europe. *Parasites & vectors*, 6(1), <https://doi.org/10.1186/1756-3305-6-1>.
- Miller, J. A., and Holloway, P., 2015. Incorporating movement in species distribution models. *Progress in Physical Geography*, 39(6), 837-49, <https://doi.org/10.1177/0309133315580890>.
- Parola, P. and Raoult, D., 2001. Tick-borne bacterial diseases emerging in Europe. *Clinical Microbiology and Infection*, 7, 80-3, <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1469-0691.2001.00200.x>.
- Peterson, A.T., Bauer, J.T. and Mills, J.N., 2004. Ecologic and geographic distribution of filovirus disease. *Emerging infectious diseases*, 10(1), 40, <https://doi.org/10.3201/eid1001.030125>.
- Peterson, A. T., J. Soberón., R.G. Pearson., R.P. Anderson., E. Martínez-Meyer., M. Nakamura., and Araújo, M.B., 2011. *Ecological niches and geographic distributions* (MPB-49). Princeton University Press.
- Phillips, S. J., Anderson, R.P., and Schapire, R.E., 2006. Maximum entropy modelling of species geographic distributions. *Ecological Modelling*, 190, 231-59, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolmodel.2005.03.026>.
- Pietzsch, M.E., Medlock, J.M., Jones, L., Avenell, D., Abbott, J., Harding, P. and Leach, S., 2005. Distribution of *Ixodes ricinus* in the British Isles: Investigation of historical records. *Medical and Veterinary Entomology*, 19, 306-14, <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2915.2005.00575.x>.
- R Development Core Team, 2008. *R: A language and environment for statistical computing*. Vienna, Austria: R Foundation for Statistical Computing.
- Raath, M.J., Le Roux, P.C., Veldtman, R. and Greve, M., 2018. Incorporating biotic interactions in the distribution models of African wild silk moths (*Gonometa* species, Lasiocampidae) using different representations of modelled host tree distributions. *Austral ecology*, 43(3), 316-27, <https://doi.org/10.1111/aec.12569>.
- Razanske, I., Rosef, O., Radzijeuskaja, J., Bratchikov, M., Gričuvienė, L. and Paulauskas, A., 2019. Prevalence and co-infection with tick-borne *Anaplasma phagocytophilum* and *Babesia* spp. in red deer (*Cervus elaphus*) and roe deer (*Capreolus capreolus*) in Southern Norway. *International Journal for Parasitology: Parasites and Wildlife*, 8, 127-34, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijppaw.2019.01.003>.
- Renner, I.W. and Warton, D.I., 2013. Equivalence of MAXENT and Poisson point process models for species distribution modeling in ecology. *Biometrics*, 69(1), 274-81, <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1541-0420.2012.01824.x>.
- Raghavan, R.K., Goodin, D.G., Hanzlicek, G.A., Zolnerowich, G., Dryden, M.W., Anderson, G.A. and Ganta, R.R., 2016. Maximum entropy-based ecological niche model and bio-climatic determinants of lone star tick (*Amblyomma americanum*) niche. *Vector-Borne and Zoonotic Diseases*, 16(3), 205-11, <https://doi.org/10.1089/vbz.2015.1837>.
- Rubel, F., Brugger, K., Pfeffer, M., Chitimia-Dobler, L., Didyk, Y.M., Leverenz, S., Dautel, H. and Kahl, O., 2016. Geographical distribution of *Dermacentor marginatus* and *Dermacentor reticulatus* in Europe. *Ticks and tick-borne diseases*, 7(1), 224-33, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ttbdis.2015.10.015>.
- Sage, K.M., Johnson, T.L., Teglas, M.B., Nieto, N.C. and Schwan, T.G., 2017. Ecological niche modeling and distribution of *Ornithodoros hermsi* associated with tick-borne relapsing fever in western North America. *PLoS neglected tropical diseases*, 11(10), e0006047, <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pntd.0006047>.
- Sándor, A.D., D'Amico, G., Gherman, C.M., Dumitrache, M.O., Domșa, C. and Mihalca, A.D., 2017. Mesocarnivores and macroparasites: altitude and land use predict the ticks occurring on red foxes (*Vulpes vulpes*). *Parasites & vectors*, 10(1), 173, <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13071-017-2113-9>.
- Schank, C.J., Cove, M.V., Kelly, M.J., Mendoza, E., O'Farrill, G., Reyna-Hurtado, R., Meyer, N., Jordan, C.A., González-Maya, J.F., Lizcano, D.J. and Moreno, R., 2017. Using a novel model approach to assess the distribution and conservation status of the endangered Baird's tapir. *Diversity and Distributions*, 23(12), 1459-71, <https://doi.org/10.1111/ddi.12631>.
- Singh, S.K. and Girschick, H.J., 2003. Tick-host interactions and their immunological implications in tick-borne diseases. *Current Science*, 85(9), 1284-98.
- Soberón, J. and Peterson, A., 2005. Interpretation of models of fundamental ecological niches and species' distributional areas. *Biodiversity Informatics*, 2, 1-10, <https://doi.org/10.17161/bi.v2i0.4>.
- Soberón, J., 2007. Grinnellian and Eltonian niches and geographic distributions of species. *Ecology letters*, 10 (12): 1115-23, <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1461-0248.2007.01107.x>.

- Soenshine, D.E., 1991.** *Biology of ticks*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Springer, Y.P., Jarnevich, C.S., Barnett, D.T., Monaghan, A.J. and Eisen, R.J., 2015.** Modeling the present and future geographic distribution of the Lone Star Tick, *Amblyomma americanum* (Ixodida: Ixodidae), in the continental United States. *The American journal of tropical medicine and hygiene*, 93(4), 875-90, <https://doi.org/10.4269/ajtmh.15-0330>.
- St. John, H.K., Adams, M.L., Masuoka, P.M., Flyer-Adams, J.G., Jiang, J., Rozmajzl, P.J., Stromdahl, E.Y. and Richards, A.L., 2016.** Prevalence, distribution, and development of an ecological niche model of *Dermacentor variabilis* ticks positive for *Rickettsia montanensis*. *Vector-Borne and Zoonotic Diseases*, 16(4), 253-63, <https://doi.org/10.1089/vbz.2015.1856>.
- Tälleklint, L. and Jaenson, T.G.T., 1996.** Relationship between *Ixodes ricinus* density and prevalence of infection with *Borrelia*-like spirochetes and density of infected ticks. *Journal of Medical Entomology*, 33, 805-81, <https://doi.org/10.1093/jmedent/33.5.805>.
- Warton, D.I. and Shepherd, L.C., 2010.** Poisson point process models solve the “pseudo-absence problem” for presence-only data in ecology. *The Annals of Applied Statistics*, 4(3), 1383-1402, <https://doi.org/10.1214/10-AOAS331>.
- Williams, H. W., Cross, D. E., Crump, H. L., Drost, C. J., and Thomas, C. J., 2015.** Climate suitability for European ticks: assessing species distribution models against null models and projection under AR5 climate. *Parasites and Vectors*, 8(1), 440, <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13071-015-1046-4>.
- Wisz, M.S., Pottier, J., Kissling, W.D. and 21 others, 2013.** The role of biotic interactions in shaping distributions and realised assemblages of species: implications for species distribution modelling. *Biological Reviews*, 88(1), 15-30, <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-185X.2012.00235.x>.
- Zintl, A., Finnerty, E.J., Murphy, T.M., de Waal, T. and Gray, J.S., 2011.** Babesias of red deer (*Cervus elaphus*) in Ireland. *Veterinary research*, 42(1), 7, <https://doi.org/10.1186/1297-9716-42-7>.
- Zintl, A., Moutailler, S., Stuart, P., Paredis, L., Dutraive, J., Gonzalez, E., O'Connor, J., Devillers, E., Good, B., O'Muireagain, C. and De Waal, T., 2017.** Ticks and Tick-borne diseases in Ireland. *Irish Veterinary Journal*, 70(1), 4, <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13620-017-0084-y>.

