

# Kent Academic Repository

## Full text document (pdf)

### Citation for published version

Tollington, Simon and Ewen, John G. and Newton, Jason and McGill, Rona A. R. and Smith, Donal and Henshaw, Aurélie and Fogell, Deborah J. and Tatayah, Vikash and Greenwood, Andrew and Jones, Carl G. and Groombridge, Jim J. and Thompson, Des (2018) Individual consumption of supplemental food as a predictor of reproductive performance and viral infection intensity.

### DOI

<https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2664.13303>

### Link to record in KAR

<https://kar.kent.ac.uk/72471/>

### Document Version

Publisher pdf

#### Copyright & reuse

Content in the Kent Academic Repository is made available for research purposes. Unless otherwise stated all content is protected by copyright and in the absence of an open licence (eg Creative Commons), permissions for further reuse of content should be sought from the publisher, author or other copyright holder.

#### Versions of research

The version in the Kent Academic Repository may differ from the final published version.

Users are advised to check <http://kar.kent.ac.uk> for the status of the paper. **Users should always cite the published version of record.**

#### Enquiries

For any further enquiries regarding the licence status of this document, please contact:

[researchsupport@kent.ac.uk](mailto:researchsupport@kent.ac.uk)

If you believe this document infringes copyright then please contact the KAR admin team with the take-down information provided at <http://kar.kent.ac.uk/contact.html>

# Individual consumption of supplemental food as a predictor of reproductive performance and viral infection intensity

Simon Tollington<sup>1,2</sup>  | John G. Ewen<sup>3</sup> | Jason Newton<sup>4</sup> | Rona A. R. McGill<sup>4</sup> |  
 Donal Smith<sup>3,5</sup> | Aurélie Henshaw<sup>6</sup> | Deborah J. Fogell<sup>1,3</sup> | Vikash Tatayah<sup>6</sup> |  
 Andrew Greenwood<sup>7</sup> | Carl G. Jones<sup>5,8</sup> | Jim J. Groombridge<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Durrell Institute of Conservation and Ecology, School of Anthropology and Conservation, University of Kent, Canterbury, UK; <sup>2</sup>North of England Zoological Society, Chester, UK; <sup>3</sup>Institute of Zoology, Zoological Society of London, London, UK; <sup>4</sup>NERC Life Sciences Mass Spectrometry Facility, SUERC, East Kilbride, UK; <sup>5</sup>School of Environment and Life Sciences, University of Salford, Salford, UK; <sup>6</sup>Mauritian Wildlife Foundation, Vacoas, Mauritius; <sup>7</sup>International Zoo Veterinary Group, Keighley, UK and <sup>8</sup>Durrell Wildlife Conservation Trust, Jersey, UK

## Correspondence

Simon Tollington  
 Email: simon.tollington@gmail.com

## Funding information

NERC, Grant/Award Number: NE/F01290X/1; Rufford Small Grants for Nature Conservation, Grant/Award Number: 14122-B; British Ecological Society, Grant/Award Number: 5163-6205

Handling Editor: Des Thompson

## Abstract

1. Supplemental food is often provided to threatened species in order to maintain or enhance reproductive fitness and thus population growth. However, its impact on individual reproductive fitness is rarely evaluated, despite being associated with both positive and negative consequences.
2. We used stable isotope analyses to characterise the relative proportional consumption of supplemental food and quantitative polymerase chain reaction to assess beak and feather disease viral infection intensity among parakeets. Life-history and nest-site data from a long-term monitoring effort was incorporated.
3. Older females benefitted the most from supplemental feeding; demonstrated by a greater reproductive uplift than younger females. There were no strong predictors of viral infection levels among nestlings.
4. Reproductive fitness, measured by the number of fledglings produced per brood, was positively associated with proportional dietary content of supplemental food among adult parakeets and breeding pairs that nested closer to feeding stations consumed more supplemental food than those nesting further away.
5. *Synthesis and applications.* Our study demonstrates that supplementary feeding can lead to an overall increase in population growth. However, by characterising individual consumption, we also reveal subtle patterns of use and differential benefits on reproductive fitness within a population. Manipulating the delivery of supplemental food may help to reduce demand on finite resources or target the proportion of a population that derives the most benefit, but is associated with trade-offs in fecundity. For example, the use of and access to feeding stations could potentially be targeted towards specific individuals, or positioned in the habitats most deficient in native food. However, increasing reproductive fitness in one component of the population may be accompanied by a decrease in another.

This is an open access article under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

© 2018 The Authors. *Journal of Applied Ecology* published by John Wiley & Sons Ltd on behalf of British Ecological Society

This knowledge can be incorporated into adaptive management strategies that aim to fulfil specific objectives associated with species recovery and long-term viability as long as the relative importance of each objective is be considered.

#### KEYWORDS

BFDV, diet, parrot, population recovery, qPCR, reproductive fitness, stable isotope analysis, supplemental feeding

## 1 | INTRODUCTION

The provision of supplemental food to threatened species is a widely used method intended to manipulate elements of population dynamics, usually with the intention of aiding population recovery. The benefits of this practice are well documented and it has been implicated in the success of high-profile avian conservation programmes including that of the kakapo (*Strigops habroptilus*) (Clout & Craig, 1995) and California condor (*Gymnogyps californianus*) (Walters et al., 2010). Supplemental feeding is, however, often implemented as a default management action under the assumption that it will benefit population recovery, but the precise costs and benefits have rarely been evaluated (Ewen, Walker, Canessa, & Groombridge, 2015). For example, the provision of supplemental food (hereafter "SF") has been associated with negative consequences such as increased dependence upon it, genetic adaptation, poor nutrition, disease transmission, and a tendency for maintaining less productive individuals (Boutin, 1990; Blanco, Lemus, & García-Montijano, 2011; Crates et al., 2016). Furthermore, providing food *ad libitum* to a growing population places a high demand on finite resources leading to questions over long-term sustainability (Chauvenet et al., 2012) and provisioning is often not targeted towards those individuals in a population that are most likely to benefit from it (Ewen et al., 2015).

Providing food at communal feeders is therefore often accompanied by the simplistic assumptions that the access to, consumption, and resulting benefits of it are equally shared among individuals. Newey, Allison, Thirgood, Smith, and Graham (2009), however, discovered that only 50% of a target population of mountain hares (*Lepus timidus*) used SF and that substantial variation occurred among individuals in the number of visits to, and time spent at feeders. More recently, Crates et al. (2016) estimated individual consumption of SF in great tits (*Parus major*) and blue tits (*Cyanistes caeruleus*) revealing that younger individuals consumed more SF than adults. To fully understand how SF affects populations, it is therefore essential to characterise individual use and understand how that variation predicts reproductive fitness (Robb, McDonald, Chamberlain, & Bearhop, 2008).

Where local population densities increase as a result of SF use, viral transmission also becomes an important component of fitness as natural host-pathogen dynamics become altered, and the risks of density-dependent and frequency-dependent pathogen transmission increase (Adelman, Moyers, Farine, & Hawley, 2015). For example, in a recent review of supplemental feeding studies,

Murray, Becker, Hall, and Hernandez (2016) noted that in 95% of 115 cases, pathogen transmission risk increased due to elevated contact rates, 77% of the studies promoted pathogen accumulation around feeders, and in 80% of cases SF was considered an immunosuppressive contaminant. However, Wilcoxon et al. (2015) demonstrated that while prevalence of disease may be higher at feeders, many individuals using them revealed a greater propensity to tolerate infection due to increased immunocompetence as a result of high-quality SF. In order to achieve the long-term objective of species recovery, it is therefore important to consider the implications of supplemental feeding on individual health and population viability.

Quantifying individual consumption of SF in free-living populations presents a considerable challenge for biologists. Where multiple feeding stations are employed, direct observations of individual birds are labour-intensive and rely on the extrapolation of results over unobserved time and space (Robb et al., 2011). Furthermore, observations are often made from distance at feeding stations where individuals congregate and need to be identified simultaneously from individual tags such as leg rings. Alternatively, the evaluation of blood and tissue samples using stable isotope analysis (SIA) can provide detailed, individual-level dietary information (Hobson & Clark, 1992; Parnell et al., 2013) but requires the *a priori* identification of potential dietary sources and relies on the existence of sufficient variation between those sources and the resulting post-assimilation ratios in body tissues (Hobson & Clark, 1992; Inger & Bearhop, 2008). Used with care, SIA can effectively partition and quantify dietary sources thus providing valuable insight on individual-level patterns of SF use and the immediate and long-term population-level implications.

The Mauritius "echo" parakeet (*Psittacula echo*) is an intensively studied, island-endemic species and the subject of a successful, long-term conservation recovery programme (Jones & Merton, 2012; Raisin et al., 2012; Tollington et al., 2015). Supplemental food is offered *ad libitum* and year round to this population and while evidence demonstrates that it increases fledging success (Tollington et al., 2013), little is known regarding levels of individual consumption and how this relates to reproductive output. Individuals breed for the first time in their second or third year, forming monogamous pairs that may last more than 10 years. Each pair produces a single clutch of between one and four eggs and can fledge up to four young. An outbreak of beak and feather disease virus (BFDV) in 2005 (Kundu et al., 2012) led to a decrease in reproductive fitness in

this population characterised by a marked decline in hatch success that was short-lived and only apparent among breeding pairs that used SF (Tollington et al., 2015). BFDV prevalence was, however, not higher among individuals that used SF when compared to those that did not, indicating that perhaps individual infection intensity may be an important factor.

Here, we use SIA to quantify (relative) individual consumption of SF among nestlings in a free-living population of endangered parakeets. Further, we use these values to estimate the combined diet of each breeding pair and identify the factors that predict variation in SF use. We then investigate how variation between breeding pairs predicts reproductive output and test whether the benefits of this resource are equally distributed. Finally, we use quantitative PCR (qPCR) to characterise individual nestling infection load in order to investigate relationships between parental SF use and BFDV infection.

More precisely, we address the following hypotheses:

1. The variation in SF consumption between breeding pairs will be explained by nest-site and life-history variables.
2. The number of fledglings produced per nesting attempt will be positively predicted by the proportion of SF consumption derived from SIA of feather samples.
3. Nestling viral load will be positively associated with parental SF use and negatively associated with nest-site distance from feeding stations.

## 2 | MATERIALS AND METHODS

### 2.1 | Stable isotope analysis

Vegetation (leaf) samples from 37 plant and tree species, including all of those known to be important food species for the Mauritian parakeet (Jones, Tollington, Raisin, Zuel, & Tatayah, 2013), were collected from across their range within the Black River Gorges National Park, Mauritius. Ten independent samples of SF ("KayteeExact Parrot Pellets"; Kaytee Products Inc.) were also collected. This commercially produced parrot food consists of maize (*Zea* spp.) as the main ingredient and we therefore expect, owing to the variation in carbon fixation strategies between the two food groups ( $C_4$  for *Zea* and  $C_3$  for upland tropical vegetation), that  $\delta^{13}C$  isotope analyses will reveal distinct signatures.

During the 2014/2015 breeding season, as part of the ongoing monitoring procedures, a small (5 mm<sup>2</sup>) sample of primary feather was taken from each nestling at c. 45 days old. A total of 194 individuals from 85 different broods were sampled. Additionally, 20 feather samples were collected from captive individuals as a control measure. The diet of the captive individuals was closely monitored and comprised almost exclusively of the maize-based food; captive birds do not have access to natural vegetation but their diet is supplemented periodically with fruit and browse. All samples of these potential food items and feathers were subjected to stable isotope analyses as detailed in Supporting Information Appendix S1.

### 2.2 | Quantification of viral load

To quantify individual BFDV infection intensity, we designed a TaqMan probe-based, qPCR assay (cf. Eastwood et al., 2015). We used a published sequence of the replicase gene (HQ641502.1, Kundu et al., 2012), derived from this host population, and the software Beacon Designer to design primers and a fluorescent probe that amplified a 120 bp fragment of the viral genome (full details can be found in the Supporting Information Appendix S1). Genomic host (and thus viral) DNA was extracted from whole blood samples taken from nestlings using an ammonium acetate precipitation method (Nicholls, Double, Rowell, & Magrath, 2000) and qPCR to determine individual viral load was performed according to details in the Supporting Information Appendix S1.

### 2.3 | Measures of reproductive fitness and nest-site variables


Individual life-history and nest-site data were collected as part of the routine monitoring procedures undertaken by the Mauritian Wildlife Foundation. During the breeding season (2014/2015), a total of 113 breeding attempts were identified. After discounting breeding attempts that were either (a) "recycle" attempts (where initial broods had failed), (b) broods that failed at egg stage, or (c) inaccessible, our final dataset consisted of 85 breeding attempts. Blood and feather samples were collected from a total of 194 nestlings from these breeding attempts. Pair reproductive fitness was characterised by the number of fledglings per breeding attempt. This was determined by accessing each nest box c. 10 days after the predicted date of fledging and we therefore assume that any chicks that were not found deceased had indeed successfully fledged.

Nest-site and individual life-history variables included in the dataset were: a unique identifier for each nest-site, the estimated lay date of the first egg (number of days after 1 September, determined by accessing each nest to candle eggs and confirm hatch success and age of chicks), the hatch order of each chick in each brood, the age and studbook identification of each female parent, and the Euclidian distance of each nest-site to the nearest SF station (km). Given the lack of anthropogenic obstacles and small distances involved in our study, we assume that individuals do not deviate from a Euclidian path to feeders.

### 2.4 | Statistical procedure

#### 2.4.1 | Stable isotope analyses

All statistical procedures were performed using R version 3.4.3 (R Development Core Team, 2017). Initially, we used simple MANOVAs to investigate the isotopic variation between the two dietary sources by pooling values derived from SF and vegetation in order to verify that they were isotopically distinct. Raw isotopic ratios from all feather samples were then similarly



**FIGURE 1** Mean ( $\pm$ SD) of raw isotopic values from dietary sources and individual values from feather samples. Captive individuals are shown in filled black circles

analysed to confirm variation between captive and wild individuals. We used a Bayesian approach to source partitioning within a two-source stable isotope mixing model (SIMM) implemented in the R package *SIAR* (Parnell, Inger, Bearhop, & Jackson, 2008) to estimate the relative proportional contribution of different food sources to feather samples (see Supporting Information Appendix S1 for details).

#### 2.4.2 | Brood-level variation in dietary composition and viral load

We used intraclass correlation tests on dietary proportions and viral load values to establish the within- and among-brood variation in order to satisfy the assumption that siblings would reveal similar values. Nestlings were fed exclusively by their parents and therefore isotopic signatures from their feathers can be used to directly infer the combined parental diet. If intraclass correlations reveal higher within-brood than among-brood variation then this inference would not be possible. Values of individual viral load determined by qPCR were log-transformed to improve residual normality and also subjected to intraclass correlation tests to determine the within- and between-brood variation. Since one of our hypotheses predicts that nestling infection load will be associated with parental SF use, we expect both of these variables to correlate highly among siblings.

#### 2.4.3 | Predictors of SF consumption, reproductive success, and viral load

In order to address our first hypothesis, predictors of proportional SF consumption were analysed at the brood-level by using

“Nest-site ID” as a random effect in a GLMM (Generalised Linear Mixed Model) to account for the pseudoreplication of siblings. The response variable was individual dietary proportion attributable to SF derived by SIMM and was arc-sin square-root transformed (Crawley, 2012). The main explanatory predictors included were: female age (incorporating the quadratic term (Møller, 2006)) and distance from nest-site to nearest feeding station. We also included as fixed covariates, the estimated lay date of the first egg in order to reveal any relationships between supplemental feeding and breeding phenology (Arcese & Smith, 1988), and subpopulation (north or south) based on previous research that supports the existence of spatially independent subpopulations (Raisin et al., 2012; Tollington et al., 2013).

We used the number of birds fledged per breeding attempt as our measure of reproductive success in a simple GLM (McDonald & White, 2010) to determine the exact reproductive benefit of SF and to examine any differential effects associated with our other fixed covariates. Our main predictor variable therefore, was proportional dietary contribution of SF, averaged across nest-mates and included as a first-order interaction term with our other predictors: female age, distance to feeding station, lay date, and subpopulation. We also included a brood-level value of viral load by taking the mean value of siblings.

GLMMs were used to investigate the predictors of nestling viral load using “Nest-site ID” as a random effect. We used our previously described value of individual viral load as the response variable. The proportional consumption of SF derived from SIA, distance from each nest-site to the nearest feeding station, and subpopulation were included as our main explanatory variables. We also included the following fixed covariates to account for demonstrable predictors of immunocompetence and disease susceptibility in birds: female age (Møller, 2006), estimated lay date of first egg (Hasselquist, Wasson, & Winkler, 2001), and hatch order (Saino, Incagli, Martinelli, Ambrosini, & Møller, 2001).

Prior to analyses we performed extensive data exploration and derived variance inflation factors (VIFs) following the protocols of Zuur, Ieno, Walker, Saveliev, and Smith (2009). We standardised our predictors to avoid any biases associated with multicollinearity according to Cade (2015), and then used an information-theoretic approach to model selection (Burnham & Anderson, 2002; Whittingham, Stephens, Bradbury, & Freckleton, 2006) to examine the fit of each candidate model. The R packages *lme4* (Bates, Maechler, & Dai, 2010) and *MuMIn* (Bartoń, 2016) were used to perform GLMMs and model averaging respectively. Candidate models were evaluated using  $AIC_c$  and final model sets were restricted to  $\Delta AIC_c < 7$  before model averaging (Bolker et al., 2009; Burnham, Anderson, & Huyvaert, 2011). Furthermore, goodness-of-fit was assessed by calculating marginal  $R^2$  values for each of our candidate models (Johnson, 2014). We derived the relative importance of our model covariates by calculating the  $AIC_c$ -weighted absolute  $t$ -statistic values of each model-averaged coefficient (Cade, 2015; Robinson et al., 2016).

**TABLE 1** Variation in raw mean isotopic signatures between dietary sources and target populations

	$\delta^{13}\text{C}$	$\pm\text{SD} (\delta^{13}\text{C})$	$\delta^{15}\text{N}$	$\pm\text{SD} (\delta^{15}\text{N})$
Source				
Supplemental pellets (n = 10)	-19.52	1.19	3.07	1.43
Vegetation (n = 37)	-29.73	4.31	-0.95	2.95
Target				
Wild (n = 194)	-20.73	1.81	4.42	0.57
Captive (n = 20)	-19.21	0.69	5.60	0.32

### 3 | RESULTS

#### 3.1 | Stable isotope values

Mean values of  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  and  $\delta^{15}\text{N}$  varied significantly between the two dietary sources confirming the existence of distinct isotopic signatures (MANOVA; Pillai,  $F_{2,40} = 16.03$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ). Supplemental pellets revealed significantly higher values of both  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  and  $\delta^{15}\text{N}$  when compared to vegetation (Figure 1 and Table 1). Values derived from feathers revealed significant separation between captive and wild-collected samples and substantial variation among wild individuals (MANOVA; Pillai,  $F_{2,211} = 73.17$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ). Values from captive individuals for both  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  and  $\delta^{15}\text{N}$  were significantly greater than those for wild individuals (Figure 1 and Table 1).


The SIMM revealed that the relative dietary contribution of SF in feathers collected from captive individuals ranged from 76% to 91% and from 29% to 91% among wild-collected samples. As expected, the mean individual dietary contribution of supplemental pellets from the captive population was significantly higher than that among samples collected from the wild (captive mean =  $82\% \pm 5$ , wild mean =  $67\% \pm 15$ ; Welch's  $T = 9.08$ ,  $df = 72.6$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ).

#### 3.2 | Brood-level variation in dietary composition and viral load

Intraclass correlations on proportional contribution of supplemental pellets demonstrated a high correlation coefficient among wild siblings and low within-brood variation (ICC = 0.97 [0.95–0.98], variance within = 0.001, variance among = 0.02) indicating as expected, that the diets of siblings were indistinguishable. Intraclass correlation coefficients for nestling viral load revealed surprising results suggesting that it was not associated with brood. The coefficient was effectively zero; the within-brood variance was considerably higher than the between-brood variance (ICC = 0.016 [-0.16 to 0.20], variance within = 1.77, variance among = 0.03).

Tests for multicollinearity between our model predictors revealed no correlation greater than 0.7; VIFs were  $<3$  for all of our variables indicating no reason to remove any of our covariates (Zuur et al., 2009).

Hypothesis 1: The variation in SF consumption between breeding pairs will be explained by nest-site and life-history variables.



**FIGURE 2** Average proportional consumption of supplemental food and distance in kilometres to nearest feeding station. Each datapoint represents the combined diet of a breeding pair ( $\beta = -0.1$ ,  $SE = 0.01$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ,  $R^2 = 0.48$ )

Our initial SIA results revealed substantial variation in dietary proportion of SF among breeding pairs (Figure 1). Model selection to identify the important predictors of this variation revealed that the top-performing model by  $>6 \Delta\text{AIC}_c$ , with an  $R^2$  of 0.36, contained distance to feeding station as the single explanatory covariate (Supporting Information Table S1). Model-averaged coefficients confirmed that nest-site distance to feeding station was a strong predictor of individual SF consumption ( $t$ -statistic = 6.22) demonstrating that nestlings' dietary contribution of SF increased with proximity to the nearest feeding station (Figure 2; Table 2). There was a small but noteworthy difference in SF consumption between the two subpopulations and the  $R^2$  for the model containing both of these covariates was 0.40 (Supporting Information Table S1 and Table 2). No other variables appeared in our model selection table (Supporting Information Table S1).

Hypothesis 2: The number of fledglings produced per nesting attempt will be positively predicted by the

**TABLE 2** Model-averaged coefficients, standard errors (SE), confidence intervals, and *t*-statistics (absolute, ratio, and variance) from GLMM to predict relative individual dietary proportion of supplemental food. Predictors are ordered by weighted *t*-statistics as a measure of relative variable importance, those in bold feature coefficient estimates where confidence intervals do not cross zero

	Estimate	SE	CI 2.5%	CI 97.5%	T abs	T ratio	T var
(Intercept)	0.08	0.00	0.08	0.08			
<b>Distance</b>	<b>-0.01</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>-0.02</b>	<b>-0.01</b>	<b>6.22</b>	<b>0.96</b>	<b>0.39</b>
Subpop	-0.01	0.00	-0.02	0.00	0.33	0.07	1.42

proportion of SF consumption derived from SIA of feather samples.

Twenty-six models remained after model selection but these did not feature a clear 'best model'. The *R*-squared values ranged from 0.29 to 0.38 (Supporting Information Table S2). Model-averaged coefficients revealed that the number of fledglings per breeding attempt was positively associated with proportional consumption of SF (*t*-statistic = 3.78). Female age also positively predicted the number of fledglings (*t*-statistic = 3.78). Moreover, the interaction between female age and proportion SF consumption was a significant predictor of fledgling productivity representing the third most important predictor (*t*-statistic = 2.87). The positive relationship between SF consumption and fledgling number was more pronounced as female age increased, indicating that supplemental feeding is disproportionately beneficial to older females (Figure 3). Lay date was negatively associated with the number of fledglings; females that laid earlier clutches raised more fledglings (*t*-statistic = 1.62). Distance to feeding hoppers and subpopulation were not strong predictors of reproductive output. Full model-averaged coefficients can be found in Table 3.

Hypothesis 3: Nestling viral load is positively associated with parental SF use and negatively associated with nest-site distance from feeding stations.

Viral load among nestlings was not predicted by any of our predictors. In the final candidate model set, *R*<sup>2</sup> values ranged from zero (for the null model) to 0.07 reflecting the equally poor fit of all 64 candidates (Supporting Information Table S3). Model averaging demonstrated a lack of clear predictors of individual viral infection intensity; model-averaged coefficients were small, all had confidence intervals that included zero and the model-averaged *t*-statistics for all covariates were <1.4 (Table 4). Of all the predictors, subpopulation and lay date were the strongest, indicating that viral load tended to be higher in the northern population and higher among broods produced earlier in the breeding season.

## 4 | DISCUSSION

### 4.1 | Supplemental feeding increases productivity


Female age and relative proportional consumption of SF per breeding pair were both strong, positive predictors of the number of fledglings produced per breeding attempt. Importantly, however, we found no relationship between SF consumption and female age

suggesting that older females were able to maintain increased reproductive fitness over younger females without the need to increase their consumption of SF. Age-dependent effects on reproductive success in birds have been well-studied and have largely been associated with increased experience of older individuals in securing sufficient high-quality nest sites, mates, and food (Newton, 1989; Oro, Hernández, Jover, & Genovart, 2014). Presumably, this result reflects an element of greater experience among older females in brood provisioning, regardless of food availability.

This general result, however, concealed a subtle but nonetheless significant pattern in SF use that revealed a disproportionate benefit to some individuals. The reproductive uplift provided by SF consumption was more pronounced with increasing female age; females of all ages demonstrated increased productivity with increased SF consumption but older females revealed the greatest benefit. This result perhaps suggests that food availability is less of a limiting factor for reproductive fitness among younger females than it is among older females. Providing SF to this population has clearly increased reproductive output, contributing to the recovery of this species and the ultimate objective of population growth. The implications of this strategy on long-term population viability are, however, less clear. For example, some evidence suggests that offspring of older parents reveal reduced survival and recruitment (Torres, Drummond, & Velando, 2011), while others have shown that enlarged broods can lead to reduced individual survival (Naguib, Riebel, Marzal, & Gil, 2004), increased levels of stress (Salleh Hudin et al., 2017), and that SF may in fact increase reproductive success without resulting in viable populations recovery (Peach, Mallord, Ockendon, Orsman, & Haines, 2015). Our results are limited to data from a single breeding season and therefore an ongoing assessment of juvenile quality and long-term survival is required in this system in order to evaluate the implications of individual supplemental feeding on population-level fitness.

### 4.2 | Nest-site distance to feeding stations predicts SF consumption

Relative dietary proportion of SF increased with proximity of nest-site to feeding stations; birds that nested closer to the feeding stations consumed more SF than those nesting further away. No other variables explained considerable variation in SF consumption and we found no indicators of distance associated with female age, or that food provisioning advances egg laying dates as in other studies (e.g., Harrison et al., 2010). Perhaps counterintuitively, in the model to describe reproductive output, nest-site distance to feeders was



**FIGURE 3** Interactive effect from GLMM of proportional supplemental food consumption and female age on the number of fledglings produced. Plots illustrate the relationship at the 10th, 50<sup>th</sup>, and 90th quantile of female age illustrating the increasing benefit of supplemental food to productivity as female age increases

**TABLE 3** Model-averaged coefficients, standard errors (SE), confidence intervals, and variable *t*-statistics (absolute, ratio, and variance) from GLM to predict number of fledglings per brood. Predictors are ordered by weighted *t*-statistics as a measure of relative variable importance, those in bold feature coefficient estimates where confidence intervals do not cross zero

	Estimate	SE	CI 2.5%	CI 97.5%	<i>T</i> abs	<i>T</i> ratio	<i>T</i> var
(Intercept)	2.27	0.08	2.1	2.43			
<b>Supp food</b>	<b>0.84</b>	<b>0.25</b>	<b>0.33</b>	<b>1.34</b>	<b>3.78</b>	<b>0.97</b>	<b>0.05</b>
<b>Dam age</b>	<b>0.61</b>	<b>0.16</b>	<b>0.28</b>	<b>0.93</b>	<b>3.78</b>	<b>0.97</b>	<b>0.05</b>
<b>Lay date</b>	<b>-0.33</b>	<b>0.16</b>	<b>-0.66</b>	<b>-0.01</b>	<b>1.62</b>	<b>0.42</b>	<b>0.16</b>
Distance	0.40	0.24	-0.09	0.89	1.10	0.28	0.30
Subpop	0.32	0.24	-0.16	0.79	0.69	0.18	0.29
<b>Dam age: Supp</b>	<b>0.92</b>	<b>0.32</b>	<b>0.29</b>	<b>1.55</b>	<b>2.87</b>	<b>0.73</b>	<b>0.02</b>
Lay date: Supp	-0.35	0.39	-1.12	0.42	0.21	0.06	0.12
Distance: Supp	-0.19	0.38	-0.96	0.58	0.08	0.02	0.03
Subpop: Supp	0.05	0.44	-0.82	0.92	0.02	0.01	0.01

**TABLE 4** Model-averaged coefficients, standard errors (SE), confidence intervals, and *t*-statistics (absolute, ratio, and variance) from GLMM to predict individual viral load. Predictors are ordered according weighted *t*-statistics as a measure of relative variable importance

	Estimate	SE	CI 2.5%	CI 97.5%	<i>T</i> abs	<i>T</i> ratio	<i>T</i> var
(Intercept)	-7.02	0.09	-0.15	0.15			
Subpop	-0.31	0.29	-0.94	0.03	1.39	0.67	0.31
Lay date	-0.21	0.21	-0.67	0.02	1.25	0.62	0.29
Hatch order	-0.09	0.15	-0.54	0.13	0.51	0.26	0.22
Distance	0.10	0.20	-0.26	0.76	0.44	0.21	0.25
Dam age	-0.07	0.14	-0.55	0.17	0.40	0.22	0.19
Supp food	0.05	0.15	-0.31	0.61	0.25	0.15	0.17

not a strong predictor (Table 3). We were initially concerned that we had introduced an element of collinearity in this model by including both the *distance* and *proportion SF* variables. However, we were reassured by our extensive efforts that the level of collinearity between these two variables was low enough to avoid misinterpretation in our model. To provide further reassurance we repeated the model, omitted *proportion SF*, and *distance* remained unimportant (Supporting Information Table S4). This highlights unavoidable

complexity in such studies: SF consumption positively predicted reproductive output; distance to feeders strongly predicted SF consumption but pairs nesting closer to feeders did not produce more fledglings. This initially confusing result suggests that, even though distance to feeders was identified as the strongest predictor of SF consumption in our study, there are likely to be numerous other, unmeasured and unknown factors that contribute to levels of supplemental feeding and reproductive output including pairs'

home ranges, habitat quality, seasonal variation, and competition at feeding stations. Furthermore, our measure of relative SF consumption was derived from feather samples of nestlings and therefore describes the combined parental diet. It is therefore possible that within a breeding pair, there exists variation in feeding strategy (and chick provisioning) between the male and female that we were unable to explain in this study.

### 4.3 | Parental consumption of SF does not predict viral load among nestlings

Beak and feather disease virus infection intensity among nestlings was not associated with parental consumption of SF nor was it strongly related to any of our nest-site or life-history variables. Our results suggested that viral load may be weakly associated with sub-population and lay date, relationships that may strengthen if a larger, multi-season dataset is considered.

Our approach to characterising consumption cannot precisely predict frequency of visitation to feeders or contact rates with other individuals, but one can reasonably expect individuals that consume high levels of SF to also spend more time at the feeders; especially since those that do so also occupy nest-sites that are closer to the feeders. Ideally, a range of methods should be employed in supplementary feeding studies that directly characterise the variables of interest. However, characterising both consumption and visitation or contact frequency simultaneously in a free-living bird population is accompanied by logistical constraints (such as the deployment of individual PIT tags) that often prevent comprehensive studies.

The lack of a strong relationship between supplemental feeding and pathogen infection may be explained by the results we observed for within- and between-brood variation in infection intensity. These results suggest that infection intensity is not brood-related and is not associated with hatch order, perhaps indicating that infection intensity of nestlings is more closely aligned with individual life-history variables such as immunogenetic condition. Alternatively, perhaps a single assessment of viral load at a specific moment in time reflects the transient nature of BFDV infection and does not infer a current clinical infection associated with disease. Regnard, Boyes, Martin, Hitzeroth, and Rybicki (2015) demonstrated that infection intensity was associated with clinical signs in Cape parrots (*Poicephalus robustus*); none of the nestlings in our study displayed signs of clinical infection and observational accounts of condition post-fledging were not recorded. Infection loads of individuals at the nestling stage may well predict post-fledging survival and future reproductive abilities but investigating this is not within the scope of this study.

## 5 | CONCLUSION

In our study, the success of breeding pairs in terms of numbers of fledged offspring was predicted by their relative proportional consumption of supplemental food. Supplemental feeding was introduced to counter low productivity of parakeets as a result of diminished natural resources (Jones & Merton, 2012) and has fulfilled

its main objective having played a significant role in preventing the extinction of this species (Butchart, Stattersfield, & Collar, 2006).

However, when food provisioning was initially introduced in this system, there was little consideration of any indirect effects and therefore feeders were placed close to release aviaries for monitoring purposes. Our approach to quantifying variation in SF consumption among individuals has revealed that individual parakeets do not use this resource equally and do not derive equal benefit from it. Our study, therefore, supports a growing recognition that the provisioning of food requires a more detailed evaluation of benefits and consequences in order that it can be applied in a more strategic manner (Ewen et al., 2015). These evaluations are difficult to implement in free-living populations owing to a variety of logistical constraints but our study has provided evidence to inform them. Reducing the overall volume of SF provided would reduce the demand on finite resources, while targeting supplementary feeding towards a specific portion of the population might be an appropriate management consideration if the long-term objective is to maintain population viability without the use of SF. Ultimately, any manipulation in food provisioning is associated with important trade-offs and a reduction in food provisioning will likely lead to a reduction in fecundity. It is therefore vital that the relative importance of the different objectives is considered and the conservation implications of each evaluated accordingly.

Our single-season analysis provides a snapshot of the factors that predict levels of SF use and the implications on productivity and viral infection in this population. It is therefore difficult to reach conclusions on long-term impacts of supplemental feeding in our system given these patterns because a much more comprehensive approach is needed that incorporates multiple seasons and an assessment of habitat quality. Nonetheless we have shown here that our methods, if incorporated into a multi-season study, could make valuable contributions to informing long-term strategies for recovering populations where SF is provided. By analysing stable isotopes of feathers, we characterised the relative proportional consumption of SF by Mauritius parakeets to a level of detail previously unobtainable. This analysis has enabled us to reveal subtle patterns in the parental use of this resource, identify the potential impacts of providing SF, and to offer recommendations for future research.

### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This work was funded by a NERC PhD studentship (NE/F01290X/1) awarded to J.G. and by grants awarded to S.T. from the Rufford Small Grants for Nature Conservation (14122-B) and the British Ecological Society (5163-6205). We are grateful to the staff and volunteers of the Mauritian Wildlife Foundation and also to the National Parks and Conservation Services of the Government of Mauritius. We thank two reviewers for their very helpful comments.

### AUTHORS' CONTRIBUTIONS

S.T. and J.G. conceived the idea. S.T., C.J., A.G., and V.T. designed the methodology. S.T., D.S., and A.H. collected field samples. S.T., J.N.,

R.M., and D.F. performed laboratory analyses. S.T. analysed the data. S.T. and J.E. led the writing of the manuscript.

## DATA ACCESSIBILITY

Data available via the Dryad Digital Repository <https://doi.org/10.5061/dryad.t7s15hp> (Tollington et al., 2018).

## ORCID

Simon Tollington  <http://orcid.org/0000-0003-2450-7255>

## REFERENCES

- Adelman, J. S., Moyers, S. C., Farine, D. R., & Hawley, D. M. (2015). Feeder use predicts both acquisition and transmission of a contagious pathogen in a North American songbird. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B*, 282, 1815.
- Arcese, P., & Smith, J. N. (1988). Effects of population density and SF on reproduction in song sparrows. *The Journal of Animal Ecology*, 57, 119–136. <https://doi.org/10.2307/4768>
- Bartoń, K. (2016). *MuMIn: multi-model inference*. R package version 1.15.6. Vienna, Austria: The Comprehensive R Archive Network (CRAN).
- Bates, D., Maechler, M., & Dai, B. (2010). *lme4: Linear mixed-effects models using Eigen and Eigenfaces*. R package version 0.999375-33. Vienna, Austria: R Foundation for Statistical Computing. CRAN R-project org/package/lme4.
- Blanco, G., Lemus, J. A., & García-Montijano, M. (2011). When conservation management becomes contraindicated: Impact of food supplementation on health of endangered wildlife. *Ecological Applications*, 21, 2469–2477. <https://doi.org/10.1890/11-0038.1>
- Bolker, B. M., Brooks, M. E., Clark, C. J., Geange, S. W., Poulsen, J. R., Stevens, M. H. H., & White, J. S. S. (2009). Generalized linear mixed models: A practical guide for ecology and evolution. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, 24(3), 127–135. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2008.10.008>
- Boutin, S. (1990). Food supplementation experiments with terrestrial vertebrates: Patterns, problems, and the future. *Canadian Journal of Zoology*, 68, 203–220. <https://doi.org/10.1139/z90-031>
- Burnham, K. P., & Anderson, D. R. (2002). *Model selection and multimodel inference: A practical information-theoretic approach*. New York, NY: Springer Verlag.
- Burnham, K. P., Anderson, D. R., & Huyvaert, K. P. (2011). AIC model selection and multimodel inference in behavioural ecology: Some background, observations, and comparisons. *Behavioural Ecology and Sociobiology*, 65(1), 23–35. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00265-010-1029-6>
- Butchart, S. H., Stattersfield, A. J., & Collar, N. J. (2006). How many bird extinctions have we prevented? *Oryx*, 40(03), 266–278. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0030605306000950>
- Cade, B. S. (2015). Model averaging and muddled multimodel inferences. *Ecology*, 96(9), 2370–2382. <https://doi.org/10.1890/14-1639.1>
- Chauvenet, A. L. M., Ewen, J. G., Armstrong, D. P., Coulson, T., Blackburn, T. M., Adams, L., ... Pettorelli, N. (2012). Does supplemental feeding affect the viability of translocated populations? The example of the hihi. *Animal Conservation*, 15(4), 337–350. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-1795.2012.00522.x>
- Clout, M., & Craig, J. (1995). The conservation of critically endangered flightless birds in New Zealand. *IBIS*, 137, S181–S190.
- Crates, R. A., Firth, J. A., Farine, D. R., Garroby, C. J., Kidd, L. R., Aplin, L. M., Radersma, R., ... Verhelst, B. L. (2016). Individual variation in winter supplementary food consumption and its consequences for reproduction in wild birds. *Journal of Avian Biology*, 47(5), 678–689. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jav.00936>
- Crawley, M. J. (2012). *The R book*. Chichester, UK: John Wiley & Sons. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118448908>
- Eastwood, J. R., Berg, M. L., Spolding, B., Buchanan, K. L., Bennett, A. T., & Walder, K. (2015). Prevalence of beak and feather disease virus in wild *Platycercus elegans*: Comparison of three tissue types using a probe-based real-time qPCR test. *Australian Journal of Zoology*, 63(1), 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.1071/ZO14052>
- Ewen, J. G., Walker, L., Canessa, S., & Groombridge, J. J. (2015). Improving supplementary feeding in species conservation. *Conservation Biology*, 29(2), 341–349. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cobi.12410>
- Harrison, T. J., Smith, J. A., Martin, G. R., Chamberlain, D. E., Bearhop, S., Robb, G. N., & Reynolds, S. J. (2010). Does food supplementation really enhance productivity of breeding birds? *Oecologia*, 164(2), 311–320. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00442-010-1645-x>
- Hasselquist, D., Wasson, M. F., & Winkler, D. W. (2001). Humoral immunocompetence correlates with date of egg-laying and reflects work load in female tree swallows. *Behavioral Ecology*, 12(1), 93–97. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordjournals.beheco.a000384>
- Hobson, K. A., & Clark, R. G. (1992). Assessing avian diets using stable isotopes I: Turnover of  $^{13}\text{C}$  in tissues. *Condor*, 94, 181–188. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1368807>
- Inger, R., & Bearhop, S. (2008). Applications of stable isotope analyses to avian ecology. *Ibis*, 150(3), 447–461.
- Johnson, P. C. D. (2014). Extension of Nakagawa & Schielzeth's R<sup>2</sup> GLMM to random slopes models. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*, 5, 944–946. <https://doi.org/10.1111/2041-210X.12225>
- Jones, C. G., & Merton, D. V. (2012). A tale of two islands: The rescue and recovery of endemic birds in New Zealand and Mauritius. In J. G. Ewen, D. P. Armstrong, K. A. Parker & P. J. Seddon (Eds), *Reintroduction biology: Integrating science and management* (pp. 33–72). Oxford, UK: Wiley-Blackwell. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781444355833>
- Jones, C., Tollington, S., Raisin, C., Zuel, N., & Tatayah, V. (2013). Birds of the Mascarenes: *Psittacula*. In R. Safford & F. Hawkins (Eds.), *The birds of Africa: Volume VIII: The Malagasy region* (pp. 430–438). London, UK: A&C Black Ltd.
- Kundu, S., Faulkes, C. G., Greenwood, A. G., Jones, C. G., Kaiser, P., Lyne, O. D., ... Groombridge, J. J. (2012). Tracking viral evolution during a disease outbreak: The rapid and complete selective sweep of a circovirus in the endangered Echo parakeet. *Journal of Virology*, 86, 5221–5229. <https://doi.org/10.1128/JVI.06504-11>
- McDonald, T. L., & White, G. C. (2010). A comparison of regression models for small counts. *Journal of Wildlife Management*, 74(3), 514–521. <https://doi.org/10.2193/2009-270>
- Møller, A. P. (2006). Sociality, age at first reproduction and senescence: Comparative analyses of birds. *Journal of Evolutionary Biology*, 19(3), 682–689. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1420-9101.2005.01065.x>
- Murray, M. H., Becker, D. J., Hall, R. J., & Hernandez, S. M. (2016). Wildlife health and supplemental feeding: A review and management recommendations. *Biological Conservation*, 204, 163–174. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2016.10.034>
- Naguib, M., Riebel, K., Marzal, A., & Gil, D. (2004). Nestling immunocompetence and testosterone covary with brood size in a songbird. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 271(1541), 833. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2003.2673>
- Newey, S., Allison, P., Thirgood, S. J., Smith, A. A., & Graham, I. M. (2009). Using PIT-tag technology to target supplementary feeding studies. *Wildlife Biology*, 15(4), 405–411. <https://doi.org/10.2981/08-083>
- Newton, I. (1989). *Lifetime reproduction in birds*. London, UK: Academic Press.
- Nicholls, J. A., Double, M. C., Rowell, D. M., & Magrath, R. D. (2000). The evolution of cooperative and pair breeding in thornbills Acanthiza (Pardalotidae). *Journal of Avian Biology*, 31(2), 165–176.
- Oro, D., Hernández, N., Jover, L., & Genovart, M. (2014). From recruitment to senescence: Food shapes the age-dependent pattern of

- breeding performance in a long-lived bird. *Ecology*, 95(2), 446–457. <https://doi.org/10.1890/13-0331.1>
- Parnell, A., Inger, R., Bearhop, S., & Jackson, A. (2008). SIAR: stable isotope analysis in R. The Comprehensive R Archive Network.
- Parnell, A. C., Phillips, D. L., Bearhop, S., Semmens, B. X., Ward, E. J., Moore, J. W., ... Inger, R. (2013). Bayesian stable isotope mixing models. *Environmetrics*, 24(6), 387–399.
- Peach, W. J., Mallord, J. W., Ockendon, N., Orsman, C. J., & Haines, W. G. (2015). Invertebrate prey availability limits reproductive success but not breeding population size in suburban house sparrows *Passer domesticus*. *IBIS*, 157(3), 601–613. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ibi.12264>
- R Development Core Team. (2017). *R: A language and environment for statistical computing*. Vienna, Austria: R Foundation for Statistical Computing.
- Raisin, C., Frantz, A. C., Kundu, S., Greenwood, A. G., Jones, C. G., Zuel, N., & Groombridge, J. J. (2012). Genetic consequences of intensive conservation management for the Mauritius parakeet. *Conservation Genetics*, 13, 1–9.
- Regnard, G. L., Boyes, R. S., Martin, R. O., Hitzeroth, I. I., & Rybicki, E. P. (2015). Beak and feather disease virus: Correlation between viral load and clinical signs in wild Cape parrots (*Poicephalus robustus*) in South Africa. *Archives of Virology*, 160(1), 339–344.
- Robb, G. N., McDonald, R. A., Chamberlain, D. E., & Bearhop, S. (2008). Food for thought: Supplementary feeding as a driver of ecological change in avian populations. *Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment*, 6, 476–484. <https://doi.org/10.1890/060152>
- Robb, G. N., McDonald, R. A., Inger, R., Reynolds, S. J., Newton, J., McGill, R. A., ... Bearhop, S. (2011). Using stable-isotope analysis as a technique for determining consumption of supplementary foods by individual birds. *The Condor*, 113(3), 475–482. <https://doi.org/10.1525/cond.2011.090111>
- Robinson, J. P., Williams, I. D., Edwards, A. M., McPherson, J., Yeager, L., Vigliola, L., ... Baum, J. K. (2016). Fishing degrades size structure of coral reef fish communities. *Global Change Biology*, 23, 1009–1022.
- Saino, N., Incagli, M., Martinelli, R., Ambrosini, R., & Møller, A. P. (2001). Immunity, growth and begging behaviour of nestling barn swallows *Hirundo rustica* in relation to hatching order. *Journal of Avian Biology*, 32(3), 263–270. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0908-8857.2001.320309.x>
- Salleh Hudin, N., de Neve, L., Strubbe, D., Fairhurst, G. D., Vangestel, C., Peach, W. J., & Lens, L. (2017). Supplementary feeding increases nestling feather corticosterone early in the breeding season in house sparrows. *Ecology and Evolution*, 7(16), 6163–6171. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ece3.3114>
- Tollington, S., Ewen, J. G., Newton, J., McGill, A. R., Smith, D., Henshaw, A., ... Groombridge, J. (2018). Data from: Individual consumption of supplemental food as a predictor of reproductive performance and viral infection intensity. *Dryad Digital Repository*. <https://doi.org/10.5061/dryad.t7s15hp>
- Tollington, S., Greenwood, A., Jones, C., Hoeck, P., Tatayah, V., & Groombridge, J. (2015). Long-term monitoring of an endangered parakeet population reveals disproportionate effects of viral outbreak on productivity of supplementary-fed birds but little signal of immune response. *Journal of Animal Ecology*, 84, 969–977. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2656.12348>
- Tollington, S., Jones, C. G., Greenwood, A., Tatayah, V., Raisin, C., Burke, T., ... Groombridge, J. J. (2013). Long-term, fine-scale temporal patterns of genetic diversity in the restored Mauritius parakeet reveal genetic impacts of management and associated demographic effects on reintroduction programmes. *Biological Conservation*, 161, 28–38. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2013.02.013>
- Torres, R., Drummond, H., & Velando, A. (2011). Parental age and lifespan influence offspring recruitment: A long-term study in a seabird. *PLoS ONE*, 6(11), e27245. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0027245>
- Walters, J. R., Derrickson, S. R., Fry, D. M., Haig, S. M., Marzluff, J. M., & Wunderle, J. M. Jr (2010). Status of the California condor (*Gymnogyps californianus*) and efforts to achieve its recovery. *The Auk*, 127, 969–1001. <https://doi.org/10.1525/auk.2010.127.4.969>
- Whittingham, M. J., Stephens, P. A., Bradbury, R. B., & Freckleton, R. P. (2006). Why do we still use stepwise modelling in ecology and behaviour? *Journal of Animal Ecology*, 75, 1182–1189. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2656.2006.01141.x>
- Wilcoxon, T. E., Horn, D. J., Hogan, B. M., Hubble, C. N., Huber, S. J., Flamm, J., ... Wrobel, E. R. (2015). Effects of bird-feeding activities on the health of wild birds. *Conservation Physiology*, 3(1), cov058. <https://doi.org/10.1093/conphys/cov058>
- Zuur, A. F., Ieno, E. N., Walker, N. J., Saveliev, A. A., & Smith, G. M. (2009). *Mixed effects models and extensions in ecology with R*. New York, NY: Springer Verlag. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-87458-6>

## SUPPORTING INFORMATION

Additional supporting information may be found online in the Supporting Information section at the end of the article.

**How to cite this article:** Tollington S, Ewen JG, Newton J, et al. Individual consumption of supplemental food as a predictor of reproductive performance and viral infection intensity. *J Appl Ecol*. 2018;00:1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2664.13303>