

Scotland's Rural College

Interactions between four species in a complex wildlife:livestock disease community: implications for Mycobacterium bovis maintenance and transmission

Cowie, CE; Hutchings, MR; Barasona, JA; Gortazar, C; Vicente, J; White, PCL

Published in:

European Journal of Wildlife Research

DOI:

[10.1007/s10344-015-0973-x](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10344-015-0973-x)

First published: 10/11/2015

Document Version

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

[Link to publication](#)

Citation for pulished version (APA):

Cowie, CE., Hutchings, MR., Barasona, JA., Gortazar, C., Vicente, J., & White, PCL. (2015). Interactions between four species in a complex wildlife:livestock disease community: implications for Mycobacterium bovis maintenance and transmission. *European Journal of Wildlife Research*, 62(1), 51 - 64. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10344-015-0973-x>

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal ?

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

1 **Interactions between four species in a complex wildlife:livestock disease community:**
2 **implications for *Mycobacterium bovis* maintenance and transmission**

3

4 Authors: Catherine E. Cowie^{1,2}, Michael R. Hutchings³, Jose Angel Barasona², Christian
5 Gortázar², Joaquín Vicente², Piran C. L. White¹

6

7 ¹Environment Department, University of York, Heslington, York, YO10 5DD, UK.

8 ²SaBio-IREC Wildlife Research Institute (CSIC–UCLM–JCCM), Ronda de Toledo s/n.,
9 13005 Ciudad Real, Spain.

10 ³Scotland's Rural College, King's Buildings, West Mains Road, Edinburgh, EH9 3JG, UK.

11

12

13 Corresponding author:

14 Catherine E. Cowie

15 Environment Department, University of York, Heslington, York, YO10 5DD, United
16 Kingdom.

17 Email: cel108@york.ac.uk

18 Telephone: +447875 333756

19

1 Abstract

2

3 Livestock diseases such as bovine tuberculosis can have considerable negative effects on
4 human health and economic activity. Wildlife reservoirs often hinder disease eradication in
5 sympatric livestock populations. Therefore, quantifying interactions between wildlife and
6 livestock is an important aspect of understanding disease persistence. This study was
7 conducted on an extensive cattle farm in south-west Spain, where cattle, domestic pigs, wild
8 boar and red deer are considered to be part of a tuberculosis host community. We tested the
9 hypothesis that the frequency of both types of interactions would be greater at food and water
10 sites, due to the aggregation of individuals from multiple species at these locations. We
11 measured direct and indirect interactions between individuals using GPS and proximity
12 loggers. Over 57,000 direct interactions were recorded over a two-year period, of which 875
13 (1.5%) occurred between different species and 216 (0.38%) occurred between wildlife and
14 livestock. Most direct and indirect interactions occurred at water sites. Over 90% of indirect
15 interactions between wildlife and livestock took place within the estimated 3-day
16 environmental survival time of *Mycobacterium bovis* in this habitat. Red deer home ranges
17 and daily activity patterns revealed significant spatial and temporal overlaps with cattle,
18 particularly in autumn. Suids and red deer also cross the farm boundary regularly, introducing
19 a between-farm interaction risk. The infrequent occurrence of direct interactions between
20 individuals from different species suggests that they are unlikely to be the sole mode of
21 disease transmission, and that indirect interactions may play an important role.

22

23

24 Keywords

25 Bovine tuberculosis, multi-host pathogens, wildlife:livestock interface, proximity logging,
26 contact rates, species interactions

1 Introduction

2

3 Livestock diseases pose a significant threat to human health, social wellbeing and economic
4 activity (Michel et al. 2010; Schiller et al. 2011). Over 77% of the pathogens affecting
5 domestic mammals can infect multiple hosts (Cleaveland et al. 2001; Martin et al. 2011).
6 This can result in epidemiologically connected multi-species communities in which a
7 pathogen persists (Haydon et al. 2002). Disease transmission depends on the characteristics
8 and virulence of the pathogen, and how long it can survive in the environment, as well as the
9 ecology, susceptibility and pathogen excretion rates of each host species, existing disease
10 prevalence, environmental conditions and contact between infected and susceptible animals
11 (Anderson and May 1979; Martin et al. 2011; Craft et al. 2011; Vander Wal et al. 2012).
12 Social behaviour strongly influences interactions between individuals of the same and
13 different species (Böhm et al. 2008; Drewe 2010). This study focusses on spatially and
14 temporally quantifying the contacts between individuals from multiple species in a disease
15 community. Identifying the different roles each species plays in the transmission of a disease
16 will improve the evidence base for making decisions about strategies for effective disease
17 management.

18

19 Inter-species transmission of disease may occur through direct or indirect interactions
20 between individuals. Direct interaction refers to direct physical contact or very close
21 proximity between individuals. In a direct interaction a pathogen may be passed between
22 individuals with little or no exposure to the environment, e.g. physical contact or inhalation
23 of aerosol particles from the exhalation of an infected individual. Indirect interaction refers to
24 shared space use, where individuals visit the same location at different times. They are likely
25 to be driven by intake behaviour such as feeding or drinking (Hutchings and Harris 1997),
26 particularly if food and water resources are not evenly distributed, causing aggregation of
27 multiple species (Barasona et al. 2014a). Transmission through indirect interaction requires
28 the pathogen to survive exposure to the environment for sufficient time remain infective
29 when encountered by different potential host individuals. Indirect interactions may be
30 important in the transmission of diseases that demonstrate environmental survival (Hutchings
31 and Harris 1999; Drewe et al. 2013), and should be considered in the management of these
32 diseases (Kukielka et al. 2013).

1

2 Proximity data loggers and GPS technology allow for the quantification of direct and indirect
3 interactions (Prange et al. 2006; Walrath 2011; Drewe et al. 2012). To date only two studies
4 have used proximity loggers to quantify close direct interactions between multiple species;
5 both studying contact between badgers (*Meles meles*) and cattle (*Bos primigenius*) in the UK
6 with reference to tuberculosis (TB) transmission. Böhm et al. (2009) identified considerable
7 individual heterogeneity in contact rates and found that direct contacts between badgers and
8 cattle did occur, although they were infrequent. Drewe et al. (2013) found that indirect
9 interactions between species were much more frequent overall than direct interactions. GPS
10 loggers have been used to identify the probability of interaction between cattle and wild boar
11 in Spain (Barasona et al. 2014a) wild and domestic bovids in Africa (Miguel et al. 2013) and
12 between cattle and pigs in Texas (Cooper et al. 2010). They have also shown that proximity
13 between elk (*Cervus elaphus*), mule deer (*Odocoileus hemionus*) and cattle in the USA varied
14 with different combinations of species (zu Dohna et al. 2014).

15

16 TB is one of the most widespread examples of a disease that is prevalent in both wildlife and
17 livestock (Fitzgerald and Kaneene 2013). Primarily caused in cattle by *Mycobacterium bovis*
18 infection, this bacterial disease can spill over into human and wildlife populations. Wildlife
19 reservoirs have been identified in brush-tailed possums (*Trichosurus vulpecula*) in New
20 Zealand (Anderson et al. 2013), badgers in the England, Wales and Ireland (O'Connor et al.
21 2012), wild deer in the USA and Canada (Nishi et al. 2006; O'Brien et al. 2011), buffalo and
22 other wildlife in South Africa (Renwick et al. 2007) and European bison (*Bison bonasus*) and
23 wild boar (*Sus scrofa*) in Europe (Naranjo et al. 2008; Gortázar et al. 2011; Krajewska et al.
24 2015). In an infected animal, *M. bovis* can be excreted in all bodily fluids, meaning
25 transmission is possible directly through close contact (aerosol transmission, meat or milk
26 ingestion) or indirectly via contact with fluids or excreta in the environment (Neill et al.
27 2001; Radostits et al. 2007).

28

29 Control of TB is particularly complicated where there are multiple livestock and wildlife
30 hosts. This is the case in south-central Spain, an area where relatively low density cattle and
31 pig (*Sus scrofa domesticus*) rearing occurs alongside red deer (*Cervus elaphus*) and wild boar

1 hunting activities (Kukeilka et al. 2013; Cowie et al. 2014). There is therefore significant
2 potential for interactions between large game and domestic species, providing opportunities
3 for disease transmission and maintenance. Bovine TB outbreaks occur in distinct clusters
4 within the region, and are significantly positively associated with wild boar TB prevalence
5 and hunting activities (Rodríguez-Prieto et al. 2012; Martínez-López et al. 2013). The
6 presence of wildlife has also been shown to be a significant risk factor for bovine TB at the
7 individual farm level (Cowie et al. 2014). Both cattle and wildlife display high TB prevalence
8 in south-central Spain, and levels in wild boar and red deer have increased over the last
9 twelve years (Vicente et al. 2013). It is thought that the presence of these wildlife reservoirs
10 is inhibiting eradication of TB in the cattle population despite a long standing test-and-
11 slaughter scheme (Diez et al. 2002; Naranjo et al. 2008; Gortazar et al. 2011).

12

13 In this study we aimed to spatially and temporally quantify direct and indirect interactions
14 between cattle, pigs, red deer and wild boar in a mixed community infected with *M. bovis*.
15 Using these data, we tested the hypothesis that direct interactions would be much less
16 frequent than indirect ones, and that the frequency of both types of interactions would be
17 enhanced by food and water sites, due to the aggregation of individuals from multiple species
18 at these locations. Furthermore, we hypothesised that seasonal variation in the availability of
19 food and water sites would alter this pattern of aggregation (and hence the level of
20 interactions) throughout the year. Finally, we investigated the frequency of indirect
21 interactions that occurred within a range of critical time windows that relate to the
22 environmental survival time of *M. bovis* and other diseases. To our knowledge, this is the first
23 study to quantify close interactions between known individuals from multiple wildlife and
24 livestock species.

1 Methods

2

3 *Study area*

4 The landscape in south-central Spain is characterised by the agroforestry system “dehesa”, an
5 open savannah-like habitat with low densities of oak trees (*Quercus spp*), commonly adjacent
6 to areas of forest and scrubland (Gaspar et al. 2009). Extensive livestock rearing of beef
7 cattle, small ruminants (sheep and some goats) and Iberian pigs takes place here at low
8 stocking densities (Plieninger et al. 2004; Milan et al. 2006; Gaspar et al. 2008). Farm sizes
9 are highly variable, with a recent study identifying a mean size of 467ha (range 37-2040ha)
10 (Cowie et al. 2014). The area has high densities of red deer and wild boar (Acevedo et al.
11 2008) where they are managed for recreational hunting activities, often on the same or
12 adjacent land as livestock farming (Herruzo and Martinez-Jauregui 2013), where densities
13 tend to be lower. TB is prevalent in this area despite test-and-slaughter schemes, affecting
14 3.54% of cattle herds in the area in 2012 (RASVE 2014). Large scale and long term sampling
15 studies have also revealed a high prevalence in wild boar (59.0%) and red deer (9.4%) in the
16 region (Vicente et al. 2013).

17

18 Environmental conditions vary throughout the year, with temperature ranging from below
19 zero to over 40°C. A wet season starts in autumn and typically contributes most of the annual
20 rainfall within 3 months. As a result, water and food for animals are often limited in the peak
21 of the dry season (from June to September) and livestock receive supplementary food and
22 water from artificial sources (Kukielka et al. 2013). At the end of the dry season, acorns fall
23 from the oak trees (an event called “Montanera”) providing food for animals, especially pigs
24 and wildlife species.

25

26 *Study farm*

27 This study was conducted on a regionally representative, traditionally managed beef cattle
28 rearing farm which also conducts hunting activities, located in Ciudad Real province. The
29 farm covers 300ha, and was rearing an average of 90 “Retinta” breed cattle and 5 adult
30 Iberian pigs during the study period. Cattle and pigs received supplementary food at two

1 main locations in the summer months. Simple wire fencing was used at the farm boundaries.
2 This contained cattle but allowed pigs and wildlife species to cross into and out of the farm.
3 Adjoining properties were used for cattle and pig rearing, and/or as hunting estates.

4

5 The farm is considered representative of cattle farms in the region because of typical
6 management practices, stocking densities, environmental conditions and TB prevalence. One
7 difference is that parts of the farm border the Montoro reservoir (figure 1), meaning that
8 wildlife and livestock had greater access to water year round than is often available on other
9 farms in the region. Within the farm, water was available from seasonal streams, managed by
10 two small reservoirs.

11

12 Wildlife densities on the study farm are moderate compared with those on hunting estates in
13 the area, but representative of cattle farms, with night-time spotlight transects revealing no
14 more than 15-20 red deer, 10 roe deer and 10 wild boar on 300ha. Government sampling of
15 the farm's cattle with skin tests confirmed by culture showed a mean TB prevalence of 8.65%
16 during the study period. Wildlife shot on the farm and the neighbouring hunting estates were
17 tested for *M. bovis* infection following methods used by Vicente et al. (2006). This revealed
18 mean local prevalences of 84% in wild boar and 30% in red deer. Samples from the Iberian
19 pigs on the farm were also tested, with seropositivity indicating that 36% (n=25, including
20 juveniles) had antibodies against members of the *M. tuberculosis* complex (Aurtenetxe et al.
21 2008).

22

23 *Data collection*

24 We deployed proximity data loggers (Sirtrack Tracking Solutions, New Zealand) and GPS
25 location loggers (Microsensory Systems, Spain) on the livestock and wildlife species, as well
26 as at base stations around the farm. Prior to collaring any animals, base stations with
27 proximity loggers were placed at the site of key resources on the farm – food points, water
28 sources and control points (figure 1). Food points are places where concentrated cattle feed
29 was provided, either in permanent raised troughs or on the ground. Control points were
30 placed at random within areas with none of the key resources and no animal paths that led to
31 any key resources. Base stations were set to record contacts at UHF30, triggering recording at

1 an estimated radius of 3.1m around the base station (Goodman 2007). Base stations were
2 placed 1-2 metres above the ground, hung from existing natural features such as dead trees
3 where possible, and were left in place for 1 month before recording began to avoid bias
4 caused by animal investigation of the novel objects.

5

6 Cattle collaring took place during routine veterinary inspections of the cattle, whilst they
7 were restrained in the farm's own cattle race. Pigs were captured individually and held by
8 hand during collaring. Collaring red deer and wild boar required the use of traps, following
9 methods described in greater detail by Barasona et al. (2013a). The collaring strategy was
10 therefore opportunistic and dependent on the animals captured. All animal proximity loggers
11 were set to a UHF setting of 45, triggering recording if another collared animal comes within
12 a radius of 1.5m (Goodman 2007). This differed from the base stations in order to ensure that
13 only very close contacts between animals were recorded as direct contacts. Four GPS loggers
14 were available and these were deployed to maximise information from wildlife species
15 (Barasona et al. 2014a). Where collars did not fall off, they were recovered during routine
16 game hunting events.

17

18 *Data processing*

19 Following downloading of data from the collars, information from the 24-hour periods
20 immediately after collaring and immediately before collar retrieval was removed from the
21 data set. Each dyad of animals that contacted each other should have two reciprocal data sets.
22 In reality these often differ slightly, so the longest data set for each dyad was retained for
23 further analysis on the assumption that a contact may have been missed by one collar, but
24 could not have been generated by the other collar if the contact had not occurred. One-way
25 ANOVA tests were used to compare the means of the used and rejected datasets for each
26 dyad.

27

28 The collars recorded two contacts with an interval between them of up to 17 seconds as one
29 long continuous contact. This time duration is known as the separation time. Short separation
30 times allow for fine scale data on direct contacts, but have been shown to increase the
31 likelihood of broken contacts, where one long contact is recorded as multiple shorter contacts

1 (Prange et al. 2006). These broken contacts are often of one second duration and are not
2 considered valid contacts when evaluating possible disease transmission. Using Drewe et al.
3 (2012)'s 'contactweld' function in R (version 2.15.3, R Core Development Team, 2012)
4 contacts with a separation time of 60 seconds or less were merged into single longer contacts.
5 After this, any remaining one second contacts were removed from the data set.

6

7 *Connectedness to resources*

8 Raw contact data do not account for the amount of time each individual wore the logger, and
9 the number of base stations it could contact (which did vary slightly). The connectivity
10 measures C_{freq} and C_{dur} were therefore calculated to allow for comparisons between base
11 station types. These were calculated for each species, following the methods of Böhm et al.
12 (2009), as:

13

14

C_{freq} :

$$\left(\frac{\text{Total number of contacts}}{\text{Number of days individual was collared}} \right)$$

Daily number of base stations available for contact

15

16

C_{dur} :

$$\left(\frac{\text{Total duration of contacts}}{\text{Number of days individual was collared}} \right)$$

Daily number of base stations available for contact

17

18

19 *Indirect interactions data analysis*

20 GPS data for each species allowed for the calculation of home range areas, and the overlaps
21 between these home ranges. Using the 'adehabitat' package in R, the kernel density
22 estimation was used to calculate the utilisation distribution (UD) with least-squares cross
23 validation for each individual. This method does not rely on predetermined distributions,

1 allows for the incorporation of various centres of activity and can be used where limited data
2 are available. Core and home ranges were set as 50% and 95% UD respectively (Barasona et
3 al. 2014a), and were calculated for each season. GPS data also provided information about
4 the study animals' movements, both on and off the farm. Using the spatial analysis
5 programme QGIS (version 1.8.0, Quantum GIS Development Team, 2013), fixes were
6 classified as inside or outside of the farm boundary, and the number of times each individual
7 crossed the boundary was calculated, and standardised by the number of days each animal
8 was collared.

9

10 Finally, the intervals between visits to base stations by two individuals of the same or
11 different species were classified into a range of critical time windows (CTWs). Thirteen
12 CTWs were selected, ranging from 30 seconds to 12 days, to account for the known
13 environmental survival times of different livestock diseases. The number and percentage of
14 contacts, and the number divided by the number of base stations at each resource were
15 calculated for each dyad of species.

16

1 Results

2

3 *Data returns*

4 Proximity data loggers returned over 400,000 direct contacts between 17 cows, eight pigs,
5 two red deer and two wild boar. This represented 24%, 63%, 13% and 20% of the estimated
6 available population of each species respectively. Data were collected continuously for 2
7 years starting in summer 2010, though there were only 202 consecutive days where all four
8 species types were collared at the same time.

9

10 After removing reciprocal contacts from each dyad of individuals, significant levels of
11 agreement between the used and rejected datasets were identified. ANOVA test p values
12 ranged from 0.02 – <0.0001, with R^2 values from 0.61 – 0.97. The data contained large
13 proportions of one second contacts. To provide an example with the cattle contact data, the
14 raw data contained 43.1% (95% CIs = 35.7 – 50.4) one second contacts. Merging contacts
15 with a separation time of less than 60 seconds resulted in a mean 50.3% (95% CIs = 42.4 –
16 58.1) reduction in the number of these contacts. However, the percentage of one second
17 contacts remained high after merging, at 47.0% (95% CIs = 44.5 – 49.5). All remaining one
18 second contacts were then removed from further analysis. Similar patterns were observed in
19 data for all species and the same processes were applied, resulting in a direct contact dataset
20 of 57,188 contacts.

21

22 Proximity loggers at base stations returned over 75,000 raw contacts from four control, two
23 food and 10 water points around the farm (figure 1). As base stations were set to record at a
24 different detection distance, the data were always taken from the base station records and
25 reciprocal contacts on the collars were discarded. After merging contacts to a separation time
26 of 60 seconds and removing one second contacts, 12,628 contacts remained for further
27 analysis.

28

1 GPS loggers were attached to two cows, one pig, two red deer and two wild boar. The herd
2 behaviour of the pigs and cattle means that the livestock GPS data normally represent the
3 approximate position of the majority of the animals of that species. After the removal of any
4 erroneous records, 43,595 fixes were used in further analysis. Most fixes were recorded from
5 cattle (43%) and red deer (44%), whilst pigs (5%) and wild boar (8%) returned fewer fixes
6 because they more frequently lost satellite reception and tended to lose their collars. All
7 species recorded adequate fixes to exceed the minimum of 50 fixes required for kernel home
8 range estimation (Seaman et al. 1999).

9

10 *Direct interactions*

11 Of the 57,188 direct contacts recorded, 875 (1.53%) contacts were observed between
12 different species, and 216 (0.38%) were between wildlife and livestock (figure 2). Variation
13 was observed over the seasons for both contact frequency and mean contact duration. Cattle-
14 pig and cattle-red deer contacts occurred more frequently in autumn and winter. Considerable
15 variation was observed in the duration of contacts. Cattle-cattle and pig-pig contacts were
16 each significantly longer in winter (GLM, both $p < 0.001$) and cattle-pig contacts had
17 significantly longer durations in autumn (GLM, $p < 0.001$).

18

19 *Home range overlaps*

20 Mean livestock home ranges (95%UD) were 2.08km^2 in cattle and 4.21km^2 in pigs. Mean
21 home ranges for wildlife were 7.25km^2 in red deer and 1.96km^2 in wild boar. Home range
22 overlaps were high, particularly between red deer and cattle, whose combined home ranges
23 overlapped by over 4.0km^2 (27% and 95% of the total range for each species respectively)
24 throughout the year. Overlaps between individual red deer, cattle and pigs, and pigs and red
25 deer all peaked considerably in autumn. Core (50%UD) ranges were much smaller, with only
26 red deer and cattle maintaining a core range overlap of over 0.5km^2 (3% and 12%
27 respectively) throughout the year. Cattle-wild boar overlaps were comparatively low, with no
28 core range overlap recorded.

29

30

1

2 *Farm boundary crossings*

3 The GPS data also allowed us to investigate animal movements across the farm boundary.
4 Cattle were unable to cross farm boundaries, but pigs showed the highest rate of boundary
5 crossings at 1.4 crossings per day. Red deer showed far more frequent crossings (1.19
6 crossings individual⁻¹ day⁻¹) than wild boar (0.61 crossings individual⁻¹ day⁻¹).

7

8 *Daily activity patterns*

9 Similarities were observed in the daily activity patterns of red deer and cattle (figure 3), with
10 both species most active at dawn and dusk. Other species did not show any notable alignment
11 with cattle activity patterns.

12

13 *Connectedness to resources*

14 Over 50% of all individuals of each species were detected at resource locations, with every
15 individual except one red deer being detected at both food and water points. The same C_{freq}
16 and C_{dur} measures of connectedness were calculated between each individual and each
17 resource type. C_{freq} (figure 4) varied considerably between species and resources. Livestock
18 showed the highest connectedness to food locations. Wildlife appeared to use these resources
19 much less, with wild boar showing some connection to control points. C_{dur} measures (figure
20 5) displayed very similar patterns to C_{freq} , showing that cattle are the only species to stay for
21 long durations at resource points.

22

23 *Critical time window (CTW) analysis*

24 The number of indirect interactions (where one animal visits a resource and then another of
25 the same or a different species visits the same location at a later time) that occurred with
26 intervals less than the range of CTWs were calculated for intra- (figure 6) and inter-species
27 (figure 7) interactions. Most intra-species indirect interactions occurred within short CTWs,
28 with 50% or more occurring within five minutes at all resource types. When standardised by

1 the number of base stations, the majority of these interactions occurred at food resource
2 points. Pigs were also more likely to have indirect interactions at food sites, but these were
3 more spread out, with 50% of these interactions occurring within a three hour interval. No
4 indirect interactions were recorded between red deer at food sites, but 50% of indirect
5 interactions at water points fell within the five minute CTW. Few indirect interactions
6 between different species were observed, and most interactions fell within longer CTWs.

7

8

1 Discussion

2

3 *Data evaluation*

4 Inter- and intra-species interactions recorded by proximity loggers cannot be interpreted
5 directly as actual disease transmission opportunities, since they provide no information on the
6 type of interaction that occurred. Nevertheless, the combination of GPS and proximity logger
7 technology provides the best available spatially and temporally explicit data on local animal
8 movements and social contacts (e.g. Drewe et al. 2012), and hence can serve as an indication
9 of potential transmission opportunities. A larger sample of wildlife individuals would allow
10 for more confidence in our conclusions. Problems were encountered with keeping collars on
11 wild boar and pigs, attracting deer into traps, and with pigs occupying traps intended for wild
12 boar. Wildlife were found at only moderate densities on the farm (Acevedo et al. 2007;
13 Acevedo et al. 2008), which limited trapping success. However, the choice of study site was
14 considered important as it is representative of the study area. Data from proximity loggers has
15 great potential for informing animal social networks and models (e.g. Marsh et al. 2011) but
16 for detailed analysis it is important to include the majority of the study population in order to
17 draw confident conclusions. Furthermore, if social interactions are being studied in relation to
18 disease transmission and the disease is known to survive in the environment, it is also very
19 important to investigate when and where indirect interactions occur (Kukielka et al. 2013).

20

21 *Direct interactions*

22 This study has quantified direct and indirect interactions between individuals in a multi-host
23 disease community. As with similar research (Drewe et al. 2013), data on direct interactions
24 between different species were limited, despite the long-term continuous sampling. Direct
25 intra-species contacts were frequent, but direct inter-species interactions were relatively rare,
26 identifying more opportunity for disease transmission within species than between species.
27 Nonetheless, this highlights the possible importance of the environmental survival of
28 pathogens and indirect interactions between individuals in maintaining disease.

29

1 The direct contacts that were recorded do indicate that cattle contacts with both red deer and
2 pigs are most frequent in autumn (at the end of the dry season, during the acorn mast).
3 Furthermore, cattle-pig contacts were significantly longer at this time. This relates to previous
4 work on the study farm that showed the number of visits to farm resources increased through
5 the dry season and peaked during the acorn season in autumn (Kukielka et al. 2013), giving
6 further confidence that the collars were identifying real changes in behaviour.

7

8 *Indirect interactions*

9 In our data set, year-round core and home range overlaps were highest for cattle and red deer,
10 with all overlaps increasing in autumn (during the acorn mast). The acorn food source is the
11 likely reason for aggregation of both species, and foraging in the same locations may increase
12 the likelihood of transmission of pathogens between different individuals. Furthermore,
13 foraging may be taking place at similar times for cattle and red deer as their daily activity
14 levels follow such similar patterns. Red deer also crossed the farm boundary more than one
15 time per day on average, increasing the risk of encountering disease outside the farm and then
16 transmitting it to livestock within the farm. However, pigs also showed moderate levels of
17 home range overlap with cattle, and the highest rate of boundary crossings. Pigs may be an
18 important part of the disease cycle in this region, as has been previously identified in another
19 Mediterranean system in Sicily (Di Marco et al. 2012). Further research and testing of pig
20 and red deer movements and disease in this area may be important for a fuller understand of
21 disease maintenance and spread. In terms of disease transmission, the relative importance of
22 each species will depend on the dyad of species, and the pathogen. For instance, red deer
23 share more viral pathogens with cattle, whilst wild boar have more pathogens in common
24 with pigs (Miller et al. 2013).

25

26 Most indirect interactions between individuals from different species occurred at water
27 points. Red deer and cattle also showed the highest connectivity to water, though red deer
28 generally stayed at water points for shorter durations. Water points should therefore be
29 considered a potential hotspot for disease transmission between wildlife and livestock in
30 south-central Spain. Indeed, Vicente et al. (2007) described a positive association between
31 wildlife aggregation at water and ground-level feeding sites and tuberculous-like lesions in

1 animals from large game hunting estates, suggesting that host aggregation could drive disease
2 transmission. Additionally, the density of water points on farms has been shown to be
3 negatively associated with TB risk in cattle (Kaneene et al. 2002; Cowie et al. 2014) and in
4 wildlife (Barasona et al. 2014b). This means that having fewer sources of water is associated
5 with an increased risk of bovine TB on the farm. The availability of water on our study farm
6 from the reservoir introduces potential bias into our results. However, as water points caused
7 aggregation even with this other water source available, this suggests that water may be a
8 very important risk factor for disease in places where it is more limited. In combination with
9 the known TB prevalence data in the area and the knowledge that wildlife here support the
10 disease in the absence of cattle (Gortazar et al. 2005; Corner 2006; Vicente et al. 2006;
11 Naranjo et al. 2008), it seems likely that indirect interactions at key resource points are more
12 important than direct contact in the transmission of TB in this area.

13

14 *Critical time windows*

15 Intra-species indirect interactions occurred much more frequently in short CTWs than inter-
16 species interactions. Cattle and pigs had most of these contacts at supplementary food sites,
17 though red deer never utilised the same food sites and instead showed most indirect
18 interactions at water points. All species showed more indirect interactions at resource sites
19 compared to control sites, indicating aggregation occurring at these resources. However,
20 indirect inter-species interactions were still avoided, with less than 50% of use of the same
21 resources by different species occurring within a 6-hour CTW. Indirect interactions between
22 cattle and pigs or wild boar happened mostly at food sites, whereas red deer used the same
23 water resources. This may be because of differences in foraging strategy; it may only be
24 worthwhile for suids, who will forage by rooting, to investigate a food site after cattle have
25 consumed the majority of the food.

26

27 Regarding TB, a review of the literature on the survival of *M. bovis* in the environment
28 applied to this region suggests that on average there could be a 3-day CTW in the dry season,
29 and a 12-day CTW in the wet season (Kukielka et al. 2013). Over 90% of intra-species
30 indirect interactions at food or water resources occurred within a 3-day CTW, suggesting that
31 if a pathogen is present within a population this could be important in the maintenance and

1 spread of the disease. Between different species, we see 40-66% of indirect interactions
2 occurring within 3 days, rising to 72-100% within the 12-day wet season CTW. In the same
3 region, Barasona et al. (2013b) demonstrated that separating wildlife and livestock access to
4 water resources appears to have reduced TB prevalence in cattle. As pigs and cattle were
5 more closely connected to food resources it may also be important to consider separation of
6 livestock at feeding stations. This is currently especially important in the study region as pigs
7 are not subject to specific controls for TB (RASVE 2014).

8

9 *Management implications*

10 As most direct and indirect interactions occur within species, livestock disease testing and
11 management (such as test-and-slaughter schemes) remain important as a means of controlling
12 TB. However, enough direct and indirect interaction between livestock and wildlife was
13 observed to indicate that multiple host diseases need to be managed in the context of the
14 whole disease community. Pigs were well connected within the indirect contact network of
15 the host community through shared use of food and water resources. This is consistent with
16 the home range overlaps with cattle that peaked during the autumn acorn mast. At present,
17 pigs are not monitored for TB in Europe, though *M. bovis* infection is increasingly reported in
18 pigs in several countries (e.g. Di Marco et al. 2012; Bailey et al. 2013). In south-central
19 Spain, pigs are increasingly being refused by slaughterhouses due to visible TB-compatible
20 lesions (Gomez-Laguna et al. 2010). The TB seroprevalence in pigs of over 30% identified in
21 this study suggests further research into the significance of pigs as a TB host could improve
22 our understanding of the disease cycle on these traditionally-managed farms.

23

24 Thus far, research efforts in this area have often focussed on wild boar as the main wildlife
25 disease reservoir. However, in this study cattle showed more direct and indirect interactions
26 with red deer than with wild boar. Our data showed that red deer cross farm boundaries
27 frequently, moving into hunting estates and/or other livestock farms. Within the farm, they
28 had large home range overlaps with cattle year round, with direct contacts with cattle
29 occurring significantly more often in autumn and winter. Furthermore, their daily activity
30 patterns were notably similar to those of cattle, particularly in the morning. These results
31 suggest that the possible role of red deer in the disease system in this region of Spain should

1 receive further investigation, though the pathogenesis and excretion of a pathogen by each
2 species needs to be considered. Regarding TB, red deer prevalence in the region has been
3 shown to be stable around a mean of 9.4%, whilst mean wild boar TB prevalence is 59.0%
4 and has been increasing over the last decade (Vicente et al. 2013). Further research into direct
5 and indirect interactions between wild boar and livestock is also necessary.

6

7 Though limited, direct inter-species interactions may still have epidemiological significance.
8 However, indirect interactions not only occurred more frequently than direct interactions but
9 did so within short critical time windows. Understanding the environmental survival time of a
10 minimum infective dose of a disease would show which of the CTWs proposed in this study
11 were likely to be important. Regarding TB, a recent literature review identified only 15
12 studies published between 1930 and 2011 that estimated *M. bovis* environmental survival
13 times. Survival times ranged from no *M. bovis* recovery to recovery of genetic material after
14 300 days, on a wide range of substrates. In our study, intra-species indirect interactions
15 occurred within short CTWs, suggesting they would also be a potential route for infection
16 with viral diseases which tend to have shorter environmental survival times (Kukielka et al.
17 2013). The role of indirect interactions in disease transmission within and between species
18 needs to be explored further.

19

20 *Conclusions*

21 This study has contributed to our understanding of multi-species host communities,
22 quantifying direct and indirect interactions between multiple species and showing how they
23 are influenced by the seasonal and spatial distribution of key resources. Management
24 strategies that reduce shared wildlife and livestock space use are likely to achieve greater
25 reductions in inter-species disease transmission than if this is not considered. The efficiency
26 of these strategies could be enhanced by concentrating effort during seasons when low water
27 availability or high food availability causes aggregation of multiple species.

28

1 Acknowledgements

2

3 We would like to thank the many research assistants and volunteers who contributed to this
4 project – particularly Ignacio Cristóbal who helped to maintain the equipment and study site.
5 Esteban Arias made the project possible by allowing us access to his farm and animals.
6 Francisco the farm hand provided invaluable support in cattle collaring and wildlife trapping.
7 SRUC and IREC provided access to equipment and vehicles. SRUC receives support from
8 the Scottish Government. C.E.C. was supported by an NERC/ESRC Interdisciplinary
9 studentship. This is a contribution to PlanNacional I+D+i research grant AGL2011-30041
10 and AGL2014-56305 from MINECO and the EU FP7 grant WildTBvac (project number
11 613779). Funding was also received from “ASFORCE”, European Union's Seventh
12 Framework Programme (ref. FP7 - KBBE.2012.1.3-02).

13

14 Compliance with Ethical Standards

15

16 **Conflict of Interest:** The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

17

18 **Ethical Approval:** All applicable international, national and/or institutional guidelines for
19 the care and use of animals were followed. This article does not contain any studies with
20 human participants performed by any of the authors.

21

22

23

1 References

2

3 Acevedo P, Ruiz-Fons F, Vicente J, et al (2008) Estimating red deer abundance in a wide
4 range of management situations in Mediterranean habitats. *J Zool* 276:37–47. doi:
5 10.1111/j.1469-7998.2008.00464.x

6 Acevedo P, Vicente J, Höfle U, et al (2007) Estimation of European wild boar relative
7 abundance and aggregation: a novel method in epidemiological risk assessment.
8 *Epidemiol Infect* 135:519–27. doi: 10.1017/S0950268806007059

9 Anderson DP, Ramsey DSL, Nugent G, et al (2013) A novel approach to assess the
10 probability of disease eradication from a wild-animal reservoir host. *Epidemiol Infect*
11 141:1509–21. doi: 10.1017/S095026881200310X

12 Anderson RM, May RM (1979) Population biology of infectious diseases: Part I. *Nature*
13 280:361–367. doi: 10.1038/280361a0

14 Aurtenetxe O, Barral M, Vicente J, et al (2008) Development and validation of an enzyme-
15 linked immunosorbent assay for antibodies against *Mycobacterium bovis* in European
16 wild boar. *BMC Vet Res* 4:43. doi: 10.1186/1746-6148-4-43

17 Bailey SS, Crawshaw TR, Smith NH, Palgrave CJ (2013) *Mycobacterium bovis* infection in
18 domestic pigs in Great Britain.

19 Barasona JA, Latham M, Acevedo P, et al (2014a) Spatiotemporal interactions between wild
20 boar and cattle: implications for cross-species disease transmission. *Vet Res* 45:122. doi:
21 10.1186/s13567-014-0122-7

22 Barasona JA, López-Olvera JR, Beltrán-Beck B, et al (2013a) Trap-effectiveness and
23 response to tiletamine-zolazepam and medetomidine anaesthesia in Eurasian wild boar
24 captured with cage and corral traps. *BMC Vet Res* 9:107. doi: 10.1186/1746-6148-9-107

25 Barasona JA, Mulero-Pázmány M, Acevedo P, et al (2014b) Unmanned Aircraft Systems for
26 Studying Spatial Abundance of Ungulates: Relevance to Spatial Epidemiology. *PLoS*
27 *One* 9:e115608. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0115608

28 Barasona JA, VerCauteren KC, Saklou N, et al (2013b) Effectiveness of cattle operated bump
29 gates and exclusion fences in preventing ungulate multi-host sanitary interaction. *Prev*
30 *Vet Med* 111:42–50. doi: 10.1016/j.prevetmed.2013.03.009

31 Böhm M, Hutchings M, White P (2009) Contact networks in a wildlife-livestock host
32 community: identifying high-risk individuals in the transmission of bovine TB among
33 badgers and cattle.

34 Böhm M, Palphramand KL, Newton-Cross G, et al (2008) Dynamic interactions among
35 badgers: implications for sociality and disease transmission. *J Anim Ecol* 77:735–45.
36 doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2656.2008.01377.x

- 1 Cleaveland S, Laurenson MK, Taylor LH (2001) Diseases of humans and their domestic
2 mammals: pathogen characteristics, host range and the risk of emergence. *Philos Trans*
3 *R Soc Lond B Biol Sci* 356:991–9. doi: 10.1098/rstb.2001.0889
- 4 Cooper SM, Scott HM, de la Garza GR, et al (2010) Distribution and interspecies contact of
5 feral swine and cattle on rangeland in south Texas: implications for disease
6 transmission. *J Wildl Dis* 46:152–64. doi: 10.7589/0090-3558-46.1.152
- 7 Corner LAL (2006) The role of wild animal populations in the epidemiology of tuberculosis
8 in domestic animals : How to assess the risk. *Vet Microbiol* 112:303–312. doi:
9 10.1016/j.vetmic.2005.11.015
- 10 Cowie CE, Beck BB, Gortazar C, et al (2014) Risk factors for the detected presence of
11 *Mycobacterium bovis* in cattle in south central Spain. *Eur J Wildl Res* 60:113–123. doi:
12 10.1007/s10344-013-0757-0
- 13 Craft ME, Volz E, Packer C, Meyers LA (2011) Disease transmission in territorial
14 populations: the small-world network of Serengeti lions. *J R Soc Interface* 8:776–86.
15 doi: 10.1098/rsif.2010.0511
- 16 Di Marco V, Mazzone P, Capucchio MT, et al (2012) Epidemiological significance of the
17 domestic black pig (*Sus scrofa*) in maintenance of bovine tuberculosis in Sicily. *J Clin*
18 *Microbiol* 50:1209–18. doi: 10.1128/JCM.06544-11
- 19 Diez M, Huerta C, Moreno T, et al (2002) Tuberculosis in Spain: epidemiological pattern and
20 clinical practice. *Int J Tuberc Lung Dis* 6:295–300.
- 21 Drewe JA (2010) Who infects whom? Social networks and tuberculosis transmission in wild
22 meerkats. *Proc R Soc B Biol Sci* 277:633–42. doi: 10.1098/rspb.2009.1775
- 23 Drewe JA, O'Connor HM, Weber N, et al (2013) Patterns of direct and indirect contact
24 between cattle and badgers naturally infected with tuberculosis. *Epidemiol Infect* 141:1–
25 9. doi: 10.1017/S0950268813000691
- 26 Drewe JA, Weber N, Carter SP, et al (2012) Performance of proximity loggers in recording
27 intra- and inter-species interactions: a laboratory and field-based validation study. *PLoS*
28 *One* 7:e39068. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0039068
- 29 Fitzgerald SD, Kaneene JB (2013) Wildlife reservoirs of bovine tuberculosis worldwide:
30 hosts, pathology, surveillance, and control. *Vet Pathol* 50:488–99. doi:
31 10.1177/0300985812467472
- 32 Gaspar P, Escribano M, Mesías FJ, et al (2008) Sheep farms in the Spanish rangelands
33 (dehesas): Typologies according to livestock management and economic indicators.
34 *Small Rumin Res* 74:52–63. doi: 10.1016/j.smallrumres.2007.03.013
- 35 Gaspar P, Mes1 FJ, Escribano M, Pulido F (2009) Sustainability in Spanish Extensive Farms (
36 Dehesas): An Economic and Management Indicator-Based Evaluation. *Rangel Ecol*
37 *Manag* 62:153–162.

- 1 Gomez-Laguna J, Carrasco L, Ramis G, et al (2010) Use of real-time and polymerase chain
2 reaction assays for the diagnosis of porcine tuberculosis in formalin-fixed, paraffin-
3 embedded tissues. *J Vet Diagnostic Investig* 22:123–128.
- 4 Goodman E (2007) Quantifying interactions in a high-density badger (*Meles meles*)
5 population. University of York
- 6 Gortázar C, Delahay RJ, McDonald RA, et al (2011) The status of tuberculosis in European
7 wild mammals. *Mamm Rev* 42:193–206. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2907.2011.00191.x
- 8 Gortazar C, Vicente J, Boadella M, et al (2011) Progress in the control of bovine tuberculosis
9 in Spanish wildlife. *Vet Microbiol* 151:170–8. doi: 10.1016/j.vetmic.2011.02.041
- 10 Gortazar C, Vicente J, Samper S, et al (2005) Molecular characterization of *Mycobacterium*
11 tuberculosis complex isolates from wild ungulates in south-central Spain. *Vet Res*
12 36:43–52. doi: 10.1051/vetres
- 13 Haydon DT, Cleaveland S, Taylor LH, Laurenson MK (2002) Identifying reservoirs of
14 infection: a conceptual and practical challenge. *Emerg Infect Dis* 8:1468–73.
- 15 Herruzo AC, Martinez-Jauregui M (2013) Trends in hunters, hunting grounds and big game
16 harvest in Spain. *For Syst* 22:114. doi: 10.5424/fs/2013221-03371
- 17 Hutchings MR, Harris S (1997) Effects of farm management practices on cattle grazing
18 behaviour and the potential for transmission of bovine tuberculosis from badgers to
19 cattle. *Vet J* 153:149–162. doi: 10.1016/S1090-0233(97)80035-4
- 20 Hutchings MR, Harris S (1999) Quantifying the risks of TB infection to cattle posed by
21 badger excreta. *Epidemiol Infect* 122:167–73.
- 22 Kaneene JB, Bruning-Fann C, Granger L, et al (2002) Environmental and farm management
23 factors associated with tuberculosis on cattle farms in northeastern Michigan. *J Am Vet*
24 *Med Assoc* 221:837–842.
- 25 Krajewska M, Zabost A, Welz M, et al (2015) Transmission of *Mycobacterium caprae* in a
26 herd of European bison in the Bieszczady Mountains, Southern Poland. *Eur J Wildl Res*
27 61:429–433. doi: 10.1007/s10344-015-0912-x
- 28 Kukeilka E, Barasona JA, Cowie CE, et al (2013) Spatial and temporal interactions between
29 livestock and wildlife in South Central Spain. *Prev Vet Med* 112:213–221.
- 30 Marsh MK, McLeod SR, Hutchings MR, White PCL (2011) Use of proximity loggers and
31 network analysis to quantify social interactions in free-ranging wild rabbit populations.
32 *Wildl Res* 38:1–12. doi: 10.1071/WR10150
- 33 Martin C, Pastoret P-P, Brochier B, et al (2011) A survey of the transmission of infectious
34 diseases/infections between wild and domestic ungulates in Europe. *Vet Res* 42:70. doi:
35 10.1186/1297-9716-42-70

- 1 Martínez-López B, Barasona JA, Gortázar C, et al (2013) Farm-level risk factors for the
2 occurrence, new infection or persistence of tuberculosis in cattle herds from South-
3 Central Spain. *Prev Vet Med*. doi: 10.1016/j.prevetmed.2013.11.002
- 4 Michel AL, Müller B, van Helden PD (2010) *Mycobacterium bovis* at the animal-human
5 interface: a problem, or not? *Vet Microbiol* 140:371–81. doi:
6 10.1016/j.vetmic.2009.08.029
- 7 Miguel E, Grosbois V, Caron a, et al (2013) Contacts and foot and mouth disease
8 transmission from wild to domestic bovines in Africa. *Ecosphere* 4:1–32. doi:
9 10.1890/es12-00239.1
- 10 Milan M, Bartolome J, Quintanilla R, et al (2006) Structural characterisation and typology of
11 beef cattle farms of Spanish wooded rangelands (dehesas). *Livest Sci* 99:197–209.
- 12 Miller RS, Farnsworth ML, Malmberg JL (2013) Diseases at the livestock-wildlife interface:
13 Status, challenges, and opportunities in the United States. *Prev Vet Med* 110:119–132.
14 doi: 10.1016/j.prevetmed.2012.11.021
- 15 Naranjo V, Gortazar C, Vicente J, de la Fuente J (2008) Evidence of the role of European
16 wild boar as a reservoir of *Mycobacterium tuberculosis* complex. *Vet Microbiol* 127:1–
17 9. doi: 10.1016/j.vetmic.2007.10.002
- 18 Neill SD, Bryson DG, Pollock JM (2001) Pathogenesis of tuberculosis in cattle. *Tuberculosis*
19 (Edinb) 81:79–86. doi: 10.1054/tube.2000.0279
- 20 Nishi JS, Shury T, Elkin BT (2006) Wildlife reservoirs for bovine tuberculosis
21 (*Mycobacterium bovis*) in Canada: strategies for management and research. *Vet*
22 *Microbiol* 112:325–38. doi: 10.1016/j.vetmic.2005.11.013
- 23 O'Brien DJ, Schmitt SM, Fitzgerald SD, Berry DE (2011) Management of bovine
24 tuberculosis in Michigan wildlife: current status and near term prospects. *Vet Microbiol*
25 151:179–87. doi: 10.1016/j.vetmic.2011.02.042
- 26 O'Connor CM, Haydon DT, Kao RR (2012) An ecological and comparative perspective on
27 the control of bovine tuberculosis in Great Britain and the Republic of Ireland. *Prev Vet*
28 *Med* 104:185–97. doi: 10.1016/j.prevetmed.2011.11.010
- 29 Plieninger T, Pulido FJ, Schaich H (2004) Effects of land-use and landscape structure on
30 holm oak recruitment and regeneration at farm level in *Quercus ilex* L. dehesas. *J Arid*
31 *Environ* 57:345–364. doi: 10.1016/S0140-1963(03)00103-4
- 32 Prange S, Jordan T, Hunter C, Gehrt SD (2006) New Radiocollars for the Detection of
33 Proximity among Individuals. *Wildl Soc Bull* 34:1333–1344. doi: 10.2193/0091-
34 7648(2006)34[1333:NRFTDO]2.0.CO;2
- 35 Quantum GIS Development Team (2013) Quantum GIS Geographic Information System.
- 36 R Core Development Team (2012) A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing.

- 1 Radostits OM, Gay CC, Hinchcliff KW, Constable PD (2007) *Veterinary Medicine: A*
2 *textbook of the diseases of cattle, horses, sheep, pigs and goats*. Springer, New York
- 3 RASVE (2014) Informe final técnico-financiero programa nacional de la tuberculosis
4 bovina año 2012.
- 5 Renwick AR, White PCL, Bengis RG (2007) Bovine tuberculosis in southern African
6 wildlife: a multi-species host-pathogen system. *Epidemiol Infect* 135:529–40. doi:
7 10.1017/S0950268806007205
- 8 Rodríguez-Prieto V, Martínez-López B, Barasona JA, et al (2012) A Bayesian approach to
9 study the risk variables for tuberculosis occurrence in domestic and wild ungulates in
10 South Central Spain. *BMC Vet Res* 8:148. doi: 10.1186/1746-6148-8-148
- 11 Schiller I, Waters WR, Vordermeier HM, et al (2011) Bovine tuberculosis in Europe from the
12 perspective of an officially tuberculosis free country: trade, surveillance and diagnostics.
13 *Vet Microbiol* 151:153–9. doi: 10.1016/j.vetmic.2011.02.039
- 14 Seaman DE, Millspaugh JJ, Kernohan BJ, et al (1999) Effects of Sample Size on Kernel
15 Home Range Estimates. *J Wildl Dis* 63:739–747.
- 16 Vander Wal E, Paquet PC, Andrés JA (2012) Influence of landscape and social interactions
17 on transmission of disease in a social cervid. *Mol Ecol* 21:1271–82. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-
18 294X.2011.05431.x
- 19 Vicente J, Barasona JA, Acevedo P, et al (2013) Temporal trend of tuberculosis in wild
20 ungulates from mediterranean Spain. *Transbound Emerg Dis* 60 Suppl 1:92–103. doi:
21 10.1111/tbed.12167
- 22 Vicente J, Delahay RJ, Walker NJ, Cheeseman CL (2007) Social organization and movement
23 influence the incidence of bovine tuberculosis in an undisturbed high-density badger
24 *Meles meles* population. *J Anim Ecol* 76:348–60. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-
25 2656.2006.01199.x
- 26 Vicente J, Hofle U, Garrido J, et al (2006) Wild boar and red deer display high prevalences of
27 tuberculosis-like lesions in Spain. *Vet Res* 37:107–119. doi: 10.1051/vetres
- 28 Walrath R (2011) Efficacy of proximity loggers for detection of contacts between maternal
29 pairs of white-tailed deer. *Wildl Soc Bull* 35:452–460.
- 30 zu Dohna H, Peck DE, Johnson BK, et al (2014) Wildlife-livestock interactions in a western
31 rangeland setting: quantifying disease-relevant contacts. *Prev Vet Med* 113:447–56. doi:
32 10.1016/j.prevetmed.2013.12.004

33

34

1 Figure Legends

2

3 **Fig 1** Map of study farm showing the location of proximity data logger base stations. The
4 dashed white line indicates a fence that is often used to separate the two cattle herds kept on
5 the farm

6

7 **Fig 2** Network representation of the direct contacts observed between cattle, pigs, wild boar
8 (WB) and red deer (RD) on the study farm. Each node represents an individual animal and
9 the width of the lines between them is proportionate to the number of contacts observed.
10 Nodes are arranged to visualise the social groups observed but the proximity of nodes to one
11 another is illustrative and has no spatial relevance

12

13 **Fig 3** Daily activity patterns of cattle and red deer recorded concurrently by GPS logger
14 collars at the study farm

15

16 **Fig 4** Box plots showing the C_{freq} of each species to (a) water, (b) food, (c) control sites on
17 the farm. Note the scales are different for each resource

18

19 **Fig 5** Box plots showing the C_{dur} at (a) water, (b) food and (c) control points on the farm.
20 Note the scales are different for each resource

21

22 **Fig 6** The standardised, cumulative number of intra-species indirect interactions per base
23 station that fell within each critical time window at each resource type for (a) cattle, (b) pigs
24 and (c) red deer. Legends on each graph show the total number of indirect interactions
25 recorded during the study period. No data were available for wild boar as individuals were
26 not collared concurrently. Where resource types are missing no indirect interactions were
27 recorded at these locations. Note the different scales on each y axis

28

29 **Fig 7** The standardised, cumulative number of inter-species indirect interactions per base
30 station that fell within each critical time window at each resource type for (a) cattle-pigs, (b)
31 cattle-red deer and (c) cattle-wild boar. Legends on each graph show the total number of
32 indirect interactions recorded during the study period. Where resource types are missing no
33 indirect interactions were recorded at these locations. Note the different scales on each y axis