



## Research

**Cite this article:** D'Bastiani E, Anglister N, Lysnyansky I, Mikula I, Acácio M, Vaadia G, Gahm K, Spiegel O, Pinter-Wollman N. 2024 Social interactions do not affect mycoplasma infection in griffon vultures. *R. Soc. Open Sci.* **11**: 240500.

<https://doi.org/10.1098/rsos.240500>

Received: 2 April 2024

Accepted: 14 November 2024

### Subject Category:

Ecology, conservation, and global change biology

### Subject Areas:

behaviour, ecology, health and disease and epidemiology

### Keywords:

feeding, infectious disease, movement ecology, pathogen transmission, roosting, social interactions

### Author for correspondence:

Elvira D'Bastiani

e-mail: [elviradbastiani@gmail.com](mailto:elviradbastiani@gmail.com)

<sup>†</sup>These authors contributed equally to the study.

Electronic supplementary material is available online at <https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.c.7557385>.

# Social interactions do not affect mycoplasma infection in griffon vultures

Elvira D'Bastiani<sup>1,†</sup>, Nili Anglister<sup>2,†</sup>, Inna Lysnyansky<sup>3</sup>, Inna Mikula<sup>3</sup>, Marta Acácio<sup>2</sup>, Gideon Vaadia<sup>2</sup>, Kaija Gahm<sup>1</sup>, Orr Spiegel<sup>2</sup> and Noa Pinter-Wollman<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology, University of California Los Angeles, Los Angeles, CA, USA

<sup>2</sup>School of Zoology, Faculty of Life Sciences, Tel Aviv University, Tel Aviv, Israel

<sup>3</sup>Mycoplasma unit, Department of Avian Diseases, Kimron Veterinary Institute (KVI), Beit Dagan, Israel

**ORCID** EDB, 0000-0002-8615-2763; NA, 0000-0002-6848-6348; IL, 0000-0002-6923-3676; MA, 0000-0002-9947-1181; KG, 0000-0002-4612-4426; OS, 0000-0001-8941-3175; NP-W, 0000-0002-0448-8037

Uncovering the ways in which pathogens spread has important implications for population health and management. Pathogen transmission is influenced by various factors, including patterns of social interactions and shared use of space. We aim to understand how the social behaviour of griffon vultures (*Gyps fulvus*), a species of conservation interest, influences the presence or absence of mycoplasma, a group of bacteria known to cause respiratory diseases in birds. We investigated how direct and indirect social interactions of griffon vultures in the wild, in different social situations, impacted the mycoplasma infection status. We inferred interactions from high-resolution global positioning system (GPS) tracking data. Specifically, we assessed how social behaviour affects infection status when vultures share feeding and roosting locations, either at the same time (direct interactions) or subsequently, when space use is asynchronous (indirect interactions). We did not detect a significant effect of any social situation and type of interaction on infection status. However, we observed a high population prevalence of mycoplasma, suggesting that other factors might be more important than social interactions in determining the transmission of this bacteria in the Israeli vulture population. Uncovering the mechanisms that underlie infection status in wildlife is crucial for maintaining viable populations, designing containment management actions and gaining insights into the ecological mechanisms that drive infectious disease dynamics.

# 1. Introduction

Uncovering the ways in which pathogens spread through a population is crucial for mitigating the transmission of pathogens, with implications for population health and management. Pathogen transmission is influenced by many factors including the transmission route, which may be facilitated by direct and/or indirect interactions among potential hosts [1,2]. Traditional epidemiological studies utilize theoretical models and social network analysis to investigate pathogen spread [1,3–6]. While these studies can explicitly consider how host interactions mediate pathogen transmission, empirical studies testing these questions *in situ* are challenging because of the costs incurred by investigating pathogen spread throughout an entire population [3,6–11]. Understanding what factors influence exposure to pathogens including social behaviour and host attributes, is crucial for enhancing wildlife conservation efforts. Despite extensive investigations into pathogen spread and the development of sophisticated host–pathogen models, our understanding of the factors influencing infectious disease prevalence in wild animal populations remains limited.

These questions are particularly difficult to disentangle since transmission of pathogens is affected by the characteristics and biology of each infectious agent. Pathogens differ in their transmission modes (airborne, waterborne, vector-borne, food-borne, faecal-oral, etc.); therefore, it is important to investigate different social and ecological situations that may facilitate pathogen transmission, as well as the environment. For example, airborne pathogens such as *Mycoplasma gallisepticum*, which infects birds, can be transmitted through airborne droplets when individuals are in close physical proximity and share airspace. In contrast, non-airborne pathogen transmission might require the sharing of a feeding site or drinking water contaminated with infectious agents [12–14]. Thus, exploring pathogen spread is important for developing specific strategies to manage infectious disease dynamics in wild populations, such as periodic vaccination programmes or interventions to reduce the risk of pathogen transmission at specific locations.

It is important to determine which attributes contribute to pathogen acquisition and spread to inform effective disease management. Pathogen transmission can be influenced by host susceptibility and the host's contact or exposure to the pathogen [15–17]. Individuals often have different social roles in a population, which may impact how pathogens spread [8,18–22]. For example, individuals that contact many others are more prone to infection [11]. Similarly, individuals with more unique social partners are more likely to become infected with an infectious disease that is transmitted through social interactions due to increased exposure to infected individuals and their pathogens [8,11]. Furthermore, individuals who interact frequently with others might be more prone to infectious diseases that are transmitted through multiple exposures to a pathogen [5,23]. For instance, Japanese macaques (*Macaca fuscata fuscata* and *M. fuscata yakui*) that engage more frequently in grooming interactions are more likely to become infected with nematodes [24]. In addition to social roles, host attributes such as age can impact infectious status, for example because of changes to the immune system as animals age that might alter susceptibility [15,25–27]. For instance, in house finches and raptors, the prevalence of mycoplasma is higher in juveniles than in adults [25,28,29]. Uncovering how host attributes affect infectious disease dynamics can provide important information for managing the spread of pathogens, for example, by recommending the removal or vaccination of certain individuals that have potentially high impact on pathogen transmission [5,15,25,30]. Such understanding is also important for gaining knowledge about the ecological elements that drive the persistence of infectious diseases.

Griffon vultures (*Gyps fulvus*) [31] are social scavengers that interact when feeding and roosting and are exposed to a wide range of pathogens. The study population in Israel is locally critically endangered [32,33] and has been the target of many conservation efforts including the deployment of global positioning system (GPS) tags on the majority of the population. Because population size is a concern in the region, it is important to understand the potential causes of population decline including infectious disease dynamics. In the griffon population that we studied, mycoplasma has very high prevalence and more than one strain has been identified, as detailed by Anglister *et al.* [29]. Mycoplasma can cause a reduction in the vultures' flight distances, particularly in sub-adults, potentially reducing their ability to find food [29]. Despite its prevalence and impacts on griffon behaviour, we know very little about how this bacteria spreads in the population. Griffon vultures aggregate at communal roosts and around carcasses [34]. They use their night roosts to share information about the location of feeding sites [35], where they often feed together, exchanging bodily fluids through regurgitations. Griffon vultures differ in their social position across social situations

[36]; therefore each individual may have a different impact on disease spread dynamics. Because pathogens can persist in the environment, shared spaces such as communal roosts or feeding sites are potential sources for indirect pathogen transmission. The extent to which shared space use contributes to pathogen transmission and spread depends on the specific characteristics and biology of a pathogen.

Mycoplasma belongs to the class Mollicutes, which lacks a cell wall [37]. The transmission of mycoplasmas depends on the species and can be horizontal, through contact with infected individuals, contaminated surfaces, or airborne particles and/or vertical, from an infected mother to her offspring [38–42]. Mycoplasma can persist in the environment for days, weeks, or even months [43–46]. More than 20 mycoplasma species have been found to infect birds [46,47], including more than one strain in griffon vultures [29,48]. Nevertheless, due to the genetic differences among mycoplasma species, their impact on hosts may vary [49–51]. Some mycoplasma species are commensals while others are pathogenic and their impact on the host will depend on the host body condition and presence of other pathogens [47,52–55]. Pathogenic mycoplasma species can cause acute or chronic conditions including respiratory infections, conjunctivitis, arthritis, embryonic death, skeletal deformations and reduced hatchling sizes, depending on the host species and the individuals they infect [28,37,49,53,56–63]. Accordingly, high prevalence of mycoplasma often reduces host survival in the wild [41,49,64]. However, the effects of mycoplasma in non-passerines remain poorly understood [28,49], despite the high prevalence of the bacterium in some populations.


Here, we investigate how the social behaviour of wild griffon vultures relates to infection with mycoplasma. We examine how direct and indirect social interactions in different social situations (feeding and roosting), relate to mycoplasma infection status in a wild vulture population (figure 1). We predicted that social interactions while feeding would have a greater impact on infection status than interactions while roosting because during feeding, individuals might share bodily fluids (mainly aerosols) due to food sharing and regurgitation, while during roosting, interactions might be less intense. Alternatively, interactions while roosting might be a better predictor of infection status compared with feeding interactions, because vultures spend more time with one another overnight at the roost, resulting in potentially longer exposures to mycoplasma. Furthermore, we predicted that direct social interactions would have a greater impact on infection status than indirect interactions, because direct contact between individuals may increase the likelihood of pathogen transmission through physical contact or exchange of bodily fluids. In contrast, indirect shared space use may involve contact only through the shared environment, reducing the chance of transmission due to factors such as environmental dilution and shorter exposure durations [65].

## 2. Methods

### 2.1. Study system

The Eurasian griffon vulture is a social scavenger that engages in frequent social interactions when feeding, roosting, resting and flying. Over the past two decades, the species has experienced a rapid population decline in Israel, from over 500 to fewer than 180 individuals [66]. To combat the population decline, the Israel Nature and Parks Authority (INPA) maintains a management programme that includes food provisioning at feeding stations (e.g. goats or cow carcasses), annual population counts, captures, tracking of individuals and pathogen sampling. In September–November, when vultures are not breeding, they are captured in cages baited with large mammal carcasses every one–three weeks, resulting in the capture of approximately 100 unique griffons yearly, as well as many recaptures.

Among the captured individuals, a total of 114 vultures (87 individuals in 2021 and 93 in 2022) were fitted with GPS-GSM-Accelerometer tags (Ornitrack—50 3G transmitters) using a Teflon harness in a leg-loop configuration (for more details see [67,68]). The GPS tags provide information on vulture locations approximately every 10 min during the day. Vultures are active during the day and, to preserve battery, the solar-powered GPS tags operate only during daylight hours, providing one or two locations at night (for more details see [36]). The high spatial and temporal resolution of the GPS information allows us to infer social interactions in different social situations based on temporal and spatial proximity [36] (for more details see the ‘Script S1a-b’ in electronic supplementary material, ‘code section’). During captures, individuals were inspected for injuries or clinical signs of disease and sampled for pathogens. A total of 77 unique vultures with active GPS tags were examined. Individuals are often recaptured, but are usually not sampled again for mycoplasma to minimize stress. If an individual was captured and sampled multiple times, we only used information from the first sample



**Figure 1.** Constructing social networks to investigate the impact of social interactions when vultures are feeding (a) or roosting (b) on infection status (positive or negative) with mycoplasma. The timeline (c) illustrates when social interactions are considered before sampling for pathogens: (i) day on which vultures are sampled for pathogens; (ii) days when the vultures were in the capture cage (excluded from social interaction analysis); (iii) days used to examine social interactions; (iv) direct interactions occur within 30 min for co-feeding or over one night for co-roosting; (v) indirect interactions were recorded when more than 4 h, for co-feeding, and more than one night, for co-roosting, elapsed between observations of vultures within 25 metres of each other.

collected to infer infection status. Vulture age is determined based on the moulting of the primary and secondary flight feathers as well as the eye and ruff plumage colours [69,70]. Individuals aged 0 to 4 years, characterized by a dark bill, dark eye, ruff with lanceolated feathers, and pointy dark reddish-tawny contour feathers are classified as immature; individuals aged more than 4 years have changes that advance with ageing such as lighter cream-coloured bill, brownish to yellow clear eyes, beige to white downy ruff, rounded contour feathers and are categorized as adults [69,70]. Thanks to the long-term capture and monitoring effort by the INPA many of the vultures included in this study were previously trapped as immatures, facilitating accurate ageing of adults.

## 2.2. Characterizing social networks from spatial and temporal data

We examined interactions only of vultures that had been GPS-tracked during the 14 days prior to sampling for mycoplasma. We included only individuals who stayed within the local geographic region of southern Israel, specifically within a 400 km radius of their tagging location. After applying these temporal and geographic filters, we retained high-quality ecological movement data for 114 vultures, representing at least 65% of Israel's vulture population and nearly all griffon vultures in the south of the country. Simulation studies show that tracking 20% of the effective population provides approximately 75% accuracy of network measures [71], thus, our data probably provided very high accuracy for the network measures we quantified. We excluded from the social interaction analysis the 3 days during which the vultures were in the capture cage (figure 1c) to account for any potential influence (e.g. social interactions imposed by cage confinement and their impact on mycoplasma transmission inside the cage) on our results. Our analysis focused on interactions that occurred during the 14 days preceding pathogen sampling and cage confinement because the incubation period of mycoplasma can range from 2 to 23 days. We took 14 days as a midpoint of this range and show in the electronic supplementary material that our results are not sensitive to using slightly longer or shorter periods (electronic supplementary material, tables S3 and S4 and figures S1–S4). Seven sampling events were included in our analysis and we constructed different interaction networks for each sampling event (see table 1 and electronic supplementary material, table S1 for information on each of these networks).

We constructed social networks for two social situations: feeding and roosting (figure 1a,b). An interaction was inferred when two vultures were within 25 m of one another, when not flying (i.e. moving at a speed of less than  $5 \text{ m s}^{-1}$ ), during the day for feeding interactions (figure 1a) and during the night for roosting interactions (figure 1b). We used a 25 m distance threshold based on biological considerations of mycoplasma [72] and vulture behaviour, and we show in the electronic supplementary material that our results are not affected by using slightly different distance thresholds

**Table 1.** Sampling date, social network size (i.e. the number of the griffon vultures tracked within a 14-day period leading up to pathogen sampling), and prevalence of mycoplasma at the genus level on each sampling day. Note that individuals in the social networks were not captured on the sampling date, but rather were tagged at previous captures. Furthermore, the number of individuals sampled for mycoplasma on each sampling date only includes individuals that were captured on the sampling day, already had a GPS tag on them, and were not sampled previously for mycoplasma, as detailed in the text.

sampling date	social network size				individuals sampled for mycoplasma			
	direct interactions		indirect interactions		number sampled	negative	positive	prevalence
	feeding	roosting	feeding	roosting				
1 (2021–09–13)	27	28	27	27	2	0	2	100%
2 (2021–09–29)	46	48	39	49	2	0	2	100%
3 (2021–10–07)	60	71	46	65	24	4	20	83%
4 (2021–10–22)	67	69	69	70	2	0	2	100%
5 (2021–11–09)	58	58	42	59	17	4	13	76%
6 (2022–10–03)	66	79	58	79	5	0	5	100%
7 (2022–11–03)	70	79	69	80	24	12	12	50%
<b>average:</b>	56.285	61.714	50	61.285	10.85	2.85	8	—

(electronic supplementary material, tables S5 and S6 and figures S5–S8). Roosting interactions were only considered if they occurred within a known roost site, during the night, as defined in Sharma *et al.* [36]. For feeding interactions, we excluded daytime interactions that occurred within known roost sites.

To distinguish between direct and indirect interactions, we used different time thresholds (figure 1a–c). We considered direct co-feeding interactions if vultures were feeding within 25 m of each other within 0–30 min, and considered indirect co-feeding interactions if vultures were feeding within 14 days but at least 4 h apart (figure 1a). Because vultures may stay near a feeding station for a long period (up to 4 h), if vultures were within 25 m of each other within 30 min and 4 h, we did not consider those interactions to ensure that there is no ambiguity between direct and indirect co-feeding interactions. A 30 min time threshold for data that is collected every 10 min is a very conservative time window that still allows detecting direct interactions. Furthermore, because vultures stay at a carcass for hours, and when they arrive, they approach it slowly, not considering co-locations that occur within 31 min to 4 h, avoids misclassifying as an interaction the co-location of an individual that recently left and one that just arrived at a carcass. Similarly, direct co-roosting interactions were recorded if vultures roosted within 25 m (distance threshold) of each other on the same night. Indirect co-roosting interactions were recorded if vultures roosted within 25 m of each other more than one night apart but less than 14 nights apart (figure 1b). To quantify the edge weight between pairs of vultures (strength), we used the number of occasions on which two vultures were observed together.

To examine interactions in both social situations together (co-feeding and co-roosting combined) we created an aggregate network [73]. The weight of each interaction in the aggregate network was the sum of the weights of interactions in the co-feeding and co-roosting situations. For example, consider two vultures, *i* and *j*, with an edge weight of 2 when co-feeding and an edge weight of 3 when co-roosting. In the aggregate network, the edge connecting *i* and *j* would have a weight of 5, representing the cumulative interactions when both feeding and roosting.

### 2.3. Quantifying social role of individuals

To determine the social position of individuals within the social network, we used individual-level centrality measures [74,75]. We used *betweenness* to quantify the extent to which a vulture serves as a bridge or intermediary between other individuals [76]. An individual with high betweenness is likely to facilitate the rapid spread of a pathogen [77,78]. We used *degree* to quantify the number of unique individuals that a vulture interacted with [79]. A vulture with high degree is exposed to more individuals and their pathogens. We used *strength* to describe the frequency of interactions of each vulture [23]. An individual with high strength has more social interactions and, therefore, potentially more pathogen exposure opportunities. To account for different network sizes in the seven



different sampling days, we normalized the centrality measures by using the ‘normalize’ argument for betweenness and degree in the respective functions in ‘igraph’. This normalization divides degree or betweenness by the number of individuals in the network minus one. To normalize strength, we divided individual strength by the total strength of all edge weights in each network. Network analysis was conducted using the ‘igraph’ R package [80].

## 2.4. Mycoplasma data


We sampled 77 unique griffon vultures (out of the 114 GPS-tracked individuals used to analyse social interactions) for the presence and absence of mycoplasma (table 1 and electronic supplementary material, tables S1 and S2). We collected samples from the vultures’ choanal or tracheal mucosa using a sterile swab and stored them at  $-20^{\circ}\text{C}$  until DNA extraction. The DNA was extracted directly from individual choanal/tracheal swabs by agitating them vigorously in 1 ml of phosphate-buffered saline (PBS; Sigma, Rehovot, Israel). Genomic DNA was then extracted from 400  $\mu\text{l}$  of PBS solution using the Maxwell DNA Isolation Kit for Cell/Tissue and the Maxwell® 16 apparatus (Promega), following the manufacturer’s instructions.

The extracted DNA was amplified using the forward GPF primer (5' GCT GGC TGT GTG CCT AA T ACA 3' [58]; and the reverse MGSO primer (5' TGC ACC ATC TGT CAC TCT GTT AAC CTC 3' [81]. The polymerase chain reaction (PCR) was based on the 16S rRNA gene (approx. 1000 bp in length), and reactions were performed in 25  $\mu\text{l}$  volumes, consisting of 0.5  $\mu\text{l}$  of Phire Hot Start II DNA Polymerase (Thermo Fisher Scientific, Waltham, MA, USA),  $\times 5$  Phire reaction buffer, 1  $\mu\text{l}$  of 10 mM dNTPs, 0.4  $\mu\text{M}$  of each primer and 5  $\mu\text{l}$  of DNA. The PCR amplifications were carried out using a C1000 Touch™ Thermal Cycler (Bio-Rad, Hercules, CA, USA). The amplification procedure was conducted as outlined by Lierz *et al.* [58] with a slight modification: initiating incubation at  $94^{\circ}\text{C}$  for 3 min, followed by 35 cycles of denaturation at  $94^{\circ}\text{C}$  for 30 s, annealing at  $66^{\circ}\text{C}$  for 30 s and synthesis at  $72^{\circ}\text{C}$  for 1 min. The process concluded with a final extension at  $72^{\circ}\text{C}$  for 5 minutes. DNA of *Mycoplasma falconis* was used as a positive control, while nuclease-free water (Sigma, Rehovot, Israel) served as a negative control.

The amplified PCR products were separated in a 1% agarose gel and visualized using ethidium bromide staining and ultraviolet transillumination. A biomarker (bp-100 Bio-Rad, Hercules, CA, USA) was used to determine the size of DNA fragments. The positive PCR samples were purified using the MEGAquick-spin™ PCR & Agarose Gel DNA Extraction System (iNtRON Biotechnology) and if the PCR yielded enough genetic material, the samples was subjected to Sanger sequencing (Hylab Ltd, Rehovot, Israel) using the Applied Biosystems DNA sequencer and the ABI BigDye Terminator cycle sequencing kit (Applied Biosystems, Foster City, CA). The sequence editing, consensus generation, and alignment construction were conducted using Lasergene software (version 5.06/5.51, 2003, DNASTar, Inc., Madison, WI), and Geneious software version R9 (<https://www.geneious.com/academic/>). Additionally, we compared the nucleotide sequences of the resulting amplicons with data deposited in GenBank (for more details, see [29]). Finally, we measured the prevalence of mycoplasma (genus level) on each sampling date. Mycoplasma prevalence was calculated by dividing the number of individuals infected by the total number of sampled individuals (table 1), and then multiplying the result by 100 to express it as a percentage [82].

## 2.5. Statistical analysis

To determine the relationship between social position and infection status we used generalized linear mixed models (GLMMs) with a binomial distribution of errors [83–85]. We ran a separate model for each type of interaction (co-feeding direct, co-feeding indirect, co-roosting direct, co-roosting indirect, aggregate direct and aggregate indirect) resulting in six statistical models when examining infection with bacteria from the mycoplasma genus. Infection status (yes/no) was the response variable, and the centrality measures betweenness, degree and strength were the fixed effects. We incorporated age (immature/adult) as a fixed effect in the model to account for the impact that age might have on infection status, which has been observed in other studies [29]. Approximately half of the samples were from adults and half were from immature individuals. We included the sampling date as a random effect in all models to account for variation that might be introduced by sampling vultures on different days. We determined if the underlying model assumptions were met by examining collinearity of fixed effects, random effects distribution, homoscedasticity, independence and normality of residuals [83]. Before analyses, we tested all of the variables and did not find collinearity using a variance



**Figure 2.** Relationship between social position (betweenness ( $a, d, g, j$ ), degree ( $b, e, h, k$ ), and strength ( $c, f, i, l$ )) of griffon vultures and infection with mycoplasma. We examined both direct ( $a-c, g-i$ ) and indirect ( $d-f, j-l$ ) interactions when vultures were co-feeding ( $a-f$ ) or co-roosting ( $g-l$ ) during the 14 days before they were sampled for mycoplasma. Here and in the following figure, lines are the GLMM fit, shaded areas are the 95% confidence interval and points are the raw data.

inflation factor test ( $VIF < 3$ ). For more details about the GLMM analysis see table 2 and electronic supplementary material, tables S3 and S4. In addition, we applied the Bonferroni correction to the GLMMs models to account for multiple comparisons. To account for multiple comparisons, because we ran six models, we used a  $p$ -value threshold of 0.0083 ( $0.05/6$ ) to determine statistical significance, rather than the traditional 0.05 threshold. We conducted all statistical analysis in R version 4.3.1 [86] using the 'DHARMa' [87], 'lmer4' [84], 'Performance' [88] and 'Stats' [89] packages. Data and analysis code can be found at [https://github.com/elviradbastiani/MycoplasmaProject\\_2023](https://github.com/elviradbastiani/MycoplasmaProject_2023).

**Table 2.** Results of the binomial generalized linear mixed model (GLMM) testing the relationship between mycoplasma infection status and social position (degree, betweenness, and strength) of griffon vultures.


social situation	type of interaction (sample size)	fixed effect	estimate	standard error	z-values	p-value
co-feeding	direct ( <i>n</i> = 68)	intercept	0.582	0.769	0.757	0.449
		degree	0.431	2.047	0.211	0.833
		strength	10.323	26.500	0.390	0.697
		betweenness	−1.150	7.322	−0.157	0.875
		age (immature)	1.047	0.632	1.657	0.097
	indirect ( <i>n</i> = 63)	intercept	0.530	0.582	0.911	0.362
		degree	0.392	1.670	0.235	0.815
		strength	−4.540	10.910	−0.416	0.677
		betweenness	0.967	4.495	0.215	0.830
		age (immature)	1.057	0.626	1.689	0.091
co-roosting	direct ( <i>n</i> = 76)	intercept	0.697	0.680	1.025	0.305
		degree	−2.787	5.054	−0.551	0.581
		strength	55.968	59.377	0.943	0.346
		betweenness	−0.105	16.182	−0.007	0.995
		age (immature)	1.193	0.632	1.888	0.059
	indirect ( <i>n</i> = 75)	intercept	0.844	0.725	1.164	0.245
		degree	−1.068	2.923	−0.365	0.715
		strength	44.370	43.687	1.016	0.310
		betweenness	−9.777	15.671	−0.624	0.533
		age (immature)	1.201	0.641	1.873	0.061
aggregate networks	direct ( <i>n</i> = 76)	intercept	0.805	0.742	1.085	0.278
		degree	0.050	1.555	0.032	0.974
		strength	6.839	26.177	0.261	0.794
		betweenness	4.200	17.410	0.241	0.809
		age (immature)	1.095	0.614	1.784	0.074
	indirect ( <i>n</i> = 76)	intercept	1.085	0.873	1.243	0.214
		degree	1.890	1.800	1.050	0.294
		strength	−20.539	17.170	−1.196	0.232
		betweenness	−18.167	18.286	−0.994	0.320
		age (immature)	1.027	0.631	1.627	0.104

### 3. Results

During the two years of the study (2021–2022), there were seven capture events in which vultures were sampled for mycoplasma, resulting in 28 social networks (table 1). In our tracking dataset, based on the criteria we applied, we observed a total of 106 individuals interacting while feeding and 114 individuals interacting while roosting. Of these, 77 unique individuals were sampled for pathogens. We examined the relationship between social behaviour and infection status, considering mycoplasma identification at the genus level.

In contrast to our expectations, vulture infection with mycoplasma was not related to social position in any type of interaction network (figure 2, table 2). This was the case even after combining direct interactions when feeding and roosting into a single network (figure 3*a–c*, table 2), and when combining indirect interactions when feeding and roosting into a single network (figure 3*d–f*, table 2).





**Figure 3.** Relationship between social position (betweenness (*a,d*), degree (*b,e*) and strength (*c,f*) of griffon vultures and infection with mycoplasma. We examined both direct (*a–c*) and indirect (*d–f*) interactions when co-feeding and co-roosting interactions were aggregated into a single network.

We further did not find a significant relationship between infection status and age, although immature were slightly, but not statistically significantly, more likely to be infected than adults (table 2). To ensure that these results are not biased by days in which sample sizes were smaller, we repeated the analysis using only the three days with the largest sample size (sampling days 3, 5 and 7) and the results were consistent with those obtained from the full dataset (see electronic supplementary material, figure S9 and table S7).

In most statistical models examining infection with the *Mycoplasma* genus, we found that some variation in infection status was attributed to the sampling date. The random effect ‘sampling date’ accounted for 45% (s.d.  $\pm 0.671$ ) of the variance in the model for co-feeding direct interactions. For models of indirect co-feeding interactions, the random effect ‘sampling date’ accounted for 0.01% (s.d.  $\pm < 0.0001$ ) model variance. For models of direct co-roosting interactions, the random effect ‘sampling date’ accounted for 35.9% (s.d.  $\pm 0.599$ ) model variance. For models of indirect co-roosting interactions, the random effect ‘sampling date’ accounted for 47.1% (s.d.  $\pm 0.686$ ) model variance. In the models of the aggregated network (co-feeding + co-roosting) the random effect ‘sampling date’ accounted for 49.1% (s.d.  $\pm 0.701$ ) of the variance in the model for direct interactions, and 99.1% (s.d.  $\pm 0.995$ ) of the variance in the model for indirect interactions.

## 4. Discussion

Contrary to our predictions, we found that social behaviour did not affect vultures’ mycoplasma infection status. This finding held regardless of the type of interactions (direct or indirect) or the social context (feeding or roosting). Our inability to detect an effect of social interactions on infection status is probably due to the very high prevalence of mycoplasma in the population [29]. We sampled 77 individuals for mycoplasma, a very large sample size for this kind of study, therefore, our inability to detect an effect is probably not because of low statistical power, but mainly due to the high prevalence of mycoplasma in the population. It is possible that the high prevalence of mycoplasma in the population is influenced by factors we did not examine such as contaminated commonly used food or water sources, climatic conditions, or chronic carrying of the bacteria without pathology, as we discuss in more detail below.

Mycoplasma infection status was not related to social behaviour during feeding or roosting, suggesting that the social interactions of griffon vultures do not impact mycoplasma infection.

Furthermore, our findings did not change when we examined longer (21 or 28 days), or shorter (7 days) time periods during which vultures interacted (electronic supplementary material, §4) suggesting that our lack of significant results is not because our sampling period of social interactions was shorter or longer than the potential incubation period of mycoplasma. The interactions we examined are based on a relatively stable population and individuals may appear in more than one interaction network. However, repeated appearances of individuals in different social networks do not necessarily mean that the same interactions occurred in the different periods, and there are no repeated measures of individuals sampled for mycoplasma. Inferring social interactions using GPS data does not necessarily reflect direct contacts between individuals due to positional accuracy and precision errors. Still, inferring interactions based on spatio-temporal co-occurrence is one of the most common approaches to the study of animal social networks, as it provides the benefits of remote sensing that do not impact the observed interactions, which might occur when observations are present [90]. Our findings contrast with previous studies in which birds that were more social were also more likely to be infected with mycoplasma [12,14,91–94]. Thus, social behaviours may have different implications for mycoplasma spread across different bird and bacteria species [49,64]. While Adelman *et al.* [14] found that songbirds feeding with more conspecifics exhibit a higher likelihood of transmitting mycoplasma, we did not observe a relationship between the number of conspecifics with which a vulture feeds and mycoplasma infection. Future work might compare interactions of vultures at feeding stations with interactions at naturally occurring carcasses, because feeding stations might be more contaminated than sites of naturally occurring carcasses. This difference could be explained by behavioural differences among the two host species. Species of birds differ in their social behaviours, immune responses and susceptibility to infections, and may experience different environmental conditions, all of which can influence disease prevalence and transmission. Indeed, other bird species have lower mycoplasma prevalence than the high prevalence we observed here [64]. One way in which griffon vultures are different from songbirds is their robust immune system, which is probably shaped by their scavenging behaviour. The physiological and immunological characteristics of vultures [95] may make them less prone to pathological impacts of mycoplasma, particularly compared with other bird species like songbirds.

There are many possible explanations for the high prevalence of mycoplasma observed in our study. Mycoplasma bacteria can be commensal and/or pathogenic. Mycoplasma can act as a commensal in the respiratory tract without causing diseases, allowing it to persist in the host population without eliciting clinical signs or causing harm [46]. Such persistence in a non-harmful state can lead to chronic infection in which the bacteria is present in a large portion of the population. Indeed, several mycoplasma species associated with respiratory diseases in birds are known to cause chronic conditions [60,96]. Future work on the infection status of individuals that are sampled repeatedly over time is needed to determine whether mycoplasma is a chronic disease in our system as well. Certain species of mycoplasma can be pathogenic, causing respiratory diseases, especially under certain conditions such as compromised host immune system and hot weather [97–100]. However, we did not observe obvious clinical symptoms in our study. It is possible that in our study system some species of mycoplasma are commensal, while others are pathogenic (or become pathogenic at some point). Finally, there is no evidence of co-infection with multiple species of mycoplasma in this system [29], so it is unlikely that there were synergistic effects of different mycoplasma species on the clinical state of the vultures.

Pathogenic bacteria elicit the production of antibodies by the immune system, which can also explain high population prevalence of mycoplasma. Vultures are exposed to many pathogens because they consume carcasses and roost communally, therefore they have strong immune systems [95,98]. Strong immune systems can establish robust defence mechanisms and provide protection against mycoplasma infections. Thus, it is possible that immunity to mycoplasma is high in vultures, allowing even a pathogenic bacteria to be prevalent in the population while exhibiting only low levels of pathology. Indeed, mycoplasma prevalence is generally very high in other raptor species; for instance, it reaches 91% in nest sites of *Circus aeruginosus* and *Milvus milvus*, as well as 94% in adult birds [28]. Additionally, in griffon vultures, the prevalence of mycoplasma was recorded at 47% and 70% in previous studies by Blass *et al.* [101] and Anglister *et al.* [29], respectively. Finally, some of the high prevalence values in our study come from sampling days on which sample sizes are low—for example with two out of two sampled individuals being positive (table 1), which is often a challenge in studies of infectious diseases in wildlife [102]. Still, on the sampling dates when we had larger sample sizes, we also observed high prevalence (table 1), indicating that small sample sizes are not the main driver for the high observed prevalence. Furthermore, removing the days with the low sample sizes and high prevalence from the analysis did not impact our results (electronic supplementary material, table

S7). Further investigations into the causes underlying the high prevalence of mycoplasma bacteria in griffon vultures might provide important information on whether there is need to manage its spread and what such management might entail.

When examining infection with bacteria at the genus level it is not always possible to determine transmission directly, because infected individuals might be carrying different species of the bacteria. Indeed, multiple *Mycoplasma* species have been identified in this population and they differ in their origin (e.g. some arrive with translocated individuals from the Iberian peninsula [29]). It is further possible that transmission dynamics differ among bacteria species. Our analysis focused on the *Mycoplasma* genus because the prevalence at each identified species was too low to allow for separate analyses of social interactions [29]. Future work on transmission dynamics of mycoplasma in this system should focus on specific species or strains of the bacteria, and on describing how long vultures take to clear an infection [103] and whether they can become reinfected with the same, or with a different, mycoplasma strain using repeated samples of individuals.

Previous analyses showed that age is related to mycoplasma prevalence in griffon vultures, with immature individuals having higher mycoplasma than adults [29]. However, our analysis did not reveal such an effect of age. This difference between the two studies that examine the same population of griffon vultures can be explained by the difference in sample sizes. Anglister *et al.* [29] considered larger sample sizes, including samples of mycoplasma taken over a longer duration (2019–2022) of both captive and wild vultures, and included repeated samples of some individuals ( $n = 167$  individuals and 244 mycoplasma samples). In our study, we considered a shorter period of mycoplasma sampling (2021–2022) because only this period had sufficient information about social behaviour. Furthermore, we included data only from wild individuals and considered a single bacterial sample (the first one taken) from each individual ( $n = 114$  individuals, and 77 mycoplasma samples). Despite the smaller sample size in our study, immature individuals still tended to have higher (but not statistically significant) positivity than adults (table 2).

In conclusion, the social behaviour of wild griffons does not appear to influence mycoplasma infection. Identifying the reasons behind the high prevalence of mycoplasma in the population is crucial for guiding appropriate management strategies and protecting griffon vultures. Future use of theoretical models could help explore the potential dynamics of this bacteria to develop effective control strategies and mitigate its impact. Pathogens and infectious diseases have been identified as potential contributors to population declines and species extinction, and vaccination has been recommended to reduce the impact of infectious diseases on threatened wildlife populations [104–106]. Thus, it is essential to consider ecological and social contexts when examining disease prevalence due to their potential impact on disease spread in the population. While the social behaviours of hosts are often studied to understand the spread of pathogens, considering pathogen conditions is often neglected (e.g. commensals becoming pathogenic and pathogens causing chronic diseases). Understanding both host social interactions and pathogen biology is crucial for developing effective disease control strategies.

**Ethics.** This research was conducted with permissions from Israel Nature and Parks Authority (permit no. 2020/42529). All samples were collected as part of annual health inspection, tagging and telemetry tracking for monitoring and management, and no special designated captures were made for this study.

**Data accessibility.** Data are provided as part of the supplementary information [107], and analysis code is available on GitHub [108].

**Declaration of AI use.** We have not used AI-assisted technologies in creating this article.

**Authors' contributions.** E.DB.: conceptualization, data curation, formal analysis, investigation, methodology, project administration, resources, validation, visualization, writing—original draft, writing—review and editing; N.A.: conceptualization, data curation, methodology, writing—review and editing; I.L.: data curation, writing—review and editing; I.M.: data curation, methodology; M.A.: data curation, methodology; G.V.: data curation, methodology; K.G.: methodology; O.S.: conceptualization, funding acquisition, methodology, project administration, resources, writing—review and editing; N.P.-W.: conceptualization, funding acquisition, methodology, project administration, resources, supervision, validation, visualization, writing—review and editing.

All authors gave final approval for publication and agreed to be held accountable for the work performed therein.

**Conflict of interest declaration.** The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

**Funding.** Funding for this work was provided by the NSF-BSF grant: NSF IOS division 2015662/BSF 2019822 to N.P.-W. and O.S.

**Acknowledgements.** We thank the researchers and rangers who helped to collect the field data: Dr Roni King, Dr Roi Lapid, Sappir Simhi, Igal Miller and Ohad Hatzofe; for mycoplasma analysis, we appreciate the contributions of Miranda May Crafton, Onn Avraham, Igal Farnushi and Avishai Lublin; and also, Jamie Lloyd-Smith and Dana

## References

1. Sah P, Otterstatter M, Leu ST, Leviyang S, Bansal S. 2021 Revealing mechanisms of infectious disease spread through empirical contact networks. *PLoS Comput. Biol.* **17**, e1009604. (doi:10.1371/journal.pcbi.1009604)
2. Gamble A. 2023 Disease ecology: when a GPS logger tells you more than a blood sample. *Curr. Biol.* **33**, R907–R909. (doi:10.1016/j.cub.2023.08.018)
3. Lloyd-Smith JO, Schreiber SJ, Kopp PE, Getz WM. 2005 Superspreading and the effect of individual variation on disease emergence. *Nature* **438**, 355–359. (doi:10.1038/nature04153)
4. Bansal S, Grenfell BT, Meyers LA. 2007 When individual behaviour matters: homogeneous and network models in epidemiology. *J. R. Soc. Interface* **4**, 879–891. (doi:10.1098/rsif.2007.1100)
5. Heesterbeek H *et al.* 2015 Modeling infectious disease dynamics in the complex landscape of global health. *Science* **347**, aaa4339. (doi:10.1126/science.aaa4339)
6. Collier M, Albery GF, McDonald GC, Bansal S. 2022 Pathogen transmission modes determine contact network structure, altering other pathogen characteristics. *Proc. R. Soc. B* **289**, 20221389. (doi:10.1098/rspb.2022.1389)
7. Fefferman NH, Ng KL. 2007 How disease models in static networks can fail to approximate disease in dynamic networks. *Phys. Rev. E* **76**, 031919. (doi:10.1103/PhysRevE.76.031919)
8. VanderWaal KL, Obanda V, Omondi GP, McCowan B, Wang H, Fushing H, Isbell LA. 2016 The ‘strength of weak ties’ and helminth parasitism in giraffe social networks. *Behav. Ecol.* **27**, 1190–1197. (doi:10.1093/beheco/aru035)
9. Silk MJ, Croft DP, Delahay RJ, Hodgson DJ, Boots M, Weber N, McDonald RA. 2017 Using social network measures in wildlife disease ecology, epidemiology, and management. *Bioscience* **67**, 245–257. (doi:10.1093/biosci/biw175)
10. Dougherty ER, Seidel DP, Carlson CJ, Spiegel O, Getz WM. 2018 Going through the motions: incorporating movement analyses into disease research. *Ecol. Lett.* **21**, 588–604. (doi:10.1111/ele.12917)
11. Albery GF, Kirkpatrick L, Firth JA, Bansal S. 2021 Unifying spatial and social network analysis in disease ecology. *J. Anim. Ecol.* **90**, 45–61. (doi:10.1111/1365-2656.13356)
12. Dhondt AA, Dhondt KV, Hawley DM, Jennelle CS. 2007 Experimental evidence for transmission of *Mycoplasma gallisepticum* in house finches by fomites. *Avian Pathol.* **36**, 205–208. (doi:10.1080/03079450701286277)
13. Hawley DM, Jennelle CS, Sydenstricker KV, Dhondt AA. 2007 Pathogen resistance and immunocompetence covary with social status in house finches (*Carpodacus mexicanus*). *Funct. Ecol.* **21**, 520–527. (doi:10.1111/j.1365-2435.2007.01254.x)
14. Adelman JS, Moyers SC, Farine DR, Hawley DM. 2015 Feeder use predicts both acquisition and transmission of a contagious pathogen in a North American songbird. *Proc. R. Soc. B* **282**, 20151429. (doi:10.1098/rspb.2015.1429)
15. Clark J, Garbutt JS, McNally L, Little TJ. 2017 Disease spread in age structured populations with maternal age effects. *Ecol. Lett.* **20**, 445–451. (doi:10.1111/ele.12745)
16. McCallum H *et al.* 2017 Breaking beta: deconstructing the parasite transmission function. *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. B* **372**, 20160084. (doi:10.1098/rstb.2016.0084)
17. Sweeny AR, Albery GF. 2022 Exposure and susceptibility: the twin pillars of infection. *Funct. Ecol.* **36**, 1713–1726. (doi:10.1111/1365-2435.14065)
18. Ezenwa VO. 2004 Host social behavior and parasitic infection: a multifactorial approach. *Behav. Ecol.* **15**, 446–454. (doi:10.1093/beheco/arh028)
19. Fenner AL, Godfrey SS, Bull CM. 2011 Using social networks to deduce whether residents or dispersers spread parasites in a lizard population. *J. Anim. Ecol.* **80**, 835–843. (doi:10.1111/j.1365-2656.2011.01825.x)
20. Fairbanks B, Hawley DM. 2012 Interactions between host social behavior, physiology, and disease susceptibility. In *Ecoimmunology* (eds GE Demas, RJ Nelson), pp. 440–467. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
21. Dizney L, Dearing MD. 2013 The role of behavioural heterogeneity on infection patterns: implications for pathogen transmission. *Anim. Behav.* **86**, 911–916. (doi:10.1016/j.anbehav.2013.08.003)
22. Johnson PTJ, Hoverman JT. 2014 Heterogeneous hosts: how variation in host size, behaviour and immunity affects parasite aggregation. *J. Anim. Ecol.* **83**, 1103–1112. (doi:10.1111/1365-2656.12215)
23. Poisot T, Canard E, Mouquet N, Hochberg ME. 2012 A comparative study of ecological specialization estimators. *Methods Ecol. Evol.* **3**, 537–544. (doi:10.1111/j.2041-210X.2011.00174.x)
24. Romano V, Duboscq J, Sarabian C, Thomas E, Sueur C, MacIntosh AJJ. 2016 Modeling infection transmission in primate networks to predict centrality-based risk. *Am. J. Primatol.* **78**, 767–779. (doi:10.1002/ajp.22542)
25. Altizer S, Davis AK, Cook KC, Cherry JJ. 2004 Age, sex, and season affect the risk of mycoplasmal conjunctivitis in a southeastern house finch population. *Can. J. Zool.* **82**, 755–763. (doi:10.1139/z04-050)



26. Lesser KJ, Paiusi IC, Leips J. 2006 Naturally occurring genetic variation in the age-specific immune response of *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Aging Cell* **5**, 293–295. (doi:10.1111/j.1474-9726.2006.00219.x)
27. Wren B, Ray IS, Remis M, Gillespie TR, Camp J. 2021 Social contact behaviors are associated with infection status for *Trichuris* sp. in wild vervet monkeys (*Chlorocebus pygerythrus*). *PLoS One* **16**, e0240872. (doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0240872)
28. Lierz M, Hagen N, Lueschow D, Hafez HM. 2008a Use of polymerase chain reactions to detect *Mycoplasma gallisepticum*, *Mycoplasma imitans*, *Mycoplasma iowae*, *Mycoplasma meleagridis* and *Mycoplasma synoviae* in birds of prey. *Avian Pathol.* **37**, 471–476. (doi:10.1080/03079450802272952)
29. Anglister N, Crafton M, Avraham Saada O, Acacio M, Vaadia G, Hatzofe O, Spiegel O. 2024 Factors affecting the individual probability of infection with a prevalent pathogen (*Mycoplasma*) and the effect on Griffon vultures' movement behavior. *bioRxiv*. (doi:10.1101/2024.08.01.606137)
30. Rushmore J, Caillaud D, Hall RJ, Stumpf RM, Meyers LA, Altizer S. 2014 Network-based vaccination improves prospects for disease control in wild chimpanzees. *J. R. Soc. Interface* **11**, 20140349. (doi:10.1098/rsif.2014.0349)
31. Hablitzl C. 1973 Bemerkungen in der persischen Landschaft Gilan und auf den Gilanischen Gebirgen. In *Neue nordische Beyträge zur physikalischen und geographischen Erd- und Völkerbeschreibung, Naturgeschichte und Oekonomie (in German)* (ed. PS Pallas), pp. 1–104 [58–59], vol. 4. St. Petersburg and Leipzig: Bey Johann Zacharias Logan.
32. Anglister N *et al.* 2023 Plasma cholinesterase activity: a benchmark for rapid detection of pesticide poisoning in an avian scavenger. *Sci. Total Environ.* **877**, 162903. (doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2023.162903)
33. BirdLife International. 2024 Species factsheet: *Gyps fulvus*. See <http://datazone.birdlife.org/species/factsheet/griffon-vulture-gyps-fulvus> (accessed 23 January 2024).
34. Mundy PJ, Butchart D, Ledger JA, Piper SE. 1992 *The vultures of Africa*. Randburg and Halfway House.
35. Harel R, Spiegel O, Getz WM, Nathan R. 2017 Social foraging and individual consistency in following behaviour: testing the information centre hypothesis in free-ranging vultures. *Proc. R. Soc. B* **284**, 20162654. (doi:10.1098/rspb.2016.2654)
36. Sharma N, Anglister N, Spiegel O, Pinter-Wollman N. 2023 Social situations differ in their contribution to population-level social structure in griffon vultures. *Ecol. Evol.* **13**, e10139. (doi:10.1002/ece3.10139)
37. Razin S, Yogev D, Naot Y. 1998 Molecular biology and pathogenicity of mycoplasmas. *Microbiol. Mol. Biol. Rev.* **62**, 1094–1156. (doi:10.1128/MMBR.62.4.1094-1156.1998)
38. Yoder HW. 1991 *Mycoplasma gallisepticum* infection. *Dis. Poul.* **12**, 807–834.
39. Hartup BK, Mohammed HO, Kollias GV, Dhondt AA. 1998 Risk factors associated with mycoplasmal conjunctivitis in house finches. *J. Wildl. Dis.* **34**, 281–288. (doi:10.7589/0090-3558-34.2.281)
40. Levisohn S, Kleven SH. 2000 Avian mycoplasmosis (*Mycoplasma gallisepticum*). *Rev. Off. Int. Epizoot.* **19**, 425–442. (doi:10.20506/rst.19.2.1232)
41. Faustino CR, Jennelle CS, Connolly V, Davis AK, Swarthout EC, Dhondt AA, Cooch EG. 2004 *Mycoplasma gallisepticum* infection dynamics in a house finch population: seasonal variation in survival, encounter and transmission rate. *J. Anim. Ecol.* **73**, 651–669. (doi:10.1111/j.0021-8790.2004.00840.x)
42. Ley DH, Yoder Jr HW. 2008 *Mycoplasma gallisepticum* infection. *Dis. Poul.* **12**, 807–834.
43. Christensen NH, Yavari CA, McBain AJ, Bradbury JM. 1994 Investigations into the survival of *Mycoplasma gallisepticum*, *Mycoplasma synoviae* and *Mycoplasma iowae* on materials found in the poultry house environment. *Avian Pathol.* **23**, 127–143. (doi:10.1080/03079459408418980)
44. Marois C, Dufour-Gesbert F, Kempf I. 2000 Detection of *Mycoplasma synoviae* in poultry environment samples by culture and polymerase chain reaction. *Vet. Microbiol.* **73**, 311–318. (doi:10.1016/s0378-1135(00)00178-4)
45. Nagatomo H, Takegahara Y, Sonoda T, Yamaguchi A, Uemura R, Hagiwara S, Sueyoshi M. 2001 Comparative studies of the persistence of animal *Mycoplasmas* under different environmental conditions. *Vet. Microbiol.* **82**, 223–232. (doi:10.1016/s0378-1135(01)00385-6)
46. Sawicka-Durkalec A, Kurska O, Bednarski Ł, Tomczyk G. 2021 Occurrence of *Mycoplasma* spp. in wild birds: phylogenetic analysis and potential factors affecting distribution. *Sci. Rep.* **11**, 17065. (doi:10.1038/s41598-021-96577-0)
47. Lierz M, Obon E, Schink B, Carbonell F, Hafez HM. 2008 The role of mycoplasmas in a conservation project of the lesser kestrel (*Falco naumanni*). *Avian Dis.* **52**, 641–645. (doi:10.1637/8378-061608-Reg.1)
48. Lecis R *et al.* 2010 Identification and characterization of novel *Mycoplasma* spp. belonging to the hominis group from griffon vultures. *Res. Vet. Sci.* **89**, 58–64. (doi:10.1016/j.rvsc.2009.12.016)
49. Sumithra TG, Chaturvedi VK, Susan C, Siju SJ, Rai AK, Harish C, Sunita SC. 2013 Mycoplasmosis in wildlife: a review. *Eur. J. Wildl. Res.* **59**, 769–781. (doi:10.1007/s10344-013-0769-9)
50. Xiao L, Totten AH, Crabb DM, Atkinson TP, Waites KB. 2022 Antimicrobial susceptibilities and mechanisms of resistance of commensal and invasive *Mycoplasma salivarium* isolates. *Front. Microbiol.* **13**, 914464. (doi:10.3389/fmicb.2022.914464)
51. Dawood A *et al.* 2022 Mycoplasmas as host pantropic and specific pathogens: clinical implications, gene transfer, virulence factors, and future perspectives. *Front. Cell. Infect. Microbiol.* **12**, 855731. (doi:10.3389/fcimb.2022.855731)
52. Poveda JB, Carranza J, Miranda A, Garrido A, Hermoso M, Fernandez J, Domenech J. 1990 An epizootiological study of avian mycoplasmas in southern Spain. *Avian Pathol.* **19**, 627–633. (doi:10.1080/03079459008418718)
53. Lierz M, Schmidt R, Goebel T, Ehrlein J, Runge M. 2000 Detection of *Mycoplasma* spp. in raptorial birds in Germany. *Raptor Biomed.* **III**, 25–33.
54. Lierz M, Schmidt R, Runge M. 2002 *Mycoplasma* species isolated from falcons in the Middle East. *Vet. Rec.* **151**, 92–93. (doi:10.1136/vr.151.3.92)



55. Poveda JB, Giebel J, Kirchhoff H, Fernandez A. 1990 Isolation of mycoplasmas from a buzzard, falcons and vultures. *Avian Pathol.* **19**, 779–783. (doi:10.1080/03079459008418729)
56. Erdélyi K, Tenk M, Dan A. 1999 Mycoplasmosis associated perosis type skeletal deformity in a saker falcon nestling in Hungary. *J. Wildl. Dis.* **35**, 586–590. (doi:10.7589/0090-3558-35.3.586)
57. Brown DR, Schumacher IM, McLaughlin GS, Wendland LD, Brown ME, Klein PA, Jacobson ER. 2002 Application of diagnostic tests for mycoplasma infections of desert and gopher tortoises with management recommendations. *Chelon. Conserv. Biol.* **4**, 497–507.
58. Lierz M, Hagen N, Harcourt-Brown N, Hernandez-Divers SJ, Lüschor D, Hafez HM. 2007 Prevalence of mycoplasmas in eggs from birds of prey using culture and a genus-specific mycoplasma polymerase chain reaction. *Avian Pathol.* **36**, 145–150. (doi:10.1080/03079450701213347)
59. Lierz M, Hafez HM. 2009 Respiratory disease. *Vet. Rec.* **164**, 629–630. (doi:10.1136/vr.164.20.629)
60. Grodio JL, Ley DH, Schat KA, Hawley DM. 2013 Chronic *Mycoplasma conjunctivitis* in house finches: host antibody response and *M. gallisepticum* VlhA expression. *Vet. Immunol. Immunopathol.* **154**, 129–137. (doi:10.1016/j.vetimm.2013.05.010)
61. Dhondt AA, DeCoste JC, Ley DH, Hochachka WM. 2014 Diverse wild bird host range of *Mycoplasma gallisepticum* in eastern North America. *PLoS One* **9**, e103553. (doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0103553)
62. Lierz M, Hagen N, Hernandez-Divers SJ, Hafez HM. 2008b Occurrence of mycoplasmas in free-ranging birds of prey in Germany. *J. Wildl. Dis.* **44**, 845–850. (doi:10.7589/0090-3558-44.4.845)
63. Lierz M, Hagen N, Lueschow D, Hafez HM. 2008c Species-specific polymerase chain reactions for the detection of *Mycoplasma buteonis*, *Mycoplasma falconis*, *Mycoplasma gypis*, and *Mycoplasma corogypis* in captive birds of prey. *Avian Dis.* **52**, 94–99. (doi:10.1637/8094-082107-Reg)
64. Sawicka A, Durkalec M, Tomczyk G, Kursa O. 2020 Occurrence of *Mycoplasma gallisepticum* in wild birds: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *PLoS One* **15**, e0231545. (doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0231545)
65. Leung NHL. 2021 Transmissibility and transmission of respiratory viruses. *Nat. Rev. Microbiol.* **19**, 528–545. (doi:10.1038/s41579-021-00535-6)
66. Hatzofe O. 2020 *Summary of the griffon vulture counts in Israel*. Israeli Nature and Parks Authority internal report. pp. 1–5.
67. Nemtsov S, Hatzofe O, Steinitz O, Vine G. 2021 An innovative automatic location-based real-time alert system to prevent wildlife poisoning using GPS-tagged griffon vultures has led to better conservation of endangered species in protected areas. See <https://panorama.solutions/en/solution/innovative-automatic-location-based-real-time-alertsystem-prevent-wildlife-poisoning-using>.
68. Acácio M, Anglister N, Vaadia G, Harel R, Nathan R, Hatzofe O, Spiegel O. 2023 A lifetime track of a griffon vulture: the moving story of Rehovot (Y64). *Ecology* **104**, e3985. (doi:10.1002/ecy.3985)
69. Duriez O, Eliotout B, Sarrazin F. 2011 Age identification of Eurasian griffon vultures *Gyps fulvus* in the field. *Ring. Migr.* **26**, 24–30. (doi:10.1080/03078698.2011.585912)
70. Zuberogioitia I, De La Puente J, Elorriaga J, Alonso R, Palomares LE, Martínez JE. 2013 The flight feather molt of griffon vultures (*Gyps fulvus*) and associated biological consequences. *J. Raptor Res.* **47**, 292–303. (doi:10.3356/JRR-12-09.1)
71. Silk MJ, Jackson AL, Croft DP, Colhoun K, Bearhop S. 2015 The consequences of unidentifiable individuals for the analysis of an animal social network. *Anim. Behav.* **104**, 1–11. (doi:10.1016/j.anbehav.2015.03.005)
72. Feberwee A, Mekkes DR, Klinkenberg D, Vernooij JCM, Gielkens ALJ, Stegeman JA. 2005 An experimental model to quantify horizontal transmission of *Mycoplasma gallisepticum*. *Avian Pathol.* **34**, 355–361. (doi:10.1080/03079450500180770)
73. Finn KR, Silk MJ, Porter MA, Pinter-Wollman N. 2019 The use of multilayer network analysis in animal behaviour. *Anim. Behav.* **149**, 7–22. (doi:10.1016/j.anbehav.2018.12.016)
74. Wey T, Blumstein DT, Shen W, Jordán F. 2008 Social network analysis of animal behaviour: a promising tool for the study of sociality. *Anim. Behav.* **75**, 333–344. (doi:10.1016/j.anbehav.2007.06.020)
75. Pinter-Wollman N et al. 2014 The dynamics of animal social networks: analytical, conceptual, and theoretical advances. *Behav. Ecol.* **25**, 242–255. (doi:10.1093/beheco/art047)
76. Freeman LC, Borgatti SP, White DR. 1991 Centrality in valued graphs: a measure of betweenness based on network flow. *Soc. Networks* **13**, 141–154. (doi:10.1016/0378-8733(91)90017-N)
77. Wasserman S. 1994 *Social network analysis: methods and applications*, pp. 131–134, vol. 2. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
78. Perkins SE, Cagnacci F, Stradiotto A, Arnoldi D, Hudson PJ. 2009 Comparison of social networks derived from ecological data: implications for inferring infectious disease dynamics. *J. Anim. Ecol.* **78**, 1015–1022. (doi:10.1111/j.1365-2656.2009.01557.x)
79. Krapivsky PL, Rodgers GJ, Redner S. 2001 Degree distributions of growing networks. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **86**, 5401–5404. (doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.86.5401)
80. Csardi G, Nepusz T. 2006 The igraph software package for complex network research. *InterJ. Complex Syst.* **1695**, 1–9.
81. van Kuppeveld FJ, van der Logt JT, Angulo AF, van Zoest MJ, Quint WG, Niesters HG, Galama JM, Melchers WJ. 1992 Genus- and species-specific identification of mycoplasmas by 16s rRNA amplification. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* **58**, 2606–2615. (doi:10.1128/aem.58.8.2606-2615.1992)
82. Bush AO, Lafferty KD, Lotz JM, Shostak AW. 1997 Parasitology meets ecology on its own terms: Margolis et al. revisited. *J. Parasitol.* **83**, 575–583. (doi:10.2307/3284227)
83. Zuur AF, Ieno EN, Walker NJ, Saveliev AA, Smith GM. *Mixed effects models and extensions in ecology with R*. New York, NY: Springer.
84. Bates D, Mächler M, Bolker B, Walker S. 2014 Fitting linear mixed-effects models using lme4. *arXiv*. (doi:arXiv:1406.5823)
85. Johnson PCD, Barry SJE, Ferguson HM, Müller P. 2015 Power analysis for generalized linear mixed models in ecology and evolution. *Methods Ecol. Evol.* **6**, 133–142. (doi:10.1111/2041-210X.12306)

86. R Core Team. 2021 *R: a language and environment for statistical computing*. Vienna, Austria: R Foundation for Statistical Computing. See <https://www.R-project.org>.
87. Hartig F, Hartig MF. 2017 Package 'DHARMA'. *R package*. See <https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/DHARMA/index.html>.
88. Lüdtke D, Makowski D, Waggoner P, Patil I. 2020 Performance: assessment of regression models performance. *R. package version 0.4*. See <https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/performance/performance.pdf>.
89. Team RC, Team MRC, Suggests M, Matrix S. 2018 Package stats. *The R stats package*. See <https://stat.ethz.ch/R-manual/R-devel/library/stats/html/OOIndex.html>.
90. Smith JE, Pinter-Wollman N. 2021 Observing the unwatchable: integrating automated sensing, naturalistic observations and animal social network analysis in the age of big data. *J. Anim. Ecol.* **90**, 62–75. (doi:10.1111/1365-2656.13362)
91. Adelman JS, Carter AW, Hopkins WA, Hawley DM. 2013 Deposition of pathogenic *Mycoplasma gallisepticum* onto bird feeders: host pathology is more important than temperature-driven increases in food intake. *Biol. Lett.* **9**, 20130594. (doi:10.1098/rsbl.2013.0594)
92. Hawley DM, Gibson AK, Townsend AK, Craft ME, Stephenson JF. 2021 Bidirectional interactions between host social behaviour and parasites arise through ecological and evolutionary processes. *Parasitology* **148**, 274–288. (doi:10.1017/S0031182020002048)
93. Briard L, Ezenwa VO. 2021 Parasitism and host social behaviour: a meta-analysis of insights derived from social network analysis. *Anim. Behav.* **172**, 171–182. (doi:10.1016/j.anbehav.2020.11.010)
94. Langager MM, Adelman JS, Hawley DM. 2023 Let's stick together: infection enhances preferences for social grouping in a songbird species. *Ecol. Evol.* **13**, e10627. (doi:10.1002/ece3.10627)
95. López-Rull I, Hornero-Méndez D, Frías Ó, Blanco G. 2015 Age-related relationships between innate immunity and plasma carotenoids in an obligate avian scavenger. *PLoS One* **10**, e0141759. (doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0141759)
96. Hamzah DJ, Ayed M, Muhammed HA. 2022 Evaluation of culturing and molecular assay for detection of *Mycoplasma gallisepticum* in chicken suffering from chronic respiratory disease. *Cell. Mol. Biol.* **68**, 86–92. (doi:10.14715/cmb/2022.68.4.11)
97. Gelfand EW. 1993 Unique susceptibility of patients with antibody deficiency to *Mycoplasma* infection. *Clin. Infect. Dis.* **17**, S250–3.
98. Blount JD, Houston DC, Møller AP, Wright J. 2003 Do individual branches of immune defence correlate? A comparative case study of scavenging and non-scavenging birds. *Oikos* **102**, 340–350. (doi:10.1034/j.1600-0706.2003.12413.x)
99. Verbeek-Bucker G, González-Candela M, Galián J, Cubero-Pablo MJ, Martín-Atance P, León-Vizcaino L. 2008 Epidemiology of *Mycoplasma agalactiae* infection in free-ranging Spanish ibex (*Capra pyrenaica*) in Andalusia, southern Spain. *J. Wildl. Dis.* **44**, 369–380. (doi:10.7589/0090-3558-44.2.369)
100. Gangoso L, Grande JM, Lemus JA, Blanco G, Grande J, Donazar JA. 2009 Susceptibility to infection and immune response in insular and continental populations of Egyptian vulture: implications for conservation. *PLoS One* **4**, e6333. (doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0006333)
101. Blass Y, Lublin A, Avni-Magen N, King R. 2012 Prevalence of *Mycoplasma* species in free ranging and captive raptors of Israel.
102. Jovani R, Tella JL. 2006 Parasite prevalence and sample size: misconceptions and solutions. *Trends Parasitol.* **22**, 214–218. (doi:10.1016/j.pt.2006.02.011)
103. Kollias GV, Sydenstricker KV, Kollias HW, Ley DH, Hosseini PR, Connolly V, Dhondt AA. 2004 Experimental infection of house finches with *Mycoplasma gallisepticum*. *J. Wildl. Dis.* **40**, 79–86. (doi:10.7589/0090-3558-40.1.79)
104. McCallum H, Dobson A. 1995 Detecting disease and parasite threats to endangered species and ecosystems. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* **10**, 190–194. (doi:10.1016/S0169-5347(00)89050-3)
105. Haydon DT *et al.* 2006 Low-coverage vaccination strategies for the conservation of endangered species. *Nature* **443**, 692–695. (doi:10.1038/nature05177)
106. Ishfaq M, Hu W, Khan MZ, Ahmad I, Guo W, Li J. 2020 Current status of vaccine research, development, and challenges of vaccines for *Mycoplasma gallisepticum*. *Poult. Sci.* **99**, 4195–4202. (doi:10.1016/j.psj.2020.06.014)
107. D'Bastiani E, Anglister N, Lysnyansky I, Mikula I, Acácio M, Vaadia G *et al.* 2024 Supplementary material from: Social interactions do not affect mycoplasma infection in griffon vultures. Figshare. (doi:10.6084/m9.figshare.c.7557385)
108. D'Bastiani E. 2024 MycoplasmaProject\_2023. GitHub. See [https://github.com/elviradbastiani/MycoplasmaProject\\_2023](https://github.com/elviradbastiani/MycoplasmaProject_2023).