

## Relatedness and spatial proximity as determinants of host–parasite interactions in the brood parasitic Barrow's goldeneye (*Bucephala islandica*)

KIM JAATINEN,<sup>\*†</sup> SONJA JAARI,<sup>\*</sup> ROBERT B. O'HARA,<sup>‡</sup> MARKUS ÖST<sup>§</sup> and JUHA MERILÄ<sup>\*</sup>

<sup>\*</sup>Ecological Genetics Research Unit and <sup>‡</sup>Bird Ecology Unit, Department of Biological and Environmental Sciences, University of Helsinki, Finland

Received 17 January 2009; accepted 17 March 2009

Editorial handling: Michael T. K. Cheung

© 2009 The Authors. Journal compilation © 2009 British Ecological Society, *Molecular Ecology*, 18, 2713–2721



microsatellite loci described in Jaari et al (2009) and listed in Table A1, Supporting information. Polymerase chain



( $\pm 0.041$ ); the two did not significantly differ from each other ( $P = 0.84$ , Tukey's test). However, both relatedness coefficients were significantly higher than that of the remaining population [ $P = 0.011$  and  $0.001$  respectively, Tukey's test], the mean ( $\pm \text{SE}$ ) of which was  $-0.015$  ( $\pm 0.0081$ ).

#### Parasitism behaviour

The number of parasitic eggs laid into host nests increased with decreasing distance [ $b = -0.17$ , 95% highest posterior density interval [ $-0.28, -0.08$ ,  $\text{Pr}(\text{coefficient} > 0) < 0.001$ ]; Fig. 2]. The number of parasitic eggs also increased with relatedness between host and parasite [ $b = 2.4$ , 95% highest posterior density interval [0.70, 4.43,  $\text{Pr}(\text{coefficient} < 0) = 0.004$ ]; Fig. 2].

#### Clutch reduction and relatedness

There was evidence that the number of host offspring decreased with increasing relatedness to the parasite and increasing numbers of parasitic offspring in the nest:  $\log(R) = 2.1 - 0.06 \times \text{parasitic offspring} - 0.77 \times \text{relatedness}$  (Table 1, Fig. 3,  $R$  = expected number of offspring). However, although the confidence intervals were wide ( $-0.13$  to  $0.015$  for number of parasitic offspring,  $-1.54$  to  $-0.003$  for relatedness), the posterior probabilities that the estimates are not negative were all around 0.05 (0.06 and 0.025 for number of parasitic offspring and relatedness, respectively), meaning that there is a very small probability that the effect



not mutually exclusive, processes. First, natal philopatry may be facilitating the proximity of relatives. Second, a closely related species, the common goldeneye *Bucephala clangula*, has been documented to prioritize safe nest sites when parasitizing (Pöysä 1999). A closer examination of the fate of host nests included in our study revealed that they had not been subject to predation once over the past three years. Neighbouring common goldeneye nests have been found to have a high probability of sharing the same fate (predated vs. successful Pöysä 1999), and the probability of sharing the same fate also decreases with distance between nests (H. Pöysä, Finnish Game and Fisheries Research Institute, Joensuu, personal communication). Thus, nesting parasite females may target nests close to their own, safe nests in order to elevate the survival probability of their parasitic offspring.

Our finding that the number of parasitic eggs donated by nesting parasites increased with relatedness is in accordance with previous studies (Andersson & Åhlund 2000; Roy Nielsen et al 2006; Andersson & Waldeck 2007; Waldeck et al 2008). These studies found the relatedness between

donors, as well as elucidating whether negotiation between hosts and parasites occurs.

### Acknowledgements

We wish to thank Perttu Seppä and Lotta Sundström for encouragement and discussion at the early stage of the project. We also thank Kaisa Välimäki for commenting the molecular methods and Jed Scharf for field assistance. Sveinn Are Hanssen and two anonymous reviewers provided valuable comments to the manuscript. The study was financially supported by the Academy of Finland (project numbers 104582 to M.Ö., 106143 to R.B.O'H, and 213663 to J.M.), The Finnish Cultural Foundation (to K.J.), Delta Waterfowl Foundation (to K.J.), and Oskar Öflunds stiftelse (to K.J. and M.Ö.).

### References

- Åhlund M, Andersson M (2001) Female ducks can double their reproduction. *Nature*, 414, 600–601.
- Anderson MG, Rymer JM, Rohwer FC (1992) Philopatry, dispersal, and the genetic structure of waterfowl populations. In: *Ecology and Management of Breeding Waterfowl* Batt BDJ, Afton AD, Anderson MG, Ankney CD, Johnson DH, Kadlec JA, Krapu GL), pp. 365–395. University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis, Minnesota.
- Andersson M (2001) Relatedness and the evolution of conspecific
- 5.5(rat)-6.3lis1.8iftt6.3308 0 TD -06.3534c (, )Tj /F4 1 Tf0

CONSPECIFIC BROOD PARASITISM