Host–Parasite Evolution

General Principles and Avian Models

Edited by

Dale H. Clayton

Department of Biology, University of Utah

and

Janice Moore

Department of Biology, Colorado State University

Oxford New York Tokyo
OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS
1997

Appendix C

Collection and quantification of arthropod parasites of birds

Dale H. Clayton and Bruno A. Walther

Introduction

Other reviews

Host handling and data

Live birds
- Visual examination
- Trapping
- Anaesthesia
- Dust-ruffling

Dead birds
- Visual examination
- Necropsy
- Intranasal washing
- Body washing
- Dissolution

Preserved birds

Nests (*in situ*)
- Visual examination
- Traps

Nests (removed)
- Visual examination (with dissection)
- Scoop samples
- Berlese–Tullgren funnels
- Washing, flotation, and other methods

Handling and preservation of parasites

INTRODUCTION

In recent years, parasite ecologists have adopted a more quantitative approach and data on parasite populations are of interest to a rapidly growing audience. Estimates of parasite load (defined below) are increasingly being used as an independent variable predicting features of host evolution. It is, therefore, important to obtain accurate estimates of parasite load. In principle, ectoparasitic arthropods are relatively easy to quantify accurately, for the simple reason that they are on the outside of the host, where one can see them. They are particularly useful for longitudinal studies, in which both host and parasite need to be studied without undue disturbance. Just as parasite taxonomists are at the mercy of the collector, dependent on properly handled specimens and accurate host data, parasite ecologists are at the mercy of the methods developed for quantifying parasite load. The methodological literature on ectoparasite collecting is extensive, and we do not have space to review all of it here. Instead, we will cover some methods in detail and liberally cite papers devoted to other methods for entry into the literature.

We have tried to address all of the main groups of arthropod parasites of birds with the exception of 'ephemeral' parasites, such as mosquitoes, which complete essentially all of their life cycle away from the host. For these groups, readers must consult reviews such as Service (1993). Table 15.3 provides a list of representative taxa for each group of parasites we cover (Table C.1). In addition to providing practical information, we hope to impress upon readers the diversity of niches occupied by arthropod parasites of birds.

We have mainly concentrated on quantitative methods, but in some cases we present qualitative methods primarily used to obtain specimens of parasites for taxonomic study and for the construction of host-parasite lists. In these cases (e.g. air sac mites), qualitative techniques are, to our knowledge, the only ones available.

We use parasite 'load' as a generic phrase, encompassing three explicit measures of parasites: 'richness', the number of species of parasites present; 'prevalence', the proportion of individuals in a host population that is parasitized; 'intensity', the number of individual parasites harboured by an individual host (Margolis *et al.* 1982). Prevalence and intensity are normally calculated for each species of parasite present.

Measures of parasite load must be appropriate for the kind of parasite studied. Measures of prevalence alone are of limited value for arthropod parasites; intensity provides far more information (see Clayton and Moore, Chapter 1). It is important to use a method with a specified degree of accuracy for predicting parasite intensity (Barnard and Morrison 1985; Clayton 1991), or one that can be shown to be significantly correlated with total intensity (Møller 1990; Clayton and Tompkins 1994; Merino and Potti 1995). Failing this, one should at least try to calculate the repeatability of the method used (Møller 1991). Like most parasites, arthropods typically show an aggregated frequency distribution among individual hosts in a population (i.e. the majority of individuals have few parasites, whereas a few individuals have many parasites; Chapter 1). It is, therefore, important to quantify parasites from as large a sample of hosts as possible. Estimates of parasite richness (Walther *et al.* 1995), prevalence (Gregory and Blackburn 1991) and/or intensity (Poiani 1992) made from small host samples can be very misleading.

Table C.1 Techniques for quantifying arthropod parasites of birds (see text for details)

Principal microhabitat	Parasites	Techniques*
On feathers	Feather mites	VE, AN, DR, (BW, DI)
	Nest mites	VE, TR, AN, DR, (BW, DI)
	Lice	VE, AN, DR, (BW, DI)
	Fleas	AN, DR, (BW, DI)
	Louse flies	VE, TR, AN, DR, (BW, DI)
In feather quills	Quill mites	VE, TR (DI)
	Quill lice	VE, (DI)
On or in skin	Ticks	VE, SC, TR, (DI)
	Nest mites	VE, TR, AN, DR, (BW, DI)
	Skin mites	VE, SC, AN, DR, (BW, DI)
	Chigger mites	VE, SC, TR, (BW, DI)
	Lice	VE, AN, DR, (BW, DI)
	True bugs	VE, TR, AN, DR
	Fleas	AN, DR, (BW, DI)
	Louse flies	VE, TR, AN, DR, (BW, DI)
	Nest flies†	VE, TR
Under skin	Subcutaneous mites	VE, (NE)
	Botflies	VE, TR, (NE)
Under leg scales or bill covering	Scaly face/leg mites	SC, (NE)
In pouch	Lice	VE, (NE)
In nostrils	Nasal mites	(IW, NE)
In air sacs, trachea, and lungs	Respiratory mites	(NE)
In and around the nest‡	Soft ticks	VE, TR, (SS)
	Nest mites	VE, (BT)
	True bugs	VE, TR, (BT)
	Fleas	VE, TR, (BT)
	Nest flies	VE, TR, (BT)

*Methods in parentheses require death of the host or removal of nest material. See Table 15.3 for representative taxa in each group of parasites.
*AN, anaesthesia; BT, Berlese–Tullgren funnel; BW, body wash; DI, dissolution; DR, dust-ruffling; IW, intranasal wash; NE, necropsy; SC, scrapings; SS, scoop samples; TR, traps; VE, visual examination.
†Blow flies, flesh flies, milichiid flies, and neottiophilid flies.
‡Methods not listed include centrifugation, flotation, sedimentation, substrate washing, and ultrasonic cleaning. These methods are normally used in conjunction with one or more of the methods in the table (see text).

The time frame of data collection should also be considered. Ectoparasites are not just another phenotypic feature of the host; they have their own biology and populations that can vary rapidly in both space and time. Errors can be minimized by collecting ectoparasite data over a relatively short time span (Marshall 1981), or in a standardized way that will permit one to document seasonal fluctuations in parasite intensity.

OTHER REVIEWS

Previous methodological reviews include Watson and Amerson (1967), Dubinina (1977), Southwood (1978), Pritchard and Kruse (1982), and McClure (1984*a*). Broader based reviews include Sonenshine (1993) for ticks, Krantz (1978) and Philips (1990, 1993) for mites and Marshall (1981) for insects. Many of these references contain useful drawings

of the main groups of parasitic arthropods of birds. Van Riper and van Riper (1980) provide a listing of anatomical locations of arthropods on and in birds. Good reviews of the arthropods of captive birds are provided by Calnek *et al.* (1991) for poultry and Ritchie *et al.* (1994) for cage birds. Harwood and James (1979) provide an excellent review of the effects of arthropods on human and animal health.

HOST HANDLING AND DATA

Scientific collecting permits are required to handle birds (dead or alive) or their nests. Accurate identification of the host is vital; if the host identification is uncertain, it is important to collect voucher specimens or make detailed photographs. Essential data to record are host identification, collection locality (including elevation), date, and the name of the collector. It is also important to record the number of parasite-free hosts examined, so that prevalence and mean intensity for the host population can be calculated. Additional useful data include host sex, age, body mass, reproductive state, and general condition. The precise anatomical location of the parasite(s) and the collecting method used are also very helpful.

Captured birds should be bagged as soon as possible in the field to pacify them, prevent the loss of vagile parasites, such as fleas and louse flies, and to keep parasites from transferring among hosts. Although workers have traditionally used cloth bags to hold freshly caught birds (McClure 1984*a*), we recommend using paper lunch bags. Cloth bags can be a source of erroneous host–parasite records, even when they are washed between uses. Paper bags eliminate this problem, since they can be thrown away after being used for a single bird. Paper bags breathe well, absorb faeces and are surprisingly resistant to dampness. The flimsy paper bags sold in third world countries also work, but birds need to be double or triple bagged for strength. Staples or clothes pins work well for keeping bags shut and, in a pinch, host data can be recorded on the bag itself and later transferred to a permanent label or notebook. Bags can even be made from newspaper, if necessary, using a stapler.

The equipment needed for collecting ectoparasites is minimal and is generally similar to that outlined by Doster and Goater (Appendix B). Specialized materials are discussed under relevant sections below.

LIVE BIRDS

Visual examination

Visual estimates work best for permanent parasites, like feather mites or lice, which complete their entire life cycle on the body of the host and which are often present in relatively large numbers. It is important to standardize the examination by searching a constant area of the host for a constant amount of time. It is also important to examine body regions of each host in the same sequence, because arthropods often change microhabitat distribution on a captive, struggling bird. It is sometimes helpful to immobilize the bird's legs with a strip of Velcro (Clayton 1991) or surgical tape (Lee and Clayton 1995) before searching it.

Magnification is typically needed when dealing with parasites less than 1 mm in length. It is not practical to use a dissecting microscope or hand lens with live birds, since both hands are required to search the plumage. The best approach is to use a 2–4 × jeweller's headset with a portable light for illumination. It is well worth investing in a good quality one to avoid eyestrain and headaches.

It is critical to check the accuracy of any visual procedure by removing and counting all of the ectoparasites from a subsample of hosts immediately after examination (see methods below). Statistical regression techniques (Barnard and Morrison 1985; Clayton 1991) can then be used to check the accuracy of the visual method against total parasite intensity. The ectoparasites removed should be prepared, identified, and deposited as voucher specimens in a properly curated collection.

Visual examination can be used for the groups of arthropods discussed next.

Hard ticks

Hard ticks are relatively easy to count accurately, since they imbed their mouthparts in the host's skin for several days (Brooke 1985). They tend to attach to naked areas, such as the underwings, bare throat, near the eyes, eyelids, feet, legs, and belly, including the brood patch.

Soft ticks

Soft ticks are much harder to quantify by visual examination, because they are nest-based parasites that normally only spend from 30 minutes to several hours attached to the host, usually at night (larval stages can remain attached for much longer periods, usually days). Nest-based methods are thus a better approach for quantifying soft ticks (see Nests).

Feather mites

Feather mites are permanent parasites that look like tiny grains of sand on the feathers and are relatively easy to quantify by visual examination, because they are very sluggish. They are often present in large numbers between the barbs of the flight feathers of the wings and tail. They can be quantified by approximating the number of mites on each flight feather while holding the spread wing or tail against a well lit background (McClure 1989). Feather mite species often show extreme microhabitat specificity on the host, preferring particular feathers or even particular regions of an individual feather (see Janovy, chapter 15). It is, therefore, desirable to make a reference collection of feather mites from each flight feather (and even different regions of the same feather). Feather mites can be collected by snipping off portions of the feather vane with attached mites and placing them in a vial of 70% alcohol. A more painstaking method (but one that is less damaging to the bird) is to pass the tip of a dissecting needle along the barbules to remove the mites.

Nest mites

Nest mites are similar to soft ticks, in that they spend most of their time in the nest and are active mainly at night. Some nest mite taxa cannot be quantified accurately by visual examination (Weatherhead *et al.* 1993), but other taxa spend a lot of time on the body of the host and are relatively easy to count (Møller 1990). Body counts of some taxa are

correlated with nest counts (Møller 1990; Clayton and Tompkins 1995), but a more accurate estimate of nest mite intensity inevitably requires quantification of the number of mites in the nest, as well as on the body (see Nests).

Skin mites

Skin mites include several families with diverse life histories (Janovy, Chapter 15; Philips 1990). Most taxa are difficult to see, because they live in or under the skin or in silken 'nests' constructed on the skin. The best way to search for skin mites is to examine naked regions of skin under magnification. Skin mites often appear as small red or yellow dots in the middle of swellings on the skin and can be collected using a fine brush or probe dipped in alcohol. Skin mites, as well as chiggers and larval ticks, can also be collected by scraping infested areas with a needle, fine forceps, or scalpel. The scrapings should be examined under a dissecting microscope after smearing them onto a slide and adding a little glycerol and a coverslip. Van Riper and van Riper (1980) list regions of the body that should be scraped to collect skin mites.

Scaly face/leg mites

Scaly face/leg mites can sometimes be removed by scraping skin, scabs, lesions, or cysts with a scalpel. Ritchie *et al.* (1994) advise scraping encrusted areas with a dull scalpel and allowing the crusts to fall into a Petri dish of 70% alcohol, which is then examined under a dissecting microscope. However, these mites are often embedded too deeply to be removed by scraping without damaging the bird.

Chigger mites

Chigger mites are parasitic only during the larval stage; post-larval stages are free-living predators. While feeding, they typically attach to the host around the thighs, vent, or under the wings for a period of 3–4 days. They are minute (0.1–0.3 mm) and difficult to observe without magnification. When present in large numbers, they usually cluster on the host's body, greatly facilitating detection. Chiggers can sometimes be removed by scraping.

Subcutaneous mites

Subcutaneous mites encyst too deeply to be retrieved by scraping. They can be detected visually by wetting the skin in the breast area and pushing it back and forth while looking for stationary white nodules of mites under the skin (Philips 1990).

Lice

Lice are permanent parasites that glue their eggs to the host's feathers with a glandular cement (Janovy, Chapter 15). The eggs tend to be congregated in regions that the bird cannot preen, such as the head or the underwing coverts (Nelson and Murray 1971). Louse intensity can sometimes be estimated by counting eggs (Kirkpatrick *et al.* 1991; Lee and Clayton 1995). At times, however, large numbers of hatched eggs may be present in the absence of lice, which have long since emigrated or died (Durden, personal communication). Louse eggs have species–specific microtopography (Balter 1968*a,b*; Foster 1969*a*), making it possible to distinguish the eggs of different species of lice from a single host (one must first determine the specific association of egg type and hatched

lice). It is relatively easy to distinguish hatched and unhatched eggs; the former are missing the distal tip and usually appear flattened.

Visual examination has been used by numerous workers to quantify adult and nymphal lice. Clayton (1991) used a stepwise regression approach, originally developed for cattle ticks (Barnard and Morrison 1985), in order to estimate the total intensity of lice on rock doves from counts of lice on particular body regions ($r^2 \geqslant 0.82$). Hunter and Colwell (1994) used an area–time-constrained search to compare the louse intensities of five shorebird species; they provide a thoughtful discussion of the advantages and disadvantages of this approach. Booth *et al.* (1993) minimized handling time of birds in the field by estimating louse loads using categorical scores.

It is important to be aware of the limitations of visual estimates. Three minute visual estimates of lice on rock doves ($n = 10$) accounted for a mean of only 12% (range 4–26%) of the lice subsequently removed by fumigating the same birds. Three minute estimates of lice on smaller bodied swifts ($n = 36$), which have less dense plumage and larger lice, accounted for a mean of 82% (range 0–100%) of the lice (Walther and Clayton 1996).

In some cases it is possible to estimate the intensity of lice by quantifying the amount of feather damage they cause. Feather mass is correlated with louse intensity (Clayton 1990, 1991), as is the number of holes chewed in the flight feathers (Møller 1991).

Quill lice, quill mites and pouch lice

Three orders of birds (Procellariiformes, Charadriiformes and Galliformes) are known to have quill lice that live inside the quills of flight feathers, and several orders of birds have quill mites that occupy the same microhabitat (see Janovy, Chapter 15). To count these by visual examination requires dissection of the quills with a microscalpel under alcohol, although both quill lice and quill mites can also be detected by holding the translucent quills up to a strong light.

Pelicans and cormorants have large lice that live inside their gular pouches.

Fleas

Fleas cannot be quantified accurately using visual examination, because they quickly abandon the body of a captured host (Stark and Kinney 1962). They also move too fast through the feathers to be sure of counting each individual only once. It is feasible, however, to count fleas on the bodies of nestling birds before they acquire their feathers (Brown and Brown 1986). It is also straightforward to count 'sticktight' fleas, which spend up to several weeks firmly attached to the face, wattles, vent, and other unfeathered regions (Marshall 1981).

Louse flies

Louse flies are temporary ectoparasites that spend the adult stage on the host, later pupating in the host's nest or general surroundings. Visual examination is an effective means of quantifying wingless species (Lee and Clayton 1995), as well as certain winged species (Young *et al.* 1993), but most louse flies move too quickly to be censused visually. Like fleas, they tend to abandon a struggling host, so it is important to use walk-in traps, rather than mist nets (McClure 1984*b*), and to move freshly caught birds into a more

secure enclosure as soon as possible. Agitating the feathers of a freshly caught bird in a fine meshed net bag is a good way to encourage flies to leave the host, after which they can be killed by squirting alcohol on them with a dropper. If a large number of birds is to be examined, a screened enclosure with sleeved armholes is a good method for agitating feathers and capturing flies (Klei and DeGiusti 1975). Tarshis (1952) provides detailed designs for portable insectaries that facilitate the collection of louse flies from freshly trapped birds in the field. Anaesthesia jars and dust-ruffling also work well (see below).

True bugs

True bugs are nest-based parasites that can be estimated by counting the number of feeding individuals attached to unfeathered nestling birds. Such counts are correlated with the total number of bugs in the nest (Brown and Brown 1996). Because they are active mainly at night, infestations need to be relatively high for many bugs to remain attached to nestlings during the daytime (Brown, personal communication). Methods for estimating the number of bugs in the nest are discussed later.

Nest flies

Nest flies (Table C.1) have larvae that spend most of their time in the host's nest, periodically emerging to feed on the nestlings. They are easy to quantify by counting the number of larvae and pupae in the nest material after the nestlings have fledged (see Nests).

Botflies

Botflies, in contrast, have body-based larvae that develop between the dermis and musculature of the nestling host. They breathe by means of spiracles protruding through a hole in the skin and are therefore easy to locate and count (Arendt 1985). Botflies drop from the host as third instar larvae and pupate in the nest or close to it.

Trapping

Ectoparasites like ticks, chiggers, and some nest mites can be trapped from live birds by placing the host in a cage over a large pan of water into which the parasites fall after feeding (Krantz 1978; Sonenshine 1993). Castro (1973) developed a clever method for trapping quill mites in a funnel as they emerged from the feathers of live house sparrows.

Anaesthesia

When removal of ectoparasites does not conflict with the goals of the study (e.g. collection of longitudinal data), then a more automatic method for determining parasite load is to anaesthetize or fumigate the parasites. This approach yields a higher fraction of the parasite population than visual examination (Walther and Clayton 1996). It is also less prone to error than visual examination, especially when dealing with large numbers of hosts. However, one cannot tell what fraction of the ectoparasites were alive at the time of collection. This can be a problem in the case of parasites such as Ischnoceran lice, which tend to clamp their mandibles shut around a feather barb when they die.

Birds have occasionally been anaesthetized along with their ectoparasites (see for example Chandra *et al.* 1990). However, this procedure is dangerous to the bird, as one must be certain to use the correct dosage. Wolfensohn and Lloyd (1994) review anaesthesia by injection or inhalation. It is, of course, essential to make sure the bird has recovered fully prior to release.

A much safer approach is to anaesthetize parasites of conscious birds using a glass or plastic jar with a modified cap, the middle of which has been replaced by a rubber diaphragm. A piece of filter paper is cut to fit the bottom of the jar and a few drops of anaesthetic are added to the paper. The bird is then placed in the jar with its head protruding through a slit of appropriate size cut in the diaphragm. The usual procedure is to wait 20 minutes for the fumes to penetrate the plumage, then release the bird, and carefully remove the filter paper for examination under magnification. This design, described by Fowler and Cohen (1983), replaced an earlier less efficient design known as the 'Fair Isle Apparatus' (Williamson 1954; Southwood 1978; Marshall 1981). Bear (1995) recently suggested further improvements, but Walther and Clayton (1996) were unable to detect any significant difference in the performance of the Fowler–Cohen and Bear designs, at least for collecting lice.

Carbon dioxide, chloroform, ether, and ethyl acetate have all been tried in anaesthesia jars. Carbon dioxide has been used successfully with Bear-type anaesthesia jars (Visnak and Dumbacher, personal communication). Chloroform is also effective, but dangerous to work with, and can cause the birds themselves to become drowsy or comatose, even in jars with tightly fitted diaphragms (Fowler 1984). Ethyl acetate is safer to use, but is somewhat less effective than chloroform or ether (Poiani, personal communication; Walther, unpublished data). Brown *et al.* (1995) used ether to fumigate individually more than 5000 cliff swallows and found it to work well, with no side effects on the birds, many of which were recaptured in subsequent years. Unfortunately, ether is a serious fire risk and is so volatile that it tends to evaporate even from tightly sealed vessels.

Anaesthesia jars have been used for many bird species to collect a variety of ectoparasite groups, including lice, mites, and even vagile parasites such as louse flies and fleas (Fowler and Cohen 1983; Wheeler and Threlfall 1986; Poiani 1992). The principal advantage of using jars is that they enable one person to sample 10 or even 20 birds at the same time, given a sufficient number of jars (Fowler and Cohen 1983). The main disadvantage is that the method removes only up to 80% of the ectoparasites (Fowler and Cohen 1983; Poiani 1992) and misses the head entirely, which is the main site of attachment for certain groups such as hard ticks. It is thus necessary to do a visual search of each bird's head, reducing the standardization of the technique. Returns are greatly improved by ruffling the bird's feathers as it is removed from the jar (Walther and Clayton 1996). Ideally, the feathers should be ruffled for repeated bouts until the point of diminishing returns is reached (Clayton *et al.* 1992; Walther and Clayton 1996).

Anaesthesia jars are further limited in that they cannot be used for very large birds (although Fowler and Shaw 1989 used modified buckets for Manx shearwaters), jars and liquid anaesthetic are cumbersome to transport, particularly to remote field sites, and the birds look uncomfortable in the jars, which can be disturbing to some field assistants and members of the public.

Dust-ruffling

A simpler, more thorough method of removing ectoparasites from live birds is to dust them with an insecticidal powder, then ruffle their feathers over a collecting surface, such as a large pan, piece of paper, cotton sheet, or into a plastic bag. A careful search of the paper or bag is then made under magnification from a jeweller's headset or dissecting microscope, while transferring the parasites to a vial with a brush dipped in alcohol (Walther and Clayton 1996). A coloured collecting surface provides the best contrast for seeing both light coloured immatures and darker adults.

Dust-ruffling was introduced by Floyd and Tower (1956) for poultry and Malcomson (1960) for wild birds, although the latter encouraged birds to flutter beneath an inverted paper carton, rather than ruffling their feathers by hand. Both studies used pyrethrum powder, a 'fast knock-down, slow killing' insecticide with no side effects on birds or mammals (Casida 1973; Jackson 1985). Pyrethrum is a biodegradable derivative of chrysanthemums, which breaks down within hours or days in the environment, making it ideal for studies of re-infestation rates (Casida and Quistad 1995). The kill rate of pyrethrum is not 100%, so most commercial insect powders use a combination of pyrethrin, a derivative of pyrethrum, and the synergist piperonyl butoxide. This combination is extremely effective and pyrethrin is considered 'the safest of all mite killers' (Bates and Busenbark 1963). Aerosal sprays containing these ingredients are produced by the pet industry and may actually work better than dust, so long as they do not wet the plumage.

Another fumigant used extensively for collecting bird ectoparasites is the silica aerogel powder known as Dri-Die 67 (Tarshis 1961; Dalgleish 1966; Watson and Amerson 1967; Kettle 1975; McClure 1984*a*). This substance is an extremely fine grained, chemically inert, industrial desiccant that works by abrading and absorbing the lipid layer of insect cuticle, leading to rapid desiccation and 100% ectoparasite mortality within 3 hours (Tarshis 1967). Unlike pyrethroids, Dri-Die is an extremely long lasting fumigant which should not be used in studies of re-infestation rates. An aerosol spray of silicon aerogel is available, but it should not be used on birds, as it coats them with crystals (McClure 1984*a*). A product called Drione dust is a silica aerogel mixed with pyrethrin and synergized with piperonyl butoxide; it works more quickly than Dri-Die alone (Dalgleish, personal communication). Although Dri-Die and Drione are non-toxic to birds (Tarshis 1961; Jackson 1985), the silicon they contain can remove oil from the plumage, causing birds to die from exposure when caught in rainy weather soon after dusting (Palma, personal communication; Walther and Clayton 1996).

Dust-ruffling with pyrethrin or Dri-Die can be irritating to the investigator, unless one uses a paper face mask to prevent sneezing. It is important to shield the bird's eyes from as much dust as possible, although it has no long-term effects. The dust can be distributed throughout the plumage either with the fingers or by using a plastic squeeze bottle to 'puff' the dust under the feathers. Distributing dust through the dense plumage of a rock dove can take up to 5 minutes (Walther and Clayton 1996). Harshbarger and Raffensperger (1959) encased chickens in open, inverted plastic bags to ensure that ectoparasites fell straight down onto the collecting surface during ruffling. Pyrethrin and Dri-Die are very irritating to parasites, causing even ischnoceran lice to drop out of the plumage, instead of dying with their mandibles clamped shut around barbules. And,

because neither substance kills the parasites outright, they continue to twitch on the collecting surface, making them easier to see.

It is necessary to combine dusting with ruffling for best results. Kettle (1983) found that Drione dusting alone removed only 75% of the lice on starlings. Walther and Clayton (1996) tripled the number of lice initially removed from pigeons dusted with pyrethrin by subsequently ruffling them for repeated bouts until reaching the point of diminishing returns (Clayton *et al.* 1992). Dust-ruffling removes up to 25% more lice than anaesthesia jars and returns are a more accurate reflection of total load (Walther and Clayton 1996).

When vagile parasites, like fleas or louse flies, are to be collected, birds should be inserted quickly into plastic bags after a cursory dusting. If necessary, the dust can be distributed more thoroughly to ensure killing of other parasites after vagile taxa have died. The materials required for this method are portable and it can conceivably be used on birds of any size, although the idea of dust-ruffling an ostrich is rather daunting! Palma (personal communication) has ruffled large albatrosses with excellent results. Unlike anaesthesia jars, dust-ruffling allows thorough sampling of the head, which is sometimes the most heavily infested part of the bird (Marshall 1981).

DEAD BIRDS

More accurate parasite counts can be made from dead birds than from live ones. Indeed, groups such as air sac mites are difficult to collect from live birds at all. Killing large numbers of birds to quantify their parasite loads is undesirable on ethical grounds. However, opportunities often exist for collecting the ectoparasites of dead birds by teaming up with museum expeditions, hunters, pest control authorities, or other sources of freshly killed material.

Several methods are aimed at collecting and quantifying arthropods from hosts in the field. Sealander and Hoffman (1956) devised a funnel for collecting fleas and other vagile ectoparasites from freshly killed mammals and birds. Clayton *et al.* (1992) anaesthetized the parasites of dead birds with ethyl acetate fumes, then ruffled their feathers for repeated bouts until reaching the point of diminishing returns.

Although the best results are usually obtained from freshly killed hosts, permanent parasites can also be collected from refrigerated hosts for up to several days following death. If refrigeration is unavailable, it is possible to delay collecting for a day or two by preserving the host temporarily with an injection of formalin into the body cavity (Mohr 1959) or embalming fluid (Nelson and Murray 1971). Birds can also be frozen for long-term storage. If aetiological agents are to be isolated, then the parasites must be kept alive or frozen in an ultra-cold or on dry ice (Marshall 1981). Museums often preserve some of their bird specimens in alcohol after injecting them with formalin to fix the internal tissues. The ectoparasite faunas of such birds can easily be quantified, so long as the birds have been bound in *several layers* of cheesecloth or otherwise isolated prior to preservation. Isolation is a critical step, since birds destined for alcoholic collections are normally transported from the field in containers containing more than one species of bird.

It is essential to keep dead birds bagged and isolated from one another in the field, because many ectoparasite groups will quickly abandon a dead host in search of a new one. The literature is replete with erroneous host records owing to the secondary

transfer, or 'straggling', of arthropods among hosts on the skinning table. It is also essential to be sure that the working surface and one's hands are thoroughly cleared of ectoparasites before switching individual hosts. The best approach is to examine birds on a sheet of paper in a large, shallow pan or tray. The paper is then shaken clean or, better yet, changed entirely each time a new host individual is examined. One cannot over-emphasize the importance of avoiding contamination in the field.

Visual examination

Ectoparasite loads of dead birds can be quantified by searching the entire skin and plumage while deflecting the feathers with forceps. This is normally done under magnification, although it is difficult to examine entire carcasses, even small ones, under a dissecting microscope. A magnifying glass on a light stand (Eveleigh and Threlfall 1976) or a jeweller's headset and lamp are the best approaches. An easier way to keep track of one's progress during a visual examination is to remove the feathers a few at a time and examine each under a dissecting microscope (Doster *et al.* 1980). This approach is also an excellent way to map the microhabitat distributions of ectoparasites (Nelson and Murray 1971; Choe and Kim 1989), so long as the parasites are 'frozen' in place immediately upon death of the host. This is a necessary step to prevent post-mortem migration of the parasites, which takes place very quickly after the host dies. Several approaches have been used, including chloroform-soaked towels wrapped around the body of the host (Nelson and Murray 1971), quick freezing (Choe and Kim 1989), and fumigation of freshly killed birds in the field.

Necropsy

Respiratory mites

Respiratory mites in the lungs, trachea, and air sacs are most easily collected by necropsy, although this is not an exercise for the impatient. Burley *et al.* (1991) failed to detect any air sac mites in 31 necropsied birds. On the other hand, Tidemann *et al.* (1992) removed respiratory mites from 62% of wild caught gouldian finches (n = 26); sites of infection included the nasal and buccal cavities, trachea, syrinx, bronchi, lungs, air sacs, and body cavity.

Tracheal mites, which can be detected in coughed up mucous, appear as small black spots in the trachea and bronchi; large numbers are also often seen in the air sacs around the base of the heart. The mites can sometimes be located using transillumination of the trachea or a transtracheal wash (Ritchie *et al.* 1994). Van Riper and van Riper (1980) list sites to be examined for respiratory mites during necropsy.

Nasal mites

Nasal mites live in the nasal passages of the host and feed on mucous, blood, and tissue. Some taxa are fairly large and reddish or white in colour and are, therefore, easily seen. The traditional way to collect nasal mites is by necropsy, in which the bill is split between the nostrils and examined under a dissecting microscope with a probe. If the host is to be preserved as a museum specimen, the culmen can be left intact by removing the palate to expose the nasal mucosa for examination (Watson and Amerson 1967). Nasal mites can also be collected using the following method of non-destructive washing.

Intranasal washing

In this procedure, the nasal cavity of a dead bird is flushed with a fine stream of water from a hypodermic syringe or bulbed pipette. The method, originally devised for mammals (Yunker 1961), is rapid and provides good returns from birds (Wilson 1964). Wilson (1964) reported that visual examination, in conjunction with necropsy of the nasal passages, yielded higher prevalences of nasal mites than intranasal washing. However, the prevalences he reported from the two approaches are not significantly different [mites detected in 32 of 89 (36%) dissected birds and 62 of 200 (31%) washed birds; $\chi^2 = 0.69$, $P = 0.41$]. Spicer (1984) used intranasal washing to collect nasal mites from a large number of tropical bird species. The method also can be used on fluid-preserved museum specimens.

Body washing

This is an efficient technique, but one that can only be used on birds that are to be preserved in alcohol, skeletonized, or discarded (Watson and Amerson 1967). The ectoparasites are removed by shaking the bird in a plastic jar or tin containing a 1–2% solution of detergent or soap. The soap serves merely as a wetting agent and must be used in small quantity to prevent excessive foaming. The brand of soap is not critical; good results have been obtained with Cold Water All® (Henry and McKeever 1971), Alconox® (McGroarty and Dobson 1974) and Palmolive Dishwashing Liquid® (Wicht and Crossley 1983). Optimal results are obtained by shaking the immersed host on a paint shaker or other mechanical shaker for 5–10 minutes. After reducing the surface tension and foam with a stream of 95% alcohol, the solution is filtered through an 80 mesh (0.180 mm) screen or filter paper. The latter normally requires several changes of paper, particularly in the case of birds with soiled plumage. Vacuum filtration with a Buchner funnel (Krantz 1978) can speed the process, or one can try methods such as sedimentation, flotation, and/or centrifugation (see sections on Dissolution and Nests).

Henry and McKeever (1971) removed > 90% of mites, fleas and lice from rats using the washing technique and a paint shaker. However, only 66% of ticks were removed, the others presumably remaining attached to the host. Lipovsky (1951) refrigerated hosts for 24 hours, then warmed them to room temperature to encourage chiggers to detach before washing. McGroarty and Dobson (1974) removed > 95% of lice and > 85% of feather mites from house sparrows using the washing method and a paint shaker.

Clayton (unpublished data) used a simple form of body washing to collect lice and mites from freshly killed birds subsequently prepared as museum skeletal specimens. Each freshly killed bird was immersed in alcohol in a medical Whirlpack® bag, shaken vigorously for 60 seconds, then rinsed with a stream of alcohol as it was removed from the bag. The bags were rolled shut and transported back to the laboratory for examination.

Dissolution

This approach is like burning down a haystack to find its needles. The feathers and skin of the host are completely dissolved in potassium hydroxide (KOH), leaving behind the

exoskeletons of arthropods, which are made of chitinous carbohydrates that do not dissolve. The following protocol is a combination of steps from Choe and Kim (1987), Lemke *et al.* (1988) and Clayton (1991).

The dead bird is carefully skinned and the skin with attached plumage is incubated at 37–38°C for 24 hours in a beaker containing 0.5% trypsin (4 × USP Pancreatin) buffered to pH 7.5–8.3 with 0.2 M disodium phosphate (Na_2HPO_4). Following incubation, KOH is added to a concentration of 5.0%. The solution is then boiled on a hot plate until both skin and feathers are dissolved. The hot solution is filtered through an 80 mesh (0.180 mm) bronze or stainless steel screen and the exoskeletons are rinsed first with 95% alcohol, then with xylene to dissolve any fat remaining from the host's skin. Next the specimens are washed into a gridded Petri dish with 95% alcohol and stained with acid fuchsin for counting under a dissecting microscope. Adult arthropods collected by this method are often in good enough shape to be identified by taxonomists after mounting on microslides (but immature stages are often badly damaged).

Tests of this technique (Clayton 1991), using known numbers of adult lice added to clean feathers, showed a mean recovery of 95% (range 91–100%). However, the mean recovery of nymphal lice was only 82% (76–93%), which accords with the findings of other workers who found few nymphs (Ash 1960; Lemke *et al.* 1988). Hence, the method is not as reliable for immature stages as for adults, because nymphal instars apparently lack sufficient chitin or pass through the screen during filtration.

As in the case of washing, it is possible to use methods other than filtration for isolating ectoparasites following dissolution. Hilton (1970) suggested allowing hot KOH solution to stand for 12 hours until the ectoparasites and other fine particles have settled to the bottom of the beaker. The supernatant can then be decanted and the sediment transferred to a tube where it is centrifuged at 1200 r.p.m. After decanting again, the tube is filled with a zinc sulfate solution (386 g $ZnSO_4$ in 1.0 litre of water, specific gravity 1.18) and the mixture is again centrifuged for 5 minutes. This procedure causes the ectoparasites to float on the surface of the solution, from which they can be decanted or aspirated into a Petri dish and counted under a dissecting microscope. The disadvantage of this approach is that, with so many additional steps, the probability of losing ectoparasites increases, unless one is very careful. Diligent checking of the supernatants and final sediment under a dissecting microscope are essential to prevent losses.

Dissolution can be used to collect parasite microhabitat data by dividing the skin of the host into regions which are then incubated and dissolved in separate beakers. Choe and Kim (1988) used this approach to plot the microhabitat distributions of ticks, mites, and lice on the bodies of seabirds.

The principle drawback of dissolution is that, like body washing, it can only be used with dead birds that are not needed for museum specimens, although skeletons can be saved. Dissolution is also a relatively slow procedure and has an offensive smell (to put it mildy). The boiling step must be performed under a fume hood, as KOH fumes are toxic.

PRESERVED BIRDS

Foster (1969*b*) studied the demographics of warbler lice by counting unhatched louse eggs on museum skins. This approach could be useful for other groups of permanent

parasites, like feather mites. Museum skins are also a source of dried lice for taxonomic study (Ward 1957). One must be cautious, however, to avoid erroneous host records, because skins are routinely moved from drawer to drawer as collections expand. It is conceivable that louse intensity might be estimated from dried lice on bird skins, assuming the skins have been collected and prepared in exactly the same way.

Fluid-preserved birds are also a useful source of ectoparasites, so long as they have been isolated from other birds when collected, as described earlier. Indeed, fluid-preserved specimens are one of the best sources of ectoparasites like skin mites, which are difficult to collect, much less quantify, under field conditions.

NESTS (*IN SITU*)

Nest-based ectoparasites can be quantified more accurately from the nest than from the body of the host. Many methods have been used (Marshall 1981) and a comprehensive treatment is beyond the scope of this review. Generalizations are difficult, because birds' nests come in a wide variety of shapes and sizes (Collias and Collias 1984).

Visual examination

It is sometimes possible to obtain accurate estimates of large bodied parasites by counting the number of individuals visible in the nest (Lee and Clayton 1995). Rannala (1995) found that the number of bugs visible on the outside of cliff swallow nests was highly correlated with the total collected by subsequent destruction and sifting of the nest. Møller (1990) estimated the number of mites in barn swallow nests from the number swarming on his hand when it was placed on the rim of the nest for 10 seconds; these estimates were significantly correlated with the number of mites collected in Berlese–Tullgren funnels (see below). Samples of parasites can be removed from nests with a bulb-operated aspirator (Singer 1964). 'Pooters' or other aspirators requiring mouth suction should not be used, because of the possibility of inhaling arthropods capable of vectoring human pathogens (or the pathogens directly).

Traps

Bates (1962) devised a series of ingenious traps for capturing fleas, including pitfalls placed at the entrances of burrow nests, funnel traps attached to nest boxes, and artificial birds constructed from bottles of hot water for attracting fleas. Brown and Brown (1986) sampled flea populations over-wintering in cliff swallow nests by holding a black, honey-coated card up to the nest entrance. The fleas instinctively jumped onto such cards, as they would onto hovering cliff swallows returning from their wintering grounds. Chapman and George (1991) bolted ectoparasite harbourages to cliff faces in order to compare the densities of bugs and ticks at different colonies of cliff swallows. Drummond (1957) attached funnels to the bottoms of nest boxes to trap mites. Loye (1996) collected protocalliphorid fly pupae from nest boxes using inserts made of corrugated cardboard.

NESTS (REMOVED)

When nests (or samples) can be removed without undue disruption, for example immediately after the nestlings fledge, their contents can be accurately quantified using several methods.

Visual examination (with dissection)

Many authors have endured the painstaking process of dissecting nests and counting parasites one by one. Brown and Brown (1986) hand sifted and counted the material in 260 cliff swallow nests, 'an activity comparable to Dante's inferno in unpleasantness' (Brown, personal communication). Rogers *et al.* (1991) teased apart the lining and outer structure of swallow nests to count fly larvae and pupae. Heeb *et al.* (1996) counted fleas and fly larvae in great tit nests using a 5 mm wire sieve to separate the nest material from the parasites; it took 5–10 hours to count the contents of each nest (Heeb, personal communication).

Scoop samples

Duffy (1983) estimated the intensity of soft ticks in seabird colonies by sieving 500 cm^3 scoop samples of guano and debris from nests. Daturi (1986) isolated ticks from scoop samples using a Berlese–Tullgren Funnel.

Berlese–Tullgren funnels

Berlese–Tullgren funnels and other 'dry extractors' (reviewed in Southwood 1978) are veritable workhorses of arthropod ecology. Numerous designs are available and illustrated descriptions of some of these can be found in Krantz (1978), Southwood (1978), Marshall (1981), and McClure (1984*a*). Most Berlese–Tullgren funnels have a 25–60 watt light bulb suspended over the funnel, which slowly dries out the nest material from top to bottom over a period of 1–3 days. This causes the live arthropods to migrate to the bottom of the funnel and drop into a jar of 70% alcohol. A grid or cheesecloth lining prevents nest debris from falling into the jar. The drying out process must not be too fast, nor too slow, so it pays to experiment with the intensity and placement of the light bulb before processing valuable material. Nests containing dermanyssid mites or other highly mobile parasites must be processed in a funnel with an aluminium lid that houses the light (Burtt *et al.* 1991), a cloth lid beneath the light (McClure 1984*a*), or a ring of petroleum jelly smeared around the top of the funnel, to prevent escape.

Modifications of this basic design include funnels with heating units (Marshall 1981) or chemical repellents (Daturi 1986) instead of a light bulb. Teasing apart of the nest material speeds up the process. Miles and Kinney (1957) designed a funnel containing a series of sieves, a heating unit, and a fan to speed the extraction of fleas from rodent nests, each nest requiring only 20 minutes. Arthropods can be captured alive by placing a jar lined with moist paper beneath the funnel. Other recent examples of studies using Berlese–Tullgren funnels to quantify parasites include Eeva *et al.* (1994), Merilä and Allander (1995) and Merino and Potti (1995).

Washing, flotation, and other methods

Clark and Mason (1985) quantified mites from starling nests using a combination of aspiration, washing, and centrifugation; the volume of mites packed into the bottom of the centrifuge tube was used to estimate mite intensity. Flotation (see Dissolution) has often been used to separate invertebrates from soil and litter (reviewed in Southwood 1978); Shamiyeh *et al.* (1971) used it in conjunction with centrifugation and ultrasonic cleaning to isolate mites from house dust. These methods, in addition to sedimentation and substrate washing (Southwood 1978), may be useful for quantifying arthropods in nests, but we know of no published examples.

HANDLING AND PRESERVATION OF PARASITES

Arthropods should be handled gently with forceps, a dissecting needle, or a fine tipped camel hair brush dipped in alcohol. Broken legs, antennae, or setae (hairs) can impede subsequent identification. Some workers prefer to use a tiny scoop made by flattening the end of an insect pin, which is then inserted into a wooden handle. If a brush is used, it is critical to switch brushes or clean the brush very carefully when switching host species, to avoid erroneous host records. Laterally compressed parasites (e.g. fleas), dorso-ventrally compressed parasites (e.g. lice), or tiny parasites (some mites) are extremely easy to overlook between the bristles of a brush.

Ixodid ticks, chiggers, and sticktight fleas embed their mouthparts in the skin of the host and must be removed carefully to avoid damage (mouthparts can be required for identification). Chlordimeform (Gladney *et al.* 1974) encourages ticks to detach prior to collection.

Fly pupae and most immature ticks need to be reared to the adult stage for identification. Sabrosky *et al.* (1989) discuss methods for rearing *Protocalliphora* that are applicable to most nest flies. Sonenshine (1993) discusses rearing methods for ticks. See Krantz (1978) and Marshall (1981) for methods of rearing mites and insects, respectively.

Arthropods should be preserved in 70% alcohol (never formalin, which impedes subsequent chemical clearing of specimens for identification) in glass vials with screw caps lined with anti-evaporation inserts made of plastic (not pop-top or stoppered vials). Mites, ticks, lice, fleas, louse flies, and bugs can be dropped straight into alcohol. Nest fly larvae should be killed by immersion in boiling water prior to storage in alcohol or, better yet, immersed for 24 hours in KAAD solution (1 part kerosene, 10 parts 95% alcohol, 2 parts acetic acid, 14 parts dioxane; the latter is highly toxic).

Never mix parasites from different species of birds in a single vial. In fact, it is best to isolate parasites from each different host individual in a different vial. Dark, hard lead pencil does not fade in alcohol and should be used to make labels on good quality paper or card stock. The label should always be put *inside* the vial. The best way to transport vials is by inserting them in Styrofoam blocks with rows of holes cut in them. These can be purchased ready made or they are easily made up. If vials are unavailable, arthropods such as lice and fleas can be placed on a small piece of tissue paper in a sealed envelope and allowed to dry out (cotton should not be used, as it entangles specimens, making them difficult to remove without damage). Subsequent rehydration and mounting on

microslides gives excellent results. Prior to rehydration, however, dried specimens are extremely brittle and must be handled with care to avoid damaging them.

If specimens are to be stored in alcohol for a long time (years), 5–10% glycerin should be added to the alcohol to prevent hardening of specimens and to preserve them should the alcohol evaporate. It is necessary to top up the alcohol periodically. To prevent small vials from drying out in long-term storage, they can be placed in an inverted position between layers of cotton in a larger jar of alcohol, so long as the caps are not loosened in the process. This ensures that the fluid in the vials will be the last to evaporate should they go unchecked. Parafilm helps slow the loss of alcohol from jars containing vials (Pritchard and Kruse 1982).

Before mounting specimens from long-term storage, it is best to wash them several times with fresh 70% alcohol to remove the glycerol (Pritchard and Kruse 1982). For instructions on preparing microscope slide mounts see Krantz (1978) for mites and Marshall (1981) for insects.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We are grateful to the following people for discussion or other forms of assistance: C. R. Brown, R. C. Dalgleish, D. C. Hahn, P. Heeb, T. Jones, J. B. Kethley, C. C. Lord, J. E. Loye, J. Moore, B. R. Moyer, P. A. Nuttall, R. D. Price, S. E. Randolph, B. H. Rannala, T. R. E. Southwood, D. M. Tompkins, and R. Visnak. For discussion and comments on an earlier version of the manuscript we thank L. A. Durden, J. A. Fowler, J. E. Keirans, R. L. Palma, A. Poiani, G. S. Spicer, and a wonderfully critical anonymous referee.

REFERENCES

Arendt, W. J. (1985). *Philornis* ectoparasitism of pearly-eyed trashers. I. Impact on growth and development of nestlings. *Auk*, **102**, 270–80.

Ash, J. S. (1960). A study of the Mallophaga of birds with particular reference to their ecology. *Ibis*, **102**, 93–110.

Balter, R. S. (1968*a*). Lice egg morphology as a guide to taxonomy. *Medical and Biological Illustration*, **18**, 94–5.

Balter, R. S. (1968*b*). The microtopography of avian lice eggs. *Medical and Biological Illustration*, **18**, 166–79.

Barnard, D. R. and Morrison, R. D. (1985). Density estimators for populations of the lone star tick, *Amblyomma americanum* (Acari: Ixodidae), on pastured beef cattle. *Journal of Medical Entomology*, **22**, 244–9.

Bates, H. and Busenbark, R. (1963). *Finches and soft-billed birds*. T. R. F. Publications, Jersey City, NJ.

Bates, J. K. (1962). Field studies on the behaviour of bird fleas. *Parasitology*, **52**, 113–32.

Bear, A. (1995). An improved method for collecting bird ectoparasites. *Journal of Field Ornithology*, **66**, 212–4.

Booth, D. T., Clayton, D. H., and Block, B. A. (1993). Experimental demonstration of the energetic cost of parasitism in free-ranging hosts. *Proceedings of the Royal Society, London, B*, **253**, 125–9.

Brooke, M. de L. (1985). The effect of allopreening on tick burdens of molting eudyptid penguins. *Auk*, **102**, 893–5.

Brown, C. R. and Brown, M. B. (1986). Ectoparasites as a cost of coloniality in cliff swallows (*Hirundo pyrrhonota*). *Ecology*, **67**, 1206–18.

Brown, C. R. and Brown, M. B. (1996). *Coloniality in the cliff swallow: the effect of group size on social behavior*. University of Chicago Press.

Brown, C. R., Brown, M. B., and Rannala, B. (1995). Ectoparasites reduce long-term survival of their avian host. *Proceedings of the Royal Society, London, B*, **262**, 313–9.

Burley, N., Tidemann, S. C., and Halupka, K. (1991). Bill colour and parasite levels of zebra finches. In *Bird–parasite interactions: ecology, evolution, and behaviour* (ed. J. E. Loye and M. Zuk), pp. 359–76. Oxford University Press.

Burtt, E. H., Chow, W., and Babbitt, G. A. (1991). Occurence and demography of mites of tree swallow, house wren, and eastern bluebird nests. In *Bird–parasite interactions: ecology, evolution, and behaviour* (ed. J. E. Loye and M. Zuk), pp. 104–22. Oxford University Press.

Calnek, B. W., Barnes, H. J., Beard, C. W., Reid, W. M., and Yoder, H. W. (eds) (1991). *Diseases of poultry*. Iowa University Press, Ames.

Casida, J. E. (1973). *Pyrethrum, the natural insecticide*. Academic Press, New York.

Casida, J. E. and Quistad, G. B. (1995). *Pyrethrum flowers: production, chemistry, toxicology, and uses*. Oxford University Press.

Castro, S. D. (1973). A method for collection of the quill mites, *Syringophiloidus minor* (Berlese) (Prostigmata: Syringophilidae), from living birds. *Journal of Medical Entomology*, **10**, 524.

Chandra, S., Agarwal, G. P., Singh, S. P. N., and Saxena, A. K. (1990). Seasonal changes in a population of *Menacanthus eurysternus* (Mallophaga, Amblycera) on the common myna *Acridotheres tristis*. *International Journal for Parasitology*, **20**, 1063–5.

Chapman, B. R. and George, J. E. (1991). The effects of ectoparasites on cliff swallow growth and survival. In *Bird–parasite interactions: ecology, evolution, and behaviour* (ed. J. E. Loye and M. Zuk), pp. 69–92. Oxford University Press.

Choe, J. C. and Kim, K. C. (1987). Community structure of arthropod ectoparasites on Alaskan seabirds. *Canadian Journal of Zoology*, **65**, 2998–3005.

Choe, J. C. and Kim, K. C. (1988). Microhabitat preference and coexistence of ectoparasitic arthropods on Alaskan seabirds. *Canadian Journal of Zoology*, **66**, 987–97.

Choe, J. C. and Kim, K. C. (1989). Microhabitat selection and coexistence in feather mites (Acari: Analgoidea) on Alaskan seabirds. *Canadian Journal of Zoology*, **69**, 10–4.

Clark, L. and Mason, J. R. (1985). Use of nest material as insecticidal and anti-pathogenic agents by the European starling. *Oecologia*, **67**, 169–76.

Clayton, D. H. (1990). Mate choice in experimentally parasitized rock doves: lousy males lose. *American Zoologist*, **30**, 251–62.

Clayton, D. H. (1991). Coevolution of avian grooming and ectoparasite avoidance. In *Bird–parasite interactions: ecology, evolution, and behaviour* (ed. J. E. Loye and M. Zuk), pp. 258–89. Oxford University Press.

Clayton, D. H. and Tompkins, D. M. (1994). Ectoparasite virulence is linked to mode of transmission. *Proceedings of the Royal Society, London, B*, **256**, 211–7.

Clayton, D. H. and Tompkins, D. M. (1995). Comparative effects of mites and lice on the reproductive success of rock doves (*Columba livia*). *Parasitology*, **110**, 195–206.

Clayton, D. H., Gregory, R. D., and Price, R. D. (1992). Comparative ecology of neotropical bird lice. *Journal of Animal Ecology*, **61**, 781–95.

Collias, N. E. and Collias, E. C. (1984). *Nest building and bird behaviour*. Princeton University Press.

Dalgleish, R. C. (1966). An improved technique for collecting bird ectoparasites. *Turtox News*, **44**, 75.

Daturi, A. (1986). A preliminary study of tick populations in jackass penguin nests on Marcus Island, South Africa. *Ostrich*, **57**, 95–100.

Doster, G. L., Wilson, N., and Kellogg, F. E. (1980). Ectoparasites collected from bobwhite quail in the southeastern United States. *Journal of Wildlife Diseases*, **16**, 515–20.

Drummond, R. O. (1957). Observations on fluctuations of acarine populations from nests of *Peromyscus leucopus*. *Ecological Monographs*, **27**, 137–52.

Dubinina, M. N. (1977). *Parasitological study of birds series: methods of parasitological studies* (translated from Russian). Al-Ahram Center for Scientific Translations, Washington, DC.

Duffy, D. C. (1983). The ecology of tick parasitism on densely nesting Peruvian seabirds. *Ecology*, **64**, 110–9.

Eeva, T., Lehikoinen, E., and Nurmi, J. (1994). Effects of ectoparasites on breeding success of great tits (*Parus major*) and pied flycatchers (*Ficedula hypoleuca*) in an air pollution gradient. *Canadian Journal of Zoology*, **72**, 624–35.

Eveleigh, E. S. and Threlfall, W. (1976). Population dynamics of lice (Mallophaga) on auks (Alcidae) from Newfoundland. *Canadian Journal of Zoology*, **54**, 1694–711.

Floyd, E. H. and Tower, B. A. (1956). Insecticide impregnated litter for control of chicken body lice, *Eomenacanthus stramineus* (Nitz.), on poultry. *Poultry Science*, **35**, 896–900.

Foster, M. S. (1969*a*). The eggs of three species of Mallophaga and their significance in ecological studies. *Journal of Parasitology*, **55**, 453–6.

Foster, M. S. (1969*b*). Synchronised life cycles in the orange-crowned warbler and its mallophagan parasites. *Ecology*, **50**, 315–23.

Fowler, J. A. (1984). A safer anaesthetic for delousing live birds. *Ringer's Bulletin*, **6**, 69.

Fowler, J. A. and Cohen, S. (1983). A method for the quantitative collection of ectoparasites from birds. *Ringing and Migration*, **4**, 185–9.

Fowler, J. A. and Shaw, G. J. (1989). The Mallophaga of Manx Shearwaters *Puffinus p. puffinus* from Ynys Enlli, Wales. *Seabird*, **12**, 14–9.

Gladney, W. J., Ernst, S. E., and Drummond, R. O. (1974). Chlordimeform: a detachment stimulating chemical for three-host ticks. *Journal of Medical Entomology*, **11**, 569–72.

Gregory, R. D. and Blackburn, T. M. (1991). Parasite prevalence and host sample size. *Parasitology Today*, **7**, 316–8.

Harshbarger, J. C. and Raffensperger, E. M. (1959). A method for collecting and counting populations of the shaft louse. *Journal of Economic Entomology*, **52**, 1215–6.

Harwood, R. F. and James, M. T. (1979). *Entomology in human and animal health*. Macmillan, New York.

Heeb, P., Werner, I., Richner, H., and Kölliker, M. (1996). Horizontal transmission and reproductive rates of hen fleas in great tit nests. *Journal of Animal Ecology*, **65**, 474–84.

Henry, L. G. and McKeever, S. (1971). A modification of the washing technique for quantitative evaluation of the ectoparasite load of small mammals. *Journal of Medical Entomology*, **8**, 504–5.

Hilton, D. F. J. (1970). A technique for collecting ectoparasites from small birds and mammals. *Canadian Journal of Zoology*, **48**, 1445–6.

Hunter, J. E. and Colwell, M. A. (1994). Phthiraptera infestation of five shorebird species. *Wilson Bulletin*, **106**, 400–3.

Jackson, J. A. (1985). On the control of parasites in nest boxes and the use of pesticides near birds. *Sialia*, **7**, 17–25.

Kettle, P. R. (1975). A technique for collecting ectoparasites from live passerine birds. *New Zealand Entomologist*, **6**, 77–8.

Kettle, P. R. (1983). The seasonal incidence of parasitism by Phthiraptera on starlings (*Sturnus vulgaris*) in England. *New Zealand Entomologist*, **7**, 403–8.

Kirkpatrick, C. E., Robinson, S. K., and Kitron, U. D. (1991). Phenotypic correlates of blood parasitism in the common grackle. In *Bird-parasite interactions: ecology, evolution, and behaviour* (ed. J. E. Loye and M. Zuk), pp. 344–58. Oxford University Press.

Klei, T. R. and DeGiusti, D. L. (1975). Seasonal occurrence of *Haemoproteus columbae* Kruse and its vector *Pseudolynchia canariensis* Bequaert. *Journal of Wildlife Diseases*, **11**, 130–5.

Krantz, G. W. (1978). *A manual of acarology*. Oregon State University Book Stores, Corvallis.

Lee, P. L. M. and Clayton, D. H. (1995). Population biology of swift (*Apus apus*) ectoparasites in relation to host reproductive success. *Ecological Entomology*, **20**, 43–50.

Lemke, L. A., Collison, C. H., and Kim, K. C. (1988). Host digestion to determine populations of the Northern fowl mite, *Ornithonyssus sylviarum* (Acari: Macronyssidae), on mature chickens. *Journal of Medical Entomology*, **25**, 183–5.

Lipovsky, L. J. (1951). A washing method of ectoparasite recovery with particular reference to chiggers. *Journal of the Kansas Entomological Society*, **24**, 151–6.

Loye, J. E. (1996). Parasite behavior and sampling for nestbox studies. Unpublished manuscript.

Malcolmson, R. O. (1960). Mallophaga from the birds of North America. *Wilson Bulletin*, **72**, 182–97.

Margolis, L., Esch, G. W., Holmes, J. C., Kuris, K. M., and Schad, G. A. (1982). The use of ecological terms in parasitology. *Journal of Parasitology*, **68**, 131–3.

Marshall, A. G. (1981). *The ecology of ectoparasitic insects*. Academic Press, London.

McClure, H. E. (1984*a*). *Bird banding*. Boxwood Press, Pacific Grove.

McClure, H. E. (1984*b*). The occurrence of hippoboscid flies on some species of birds in Southern California. *Journal of Field Ornithology*, **55**, 230–40.

McClure, H. E. (1989). Occurence of feather mites (Proctophyllodidae) among birds of Ventura County lowlands, California. *Journal of Field Ornithology*, **60**, 431–50.

McGroarty, D. L. and Dobson, R. C. (1974). Ectoparasite populations on house sparrows in northwestern Indiana. *American Midland Naturalist*, **91**, 479–86.

Merilä, J. and Allandar, K. (1995). Do great tits prefer ectoparasite-free roost sites? An experiment. *Ethology*, **99**, 53–60.

Merino, S. and Potti, J. (1995). Mites and blowflies decrease growth and survival in nestling pied flycatchers. *Oikos*, **73**, 95–103.

Miles, V. I. and Kinney, A. R. (1957). An apparatus for rapid collection of fleas from rodent nests. *Journal of Parasitology*, **43**, 656–8.

Mohr, C. O. (1959). A procedure for delayed collecting of ectoparasites from small captured hosts. *Journal of Parasitology*, **45**, 154.

Møller, A. P. (1990). Effects of parasitism by a haematophagous mite on reproduction in the barn swallow. *Ecology*, **71**, 2345–57.

Møller, A. P. (1991). Parasites, sexual ornaments, and mate choice in the barn swallow. In *Bird-parasite interactions: ecology, evolution, and behaviour* (ed. J. E. Loye and M. Zuk), pp. 328–43. Oxford University Press.

Nelson, B. C. and Murray, M. D. (1971). The distribution of Mallophaga on the domestic pigeon (*Columba livia*). *International Journal for Parasitology*, **1**, 21–9.

Philips, J. R. (1990). What's bugging your birds? Avian parasitic arthropods. In *Wildlife Rehabilitation* (ed. D. R. Ludwig), pp. 155–203. Burgess Publishing, Edina, Minnesota.

Philips, J. R. (1993). Avian mites. *Compendium on continuing education for the practicing veterinarian*, **15**, 671–83.

Poiani, A. (1992). Ectoparasitism as a possible cost of social life: a comparative analysis using Australian passerines (Passeriformes). *Oecologia*, **92**, 429–41.

Pritchard, M. H. and Kruse, G. O. W. (1982). *The collection and preservation of animal parasites*. University of Nebraska Press, Lincoln.

Rannala, B. H. (1995). Demography and genetic structure in island populations. Unpublished PhD thesis, Yale University.

Ritchie, B. W., Harrison, G. J., and Harrison, L. R. (eds) (1994). *Avian medicine: principles and applications*. Wingers Publishing, Lake Worth, Florida.

Rogers, C. A., Robertson, R. J., and Stutchbury, B. J. (1991). Patterns and effects of parasitism by *Protocalliphora sialia* on Tree Swallow nestlings. *In Bird-parasite interactions: ecology, evolution, and behaviour* (ed. J. E. Loye and M. Zuk), pp. 123–39. Oxford University Press.

Sabrosky, C. W., Bennett, G. F., and Whitworth, T. L. (1989). *Bird blow flies (Protocalliphora) in North America (Diptera: Calliphoridae), with notes on the Palearctic species*. Smithsonian Institution Press, Washington, DC.

Sealander, J. A. and Hoffman, C. E. (1956). A modified Berlese funnel for collecting mammalian and avian ectoparasites. *Southwestern Naturalist*, **1**, 134–6.

Service, M. W. (1993). *Mosquito ecology: field sampling methods*. Elsevier Applied Science, London.

Shamiyeh, N. B., Stelmon, E. B., Hornsby, R. P., and Woodiel, N. L. (1971). Isolation of mites from house dust. *Journal of Economic Entomology*, **54**, 53–5.

Singer, G. (1964). A simple aspirator for collecting small arthropods directly into alcohol. *Annals of the Entomological Society of America*, **57**, 796–8.

Sonenshine, D. E. (1993). *Biology of ticks*. Oxford University Press.

Southwood, T. R. E. (1978). *Ecological methods*. Chapman and Hall, London.

Spicer, G. S. (1984). Nasal mites from birds of a Guatemalan cloud forest (Acarina: Rhinonyssidae). *Journal of Parasitology*, **70**, 794–802.

Stark, H. E. and Kinney, A. R. (1962). Abandonment of disturbed hosts by their fleas. *Pan-Pacific Entomologist*, **38**, 249–51.

Tarshis, I. B. (1952). Equipment and methods for the collection of hippoboscid flies from trapped California valley quail, *Lophortyx californica vallicola* (Ridgway), (Diptera). *Bulletin of the Brooklyn Entomological Society*, **47**, 69–78.

Tarshis, I. B. (1961). The use of Dri-Die 67 for the rapid recovery of ectoparasites infesting birds. *Newsletter of the Wildlife Disease Association*, **27**, 12–4.

Tarshis, I. B. (1967). Silica aerogel insecticides for the prevention and control of arthropods of medical and veterinary importance. *Angewandte Parasitologie*, **4**, 210–37.

Tidemann, S. C., McOrist, S., Woinarski, J. C. Z., and Freeland, W. J. (1992). Parasitism of wild gouldian finches (*Erythrura gouldiae*) by the air-sac mite *Sternostoma tracheacolum*. *Journal of Wildlife Diseases*, **28**, 80–4.

van Riper, C. and van Riper, S. G. (1980). A necropsy procedure for sampling disease in wild birds. *Condor*, **82**, 85–98.

Walther, B. A. and Clayton, D. H. (1996). Dust-ruffling: a simple method for quantifying the ectoparasite loads of live birds. *Journal of Field Ornithology*, in press.

Walther, B. A., Cotgreave, P., Price, R. D., Gregory, R. D., and Clayton, D. H. (1995). Sampling effort and parasite species richness. *Parasitology Today*, **11**, 306–10.

Ward, R. A. (1957). A study of the host distribution and some relationships of Mallophaga parasitic an birds of the order Tinamiformes Part I. *Annals of the Entomological Society of America*, **50**, 335–53.

Watson, G. E. and Amerson, A. B. (1967). Instructions for collecting bird parasites. *Smithsonian Institution Information Leaflet* no. 477, pp. 1–12.

Weatherhead, P. J., Metz, K. J., Bennett, G. F., and Irwin, R. E. (1993). Parasite faunas, testosterone and secondary sexual traits in male red-winged blackbirds. *Behavioural Ecology and Sociobiology*, **33**, 13–23.

Wheeler, T. A. and Threlfall, W. (1986). Observations on the ectoparasites of some Newfoundland passerines (Aves: Passeriformes). *Canadian Journal of Zoology*, **64**, 630–6.

Wicht, M. C. and Crossley, D. A. (1983). Optimal concentrations of detergent solutions used for recovery of chiggers (Acarina: Trombiculidae). *Journal of the Georgia Entomological Society*, **18**, 514–6.

Williamson, K. (1954). The Fair Isle apparatus for collecting bird ectoparasites. *British Birds*, **47**, 235–6.

Wilson, N. (1964). An evaluation of Yunker's technique for the recovery of nasal mites from birds. *Journal of Medical Entomology*, **1**, 117.

Wolfensohn, S. and Lloyd, M. (1994). *Handbook of laboratory animal management and welfare*. Oxford University Press.

Young, K. E., Franklin, A. B., and Ward, J. P. (1993). Infestation of northern spotted owls by hipposboscid (Diptera) flies in northwestern California. *Journal of Wildlife Diseases*, **29**, 278–83.

Yunker, C. E. (1961). A sampling technique for intranasal chiggers (Trombiculidae). *Journal of Parasitology*, **47**, 720.

Appendix D
Resources for identifying bird parasites

A detailed review of technical literature for identifying bird parasites would exceed the scope of this volume. Generally speaking, the best place to start is the literature cited in Appendices A–C and Part II.

For specific identifications or confirmation of identifications, it is often necessary to consult a specialist. We have listed below a few of the major institutions with staff who will identify parasites, or at least provide leads on where to find specialists for a given group. It is always advisable to make enquiries prior to actually submitting any material for identification. The amount of help that one is likely to receive will depend on a variety of factors, including the expertise of staff for the parasite group in question, the stated mission of the institution, and the flexibility of the institution in allowing staff to handle requests outside that mission.

On the whole, the availability of taxonomic assistance is becoming more restricted, as many of the specialists retire and funding gets tighter. Some institutions, for example the Natural History Museum (London), have begun charging for each parasite identified. One should never assume that specialists will readily identify material which arrives unsolicited. The task can be time-consuming and difficult and, like the rest of us, specialists have their own career goals and may require compensation and/or co-authorship for time-consuming projects. They will also usually require deposition of representative specimens in their institution. In some quarters, it is viewed as a courtesy if the investigator submitting the material does so with a synopsis of an attempt at identification to the level of family, or even genus.

Lichtenfels *et al.* (1992) and Friend (1987) provide useful tips on packaging specimens and the necessary data that should accompany specimens submitted for identification (see also Appendices A–C.) Such information will also usually be provided by the institution where one is planning to submit material for identification.

Below is a list of institutions housing staff who are willing to identify bird parasites, or can suggest other specialists who may be willing to identify specimens. For more comprehensive listings see Hillgarth and Cooper (1989), LaFrana (1994), and Lichtenfels (1994).

VIRUSES, BACTERIA, AND FUNGI

National Wildlife Health Center, National Biological Service, 6006 Schroeder Road, Madison, WI 53711, USA. Primary US government diagnostic laboratory for post-mortem examination of endangered bird species and more routine diagnostic support.