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Results In contrast to initial predictions, the cat population density was generally higher in low CCA districts. The prevalence of feline leukemia virus, which is transmitted through direct contact, was significantly higher in areas with a high CCA, conforming to our hypothesis. On the other hand, the prevalence of feline parvovirus, which can be spread by environmental transmission, was higher in low CCA districts. The remaining six pathogens did not show any association with the CCA; however, they had a unique association with the population density or the sex of the stray cats. Discussion Our findings suggest that in addition to influencing the population density, supplemental feeding may affect the prevalence of pathogens in urban animals by mechanisms such as increased aggregation and/or altered foraging strategies, with different consequences depending on the transmission mode of each pathogen.
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Abstract
Background
Supplemental feeding of free-roaming animals, including wildlife and feral or stray animals, is well known to have a substantial impact on various aspects of animal ecology including habitat use, activity patterns, and host-pathogen interactions. Among them, an increased population density of animals receiving supplemental food raises concerns regarding the transmission of pathogens in these host populations. The primary aim of this study was to investigate how supplemental feeding is associated with host population density and prevalence of pathogens with different transmission modes in urban stray cats. We hypothesized that supplemental feeding would be positively associated with host population density and the prevalence of pathogens with density-dependent transmission modes compared with pathogens with transmission modes that are considered relatively density-independent.

Methods
This study was conducted in six districts in Seoul, Republic of Korea which were selected based on different degrees of supplemental feeding and cat caretaker activity (CCA). The population density of stray cats was estimated by mark-recapture surveys. Stray cat blood samples (N=302) were collected from stray cats by local animal hospitals from each district performing the trap-neuter-release (TNR) which tested for 8 pathogens with different transmission modes (feline immunodeficiency virus, feline leukemia virus, feline panleukopenia virus, feline calicivirus, feline herpesvirus-1, Bartonella henselae, hemoplasma and Toxoplasma gondii) with molecular or serological assays. Associations between the prevalence of each pathogen and population density, CCA, and sex of cats were statistically analyzed.

Results
In contrast to initial predictions, the cat population density was generally higher in low CCA districts. The prevalence of feline leukemia virus, which is transmitted through direct contact, was significantly higher in areas with a high CCA, conforming to our hypothesis. On the other hand, the prevalence of feline parvovirus, which can be spread by environmental transmission, was higher in low CCA districts. The remaining six pathogens did not show any association with the CCA; however, they had a unique association with the population density or the sex of the stray cats.

**Discussion**

Our findings suggest that in addition to influencing the population density, supplemental feeding may affect the prevalence of pathogens in urban animals by mechanisms such as increased aggregation and/or altered foraging strategies, with different consequences depending on the transmission mode of each pathogen.

**Introduction**

Supplemental feeding of free-ranging animals is a common practice worldwide that occurs through multiple direct (e.g., feeding for conservation management and backyard bird feeders) or indirect (e.g., urban trash cans and pet’s food outdoors) routes (Oro et al., 2013; Becker, Streicker & Altizer, 2015; Murray et al., 2016). However, an increasing number of studies have raised concerns regarding the impact of anthropogenic food supplementation on various aspects of animal ecology, ranging from individual phenotypic traits (e.g., body size and immunocompetence), population dynamics (e.g. survival rate, breeding rate and population density), to pathogen host community composition (Robb et al., 2008; Rodriguez-Hidalgo et al., 2010; Jessop et al., 2012; Galbraith et al., 2015). For instance, increased body mass, population density, and reproduction
rates were observed in red deer (*Cervus elaphus*) that were provided with artificial food sources in an effort to maintain their population size as a game species (Vicente et al., 2007; Rodríguez-Hidalgo et al., 2010). These accumulated changes in individual biology and population dynamics are suspected to have further and unexpected consequences on disease transmission because the dependence of animals on supplemented food can ultimately alter their exposure and/or susceptibility to pathogens. Among diverse mechanisms linking supplemental feeding and altered host-pathogen interactions, a heightened population density (increase in general abundance of animals in a certain area) and crowding (spatiotemporal aggregation of animals) of host individuals has been frequently discussed for several reasons. For instance 1) increased stress of the animals as a result of crowding may lead to negative influences on the immune function of animals and their susceptibility of pathogen infection (Semeniuk CAD & Rothley KD, 2008; Forristal et al., 2012), while 2) increased frequency of close contact between infectious and susceptible host individuals around the food source may mechanically accelerate the transmission of pathogens. This has been particularly well documented in avian species regarding backyard bird feeders, where the crowding of birds contributes to the spread of mycoplasma conjunctivitis, caused by *Mycoplasma gallisepticum* (Adelman et al., 2015; Moyers, 2017).

The influence of supplemental feeding on host-pathogen interactions as a result of increased host population density can further be complicated because the response of a pathogen to host density may vary based on its unique transmission mode. Theoretically, pathogen transmission dynamics are commonly categorized based on different assumptions about the dependence of pathogen transmission on population density of host populations. Pathogens transmission through contact that increases proportionately with population density, is regarded as “density-dependent transmission”, whereas when pathogen transmission is driven by the
“frequency of infected contacts”, independent of host density, it is identified as “frequency-dependent transmission”. For pathogen groups adopting density-dependent transmission, its transmission is facilitated as host population density increases and the chances of individuals having contacts in close proximity becomes frequent, as with *Brucella abortus* in ungulates (Dobson & Meagher, 1996). However, pathogens with frequency-dependent transmission modes, such as vector-borne and sexually or trophically-transmitted pathogens, often depend on specific behaviors of the infectious vectors or host individuals, such as aggressive behavior during the breeding season or exposure to hematophagous arthropods, which enables the transmission of the pathogens, rather than population density or physical contact in proximity among host individuals (Thrall, Antonovics & Hall, 1993). In relation to supplemental feeding, increased host aggregation in response to a spatiotemporally stable food source may increase the transmission of directly transmitted pathogens as observed in the increased prevalence of endoparasites in raccoons (*Procyon lotor*) with altered contact rates (Wright & Gompper, 2005). However, it is possible that such a pattern may not apply to other pathogens as observed in the cases of decreased prevalence of echinococcosis in urban red foxes (*Vulpes vulpes*) compared to those in rural area, potentially due to their reduced predation on intermediate hosts in urban habitats (Fischer et al., 2005). However, to date, few studies have simultaneously evaluated the linkages between supplemental feeding and the prevalence of pathogens with differing transmission modes (Miller et al., 2003; Vicente et al., 2007; Brennan et al., 2014).

Modifications of host-pathogen interactions due to supplemental feeding may also apply to other free-roaming animals. Among them, domestic cats (*Felis catus*) are one of the species that have managed to prosper in a wide range of habitats, including well developed cities (Bateman & Fleming, 2012). Urban free-roaming cats can benefit from surplus food sources provided by urban
Residents. These residents who regularly or sporadically provide a supplemental food source for free-roaming cats are commonly referred to as cat caretakers (Centonze & Levy, 2002; Finkler, Hatna & Terkel, 2011b; Peterson et al., 2012). There are many ecological and sociological issues centered around free-roaming cats, as the availability of predictable food sources and a stable energy intake are known to increase the overall abundance of supplemented animals (López-Bao et al., 2010; Rickett et al., 2013; Plummer et al., 2013). Among them, the epidemiological role of urban free-roaming cats regarding public health and the health of other domestic and wild animals is a subject of concern (Lepczyk, Lohr & Duffy, 2015). The most well-known zoonotic pathogens and diseases infecting cats include rabies, Toxoplasma gondii, and various arthropod-borne pathogens such as Bartonella henselae and Rickettsia species (Gerhold & Jessup, 2013; Spada et al., 2014).

The aim of this study was to examine how human food provisioning, host population density, and pathogen prevalence are associated in urban stray cats while asking how these relationships vary with the transmission modes of each pathogen. Here, we defined the group of unowned and free-roaming cats in a city as urban stray cats. We investigated the prevalence of eight feline pathogens, feline calicivirus (FCV), feline herpesvirus-1 (FHV-1), feline leukemia virus (FeLV), feline immunodeficiency virus (FIV), feline hemoplasma, Bartonella henselae, feline parvovirus (FPV) and Toxoplasma gondii. Each of these pathogens has a different transmission mode, falling somewhere along the continuum of density-dependent and frequency-dependent transmission (Table 1) (Fenton et al., 2002; Begon et al., 2002; Greer, Briggs & Collins, 2008). FCV, FHV-1 and FeLV are pathogens with density-dependent transmission modes because its transmission is commonly facilitated by close contact in proximity driven by aggregation and crowding of individuals, such as through aerosols (Radford et al., 2009; Thiry et al., 2009). In
contrast to FIV, feline hemoplasma and \textit{Bartonella henselae} are either transmitted during reproductive behavior (FIV and feline hemoplasma) (Courchamp, Say & Pontier, 2000; Willi et al., 2007), or through arthropod vectors (\textit{B. henselae} and feline hemoplasma) (Chomel et al., 2006; Willi et al., 2007). Hence, the transmission modes of these three pathogens are assumed to be relatively frequency-dependent (Thrall, Antonovics & Hall, 1993). Lastly, FPV and \textit{Toxoplasma gondii} are pathogens mostly transmitted through environmental contaminants rather than direct contact between infectious and susceptible individuals. As environmental feces concentration, which function as common point source of exposure for environmentally-transmitted pathogens, is expected to increase in relation to population density, we also assume the positive association between the transmission of FPV and \textit{T. gondii} with host population density. In summary, we hypothesize that supplemental feeding would increase the population density of stray cats, leading to heightened prevalence of pathogens transmitted through direct contact with infectious individuals or with environmental contaminants (density-dependent transmission: FCV, FHV-1 and FeLV; environmental transmission: FPV and \textit{T. gondii}) (Lutz et al., 2009; Radford et al., 2009; Thiry et al., 2009; Ballash et al., 2015). Meanwhile we expect that the prevalence of sexually-transmitted, vector-borne, or trophically-transmitted pathogens (frequency-dependent transmission: \textit{T. gondii}, FIV, hemoplasma and \textit{B. henselae}) would be relatively unaffected by difference in host population density and supplemental feeding (Courchamp, Say & Pontier, 2000; Willi et al., 2007; Chomel et al., 2009; Afonso et al., 2013).

\textbf{Table 1. Transmission modes of studied pathogens.} Specific transmission routes of studied pathogens and its relative position along the continuum between density-dependent and frequency-dependent transmission
Methods and Materials

Study area

The study was performed in Seoul, the capital city of the Republic of Korea (ROK). Seoul is one of the largest megacities in the world with a population size and density of approximately 9,908,000 and 17,000 people per km$^2$, respectively (Kim & Baik, 2005). The city has a temperate climate with four seasons and an average temperature of 13.2 °C in the spring and fall, 24.3 °C in the summer and -2.4 °C in the winter. Cat ownership is rapidly increasing in the ROK, and according to a recent national survey, cat ownership increased from 1.7% in 2010 to 3.4% in 2012 and to 5.2% in 2015 (Animal and Plant Quarantine Agency, 2015). Most owned cats in Seoul are kept indoors due to hygienic reasons and the fear of mortality from vehicle collisions. Hence free-roaming cats in the city are commonly considered as unowned, stray cats. In the city, stray cats are most commonly observed in residential areas including apartment complexes and intensive housing areas.

Seoul is divided into 25 administrative local districts. We ranked the districts based on the intensity of the cat caretaker activity (denoted hereafter as CCA) of each district. To rank all 25 districts based on the intensity of the CCA, we selected parameters that reflect the following features: spatiotemporal regularity of the feeding behavior, socioeconomic characteristics related to the cat feeding behavior, the number of cat caretakers and the number of cats cared for per caretaker. In total, we used eight parameters, and information on six of those parameters were extracted from the result of a 2013 nationwide cat-caretaker questionnaire (Seoul; n=1048) (Kim J et al., 2016) as follows: (1) proportion of survey respondents who identified themselves as cat caretakers in the total population of each district, (2) proportion of respondents who are taking care
of more than 10 cats, (3) proportion of respondents who have been working as a cat caretaker for more than five years, (4) proportion of respondents who provide food supplement daily in a regular manner, (5) proportion of respondents who provide food in areas further than 100 meters radius from their house, and (6) a score from the subjective perception of each respondent about the intensity of the CCA in his/her residing district. In addition, we included two more demographic factors for each district, (7) matriculation rates and (8) property tax (index of wealth), which are known to be positively associated with the intensity of the CCA in a previous study (Finkler, Hatna & Terkel, 2011b). Second, we performed a principal component analysis of these eight parameters. The first principal component (PC1) explained 39% of the variance in the data (Table 2), and all the parameters explaining the intensity of the CCA correlated positively with the PC1. Hence, the PC1 was used as the index reflecting intensity of the CCA and the 25 city districts were ranked based on this index (Fig 1).

**Table 2. Principal components (PC1 and PC2) eigenvalues and PC loadings for the CCA parameters.**

Out of eight districts with highest or lowest CCA based on the ranking (Fig. 1), we excluded two districts, one with high CCA (Songpa; SP) and the other with low CCA (Gangdong; GD), for different reasons. SP is a unique district extensively consisting of many apartment complexes where each apartment complex has their own specific policy on how to deal with stray cats (trapping and euthanizing, poisoning, active cat caretaker activity etc.). Therefore, we assumed it would be inappropriate to compare cat populations from SP with other districts; it was excluded from this study. On the other hand, district GD was excluded due to unique local condition
regarding stray cats. Although GD scored low in our CCA index, the district office and caretakers of GD have been working in cooperation to systemically provide food for stray cats in its district for years. For instance, they established various official feeding sites within the district for stray cats. Hence, despite the low CCA of GD, the feeding ecology of stray cats within the district may differ from other districts with similar CCA and were excluded from this study. Hence, six remaining districts were used as our study sites, three with a high CCA (Gangnam; GN, Seocho; SC, Mapo; MP) and three with a low CCA (Geumcheon; GC, Seongdong; SD, Dongdaemoon; DDM)(Fig 1). Hereafter the three high CCA sites will be labeled as GN (H), SC (H) and MP (H), and three low CCA sites as GC (L), SD (L) and DDM (L).

Fig 1. CCA (PC1) in the districts of Seoul based on the PCA result.

The six districts selected are; GN, SC and MP on the upper right side (high CCA districts; yellow), and GC, DDM and SD on the lower left side (lower CCA districts; blue). District SP and GD was excluded from the study site due to logistical reasons.
Fig 2. Map of Seoul showing the 6 districts where the study was performed

High CCA districts in red letters and low CCA districts in blue letters.

**Field surveys**

We performed population density surveys at 12 sites from the six selected districts (two sites were selected in each district) (Fig 2). Due to logistical reasons, a survey of four sites (two high CCA sites from district SC (H), and two low CCA sites from district GC (L)) was conducted in the fall (September-November) of 2014 and the rest of the sites in the spring (April-June) of 2015. At each site, one survey transects of 2 km was established from the residential areas within each district. Apartment complexes were excluded from the survey routes to prevent sampling bias because different apartment complexes tend to have specific stray cat management policies. Each transect was surveyed five times, once per day for five days, all within two weeks period. Typical residential areas in the city used for the density survey consisted of rows of multistory houses (usually 2-4 stories) constructed parallel to each other with a narrow alley in between (S1 Fig.).

---

1 We modified a source figure produced by ‘Stefan-Xp’ under the following copyright permission. ‘Permission is granted to copy, distribute and/or modify this document under the terms of the GNU Free Documentation License, Version 1.2 or any later version published by the Free Software Foundation; with no Invariant Sections, no Front-Cover Texts, and no Back-Cover Texts. A copy of the license is included in the section entitled the GNU Free Documentation License. The GNU Free Documentation License (GNU FDL or simply GFDL) is a copyleft license for free documentation, designed by the Free Software Foundation (FSF) for the GNU Project.’
each site, the transect routes were selected in a zig-zag configuration to thoroughly cover the blocks, as in methods used in previous studies (Calhoon & Haspel, 1989; Finkler, Hatna & Terkel, 2011a). Alleys were walked by the same person throughout the survey (JH). Surveys were started within one hour from sunset and usually completed within 60-70 min. These times were selected based on the nocturnal characteristics of the cat activity (Izawa, 1983; Horn et al., 2011). All the cats observed in the alleys were recorded as well as the ones on the roofs and walls of houses on the both sides of the alleys. Due to the dense structure of the houses in these area, the lateral view from the alleys was limited, and in most cases, the observer was only able to see the walls and the roof top of the houses right next to the alleys. Only cats spotted near the observer, approximately within two meters of range, close enough to identify its full morphological characters, were counted and recorded. For every cat observed, the location, time of observation, and unique characteristics (morphological features, behavior toward survey personnel, health status based on external observation, and sex when possible) were recorded. Individual cats were primarily identified by their coat color. A detailed coat pattern was depicted at the observed site on a record sheet printed with outlines of cat body forms in various angles and postures. Cats with completely uniform color throughout their body were very rare (eight out of 277 total observed cats), mostly observed at different sites and were identified by other characteristics such as body size, tail shape, or hair length. Data on the sterilization of the cats were identified and recorded by the ear-cut mark made during the sterilization procedure. In Seoul, sterilized stray cats are marked with a straight cut of the ear-tip, rather than a notch, which is easily identified by its abrupt shape. During this survey, we did not observe any cat with physical scars that would be confused with the ear mark. Kittens that were accompanied by their mother were not included in the density analysis. We did not observe any kittens roaming by themselves during our surveys.
Biological sample collection

Biological samples were collected from the 6 study districts (GN, SC, MP (high CCA) and GC, DDM and SD (low CCA)) from September, 2014 to June, 2015 except for the cold season (from December, 2014 to March, 2015) when Trap-Neuter-Release (TNR) is not done. The time frame of the sample collection overlapped with that of the field density survey. The Seoul Metropolitan Government has been performing TNR since 2008 as part of official city service. In each district, designated animal hospitals perform TNR of stray cats under a contract with the Seoul city government. We cooperated with animal hospitals from the six districts we selected and requested that they collect 50 adult cat blood samples per district during the sterilization procedures (Yeonnam Animal Hospital, MP (H); Hanbit Animal Hospital, SD (L); Kang Hyunrim Animal Hospital, GC (L); Gangnam 24hr Animal Hospital, GN (H); Han Animal Hospital, SC (H) and Jeonnong Animal Hospital, DDM (L)). All blood samples were drawn after the sterilization surgery by certified veterinarians at each animal hospital. The protocol explaining the preferred site and volume for the blood draw (jugular vein) and the data sheet to input the types of information required for this study were provided to the veterinarians in advance with the syringes and tubes required for our sample collection. All procedures were performed under full anesthesia of the animal with a combination of Ketamine (22mg/kg) and Xylazine (1.1mg/kg) injected through the hind leg muscle. All the cats that were determined to be yearlings or younger by the veterinarians and were released without being sterilized; hence, no samples were collected from these individuals.

Half of each blood sample (approx. 1.5-2ml) was placed into a tube containing the anticoagulant ethylene diamine tetra-acetic acid (EDTA; Becton Dickinson, Rutherford, New Jersey, USA), and the other half was placed into a serum separator tube. Blood samples collected
282 for serum separation were permitted to clot and then centrifuged for 10 min at 1200 rcf (relative 283 centrifugal force). Next, the serum was removed from the clot using a sterile pipet and transferred 284 to a sterile 1.5 ml Eppendorf tube. All serum and whole blood samples were stored at -70 °C until 285 analyses were conducted.

286 **Laboratory analysis**

287 PCR was used to identify feline hemoplasma in the whole blood samples. Frozen whole 288 blood samples were thawed at room temperature and genomic DNA was extracted using the 289 QIAamp DNA mini kit (Qiagen, Hilden, Germany). The extracted DNA was used as a template 290 for the subsequent PCR assay. We amplified a partial segment of the 16S rRNA gene of 291 mycoplasma species (including hemoplasma, which is the hemotropic mycoplasma) using the 292 universal primer set HBT-F (ATACGGCCCATATTCCTACG) and HBT-R 293 (TGCTCCACCAGCTTGTTCA) described in a previous study (Criado-Fornelio et al., 2003). Every 294 PCR run included a positive and negative control to detect bacterial contamination. Amplified 295 products were separated by electrophoresis on a 1.2% agarose gel. PCR amplicons from the 296 positive samples were purified and prepared for direct sequencing. The sequence homology of the 297 sequenced 16S rRNA gene from the positive samples was examined using the BLAST software 298 (National Center for Biotechnology Information; available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov). 299

300 Serological assays were performed to determine the prevalence of *T. gondii, B. henselae,* 301 FIV, FeLV and FCV, FHV-1 and FPV in the samples. Because different serological tests were not 302 performed on the same day, aliquots of serum samples were stored in several tubes so that each 303 tube was thawed for a single analysis only to prevent repeated thawing and freezing of the samples. 304 Commercial ELISA test kits were used to detect (1) antibodies for FIV and FeLV p27 antigen 305 detection (SensPERT FeLV Ag/FIV Ab kit; VetAll™) and (2) antibodies for *T. gondii* (Rapid
diagnostic test (RDT) developed by Chong et al. 2011, using recombinant SAG1 antigen.). Tests to detect *B. henselae* antibodies were done with the indirect immunofluorescence (IFA) slides test (*Bartonella henselae* IFA feline IgG antibody kit; Fuller laboratories). A titer of > 1:64 IgG immunoglobulins was considered positive for exposure to *B. henselae*. Lastly, modified in-house ELISA kits (ImmunoComb, Feline VacciCheck, Biogal Galed Laboratories) were used to test for FCV, FHV-1 and FPV antibodies. The ImmunoComb® test is based on the solid phase “dot”-ELISA technology consisting of a comb-shaped plastic card. On each of the 12 teeth on the plastic card, there are four spots as follows: FCV antigen is the lowest spot; FHV-1 antigen is next to the lowest spot; FPV antigen is the second spot from the top; and the uppermost spot is the positive reference. The titer of the positive index used to test for antibodies to each pathogen in ImmunoComb was as follows: FPV antibodies at 1:80 in the hemagglutination-inhibition (H.I.) reaction; FHV-1 antibodies at 1:16, and FCV antibodies equal to 1:32 in the virus neutralization reactions. Tests for all antigens and antibodies were performed based on the protocols provided by the manufacturers.

**Estimating population density**

The population density estimation was performed by counting of individual cats identified by their morphological characteristics (Harihar Abishek et al., 2009; Finkler, Hatna & Terkel, 2011a). Information of morphological characteristics were primarily recorded during direct observation, but also collected by photographs taken during the survey. We used a capture-recapture sampling technique: there was an initial capture during which each observed cat was individually identified and recorded, and four consecutives ‘recapture’ surveys in which re-sighted cats were counted as ‘recapture’. Population estimation was done based on the closed population model assuming there was limited immigration/emigration, birth, and death during the 2-week
survey period (Gross et al., 2011). Using the program MARK (Cooch & White, 2001), we built four models, \( M_0, M_t, M_h \) and \( M_{th} \), with different variables and assumptions. \( M_0 \) is the null model with the principal assumption that the probability of capturing an animal is constant over all animals over all periods, while the heterogeneity model, \( M_h \), permits the capture probability to vary for each individual. \( M_t \) assumes each animal has a constant capture probability on any sampling occasion; however, the probability of capture can vary from one occasion to the next (Seber, 1992). Finally, model \( M_{th} \) simultaneously assumes the heterogeneity in the capture probability among individuals and between sampling occasions. Another trap response model commonly used is \( M_b \) which captures the variation of the individual response to previous trapping (e.g., trap-shy and trap-neutral). However, this model was not used in our analysis because our survey was based on capturing cats visually rather than physical trapping, and we did not consider our visual observation as a likely source of behavioral variation. We evaluated the relative fit of the models using the sample-size-adjusted Akaike Information Criterion (AIC\(_c\)) index (Burnham & Anderson, 1998). The model with the best fit was selected based on its AIC\(_c\) values, delta AIC\(_c\) and AIC\(_c\) weight. For each site, the population size was obtained as the derived parameter of the best fit model based on the AIC\(_c\) model selection. The total number of individuals observed at each site was multiplied by the size of the survey area to obtain estimates of the cat density (per km\(^2\)) and 95% confidence intervals. Survey areas were determined in ArcView 9.0 (ESRI, Redlands, CA) by creating a polygon with a 50-meter buffer zone around each survey transect. The length of the buffer zone was based on the result from a recent study on the home range of urban free-roaming cats using GPS tracker, where the smallest home range size was 0.99ha. (Thomas, Baker & Fellowes, 2014). This home range being equivalent to a circular area of diameter of approximately 55 m, we used 50 meters as our buffer zone as a conservative estimate. The
resulting size of the survey sites ranged from 0.13 - 0.20 km². The population density estimated from 2 sites within each district was averaged to enable the analysis of each district’s association with the prevalence of tested pathogens.

**Statistical analysis**

All statistical analyses were performed with R (http://cran.r-project.org). Chi-square tests were done to ensure that there was no sex bias in the blood sample size among the six districts. The normality of the population density of the 12 survey sites were confirmed through Shapiro-Wilk tests. Two linear mixed-models (LMMs) were used to test the associations between the CCA and the population density or the sterilization rates. In each model, the population density or the sterilization rates were set as a response variable. In both models, the CCA was set as the explanatory variable, and ‘district’ and ‘year (density survey done in 2014 or 2015)’ were set as random effects. We also tested for the presence of associations between the prevalence of each pathogen (response variable) and sex, population density (pd), and CCA using generalized linear models (GLMs) with the logit link function. None of the interaction factors showed a significant effect on the response variable (prevalence of each pathogen) and were not added to the analysis.

For the above statistical analyses, we considered a p-value of $\leq 0.05$ as significant. We used a model selection approach (AICc) to determine the best model or suite of models (Burnham & Anderson, 1998). For each pathogen, we did model-averaging for most parsimonious models (delta AICc smaller than 2 units) to further analyze the estimates of the model parameters. Analyses were performed using R package ‘AICmodav’ and ‘lme4’ (Bates et al., 2015; Mazerolle, 2017). Lastly, we calculated the mean and standard deviation of the stray cat sterilization rates in studied districts.
Results

Across the 12 survey sites we observed a total of 276 cats during 60 surveys. The estimated number of cats at each survey site ranged from 132 individuals to 268 individuals per km$^2$, with mean 186.8 per km$^2$ (Table 3). However, two replicate sites from the same district showed a similar number of estimated cats, although in two districts (DDM (L), GC (L)), the gap between the replicate sites within each district was rather large (DDM (L) 1 and DDM (L) 2 had 132 and 175 individuals/km$^2$; GC (L) 1 and GC (L) 2 had 168 and 231 individuals/km$^2$), implying a possible heterogeneity in the abundance of stray cats within the districts (Fig. 3). There was no association between the population density and CCA (LMM; Wald $\chi^2 = 1.06, p = 0.30$) although trends for a higher population density in low CCA districts (GC (L), SD (L)) and a lower population density in high CCA districts (GN (H), MP (H)) were observed. Based on the observation of the TNR ear marking, the proportion of sterilized cats ranged from 0 - 0.68 with overall average of 0.23. High CCA districts had a significantly higher proportion of sterilized cats (0.36 ± 0.22), compared to that of the low CCA districts (0.10 ± 0.09) (LMM; Wald $\chi^2 = 7.34, p < 0.01$; Table 3).

Fig 3. Cat population density estimates (95% confidence intervals) from the 12 survey sites.

Table 3. Estimated population densities (95% confidence intervals) and proportion of observed cats with the sterilization mark from the six districts (CCA indicated in parenthesis; high-H, low-L)

Blood samples collected for pathogen prevalence testing showed no sex bias among the six districts ($\chi^2 = 7.25; p = 0.20; d.f. = 5$). The overall prevalence of the pathogens was relatively high for FCV (94.3% (282/299)), FHV-1 (97.9% (293/299)) and FPV (79.2% (236/298)) but low for
the rest of the pathogens: *T. gondii*, 7.7% (23/298); FIV, 3.6% (11/302); FeLV, 23.2% (70/302), *B. henselae*, 34.8% (105/302); and feline hemoplasma, 32.5% (98/302). Among them, the FeLV prevalence was highest in GN (H) and SC (H), both high CCA districts, whereas the FPV prevalence was highest in DDM (L) and SD (L), followed by GC (L) which were the 3 low CCA districts (Table 4).

Table 4. Prevalence (%), 95% confidence interval and sample size (n)) of each pathogen from the stray cats in the six studied districts (Letter inside the parentheses indicates the CCA of each district; H-high, L-low)

For all the pathogens, multiple models fell within 2 ΔAICc units (hereafter 'best models') (Table 5), and all three explanatory variables were included within these models, except for FPV. However, based on the magnitude and direction of the parameter estimates, different variables showed unique associations with the prevalence of each pathogen (Table 6). For FeLV, the two best fit models (Akaike weight=0.62 and 0.25) was composed of sex and CCA, and based on the estimates of both parameters, the prevalence of FeLV was significantly higher in high CCA districts and in females. Meanwhile, both of the two best models for the FPV prevalence with the highest AICc weights (0.39 and 0.33) included the CCA parameter. According to the parameter estimates, the prevalence of FPV in the low CCA districts is likely to be approximately three times higher than that of the high CCA districts; showing an opposite pattern with FeLV. For hemoplasma, sex was included in all three best models (Akaike weight=0.35, 0.33 and 0.17), and the parameter estimates showing that males contracting hemoplasma infection would be approximately 2.23 times higher compare to females. Similarly, sex was the only variable included in all top three models (Akaike weight=0.34, 0.26 and 0.13) for *T. gondii*; however, its relationship
with prevalence was in the opposite direction for which females had three times higher odds of *T. gondii* infection. FCV was the only pathogen for which the population density parameter was consistently included in the three best models (Akaike weight 0.38, 0.31 and 0.16), and its prevalence showed a negative relationship with the population density. Regarding FHV, all top four models included the variable CCA; however, its influence on the FHV prevalence remains unverified based on its 95% confidence interval which included a zero and non-significant *p*-value (P=0.99). In the model evaluation of the last two pathogens, FIV and *B. henselae*, none of the top models shared a variable. In the parameter estimates, 95% confidence intervals of all three variables included zero, and the variables did not show any significant influence on the infection status of FIV or *B. henselae* (Table 6).

Table 5. AICc values and AICc weights of the most parsimonious candidate models (models within 2 units of the ΔAICc) testing the effect of the explanatory variables (sex, population density (pd) and CCA) on the prevalence of the eight studied pathogens.

Table 6. Model-averaged parameter estimates included in the most parsimonious models (models within 2 units of the ΔAICc) for each pathogen

Discussion

In contrast to our hypothesis, the population density of cats did not show a positive relationship with the intensity of the CCA. Instead, the population density of the cats was lower in the high CCA districts although the association was not statistically significant (Fig. 3). This trend may be
explained by the difference in the proportion of sterilized cats among the districts as evidenced by
the higher proportion of ear-marked cats in the high CCA districts in our observation. In certain
districts, cat caretakers are known to heavily contribute to sterilizing stray cats in addition to the
TNR done by the Seoul government as result of aggressive campaigning and education. The two
high CCA districts (GN (H) and SC (H)) are the districts with the highest income in the city which
is a socioeconomic factor that is known to be linked to either the proportion of sterilized stray cats
or the level of sterilization by the caretakers (Finkler, Hatna & Terkel, 2011a,b; Flockhart, Norris
& Coe, 2016). This is also supported by the result of the cat caretaker survey done in the ROK
(Kim J et al., 2016), in which GN (H), SC (H) and MP (H) were among the top five districts
regarding the proportion of cat caretakers with experience of sterilizing stray cats. Thus, although
stray cats from the districts with a higher CCA may be exposed to more frequent and stable
supplemental feeding, it is likely that more cats in these areas are also sterilized resulting in smaller
population sizes compared to districts with a lower CCA.

From the eight studied pathogens, different associations were observed for each pathogen
in relation to the population density and CCA. In three pathogens, FCV, FHV-1 and FeLV, with a
transmission mode considered to rely on close contact of the host individuals (density-dependent
transmission), we predicted its prevalence to be higher in a high CCA district due to higher
population density. However, the pattern of association varied among these three pathogens. A
significant link was observed between FeLV and CCA and between FCV and population density,
whereas no single variable had a strong influence on explaining the prevalence of FHV-1. FCV
and FHV-1 are two of the main pathogens causing feline respiratory tract disease and can
especially be important in conditions where cats live socially. Compared to previous
seroprevalence reports on pets or shelter cats (FCV, 36.6-92.4%; FHV-1, 11-73.3%) (Lappin et
results from our study were in a higher range for both FCV (95%) and FHV-1 (97.3%). However, Yamaguchi et al. (1996) reported high seroprevalence values for both FCV and FHV-1 (FCV, 100%; FHV-1, 100%) in a study of free-roaming farm cats, that shared supplemental food and latrine sites which is a condition perhaps more similar to our study setting compared to the other studies. Considering that both viral pathogens are highly contagious among cats in immediate proximity (Bannasch & Foley, 2005; Radford et al., 2009; Thiry et al., 2009), aggregation of individuals in close contact and/or higher survival rates of individuals after infection, driven by supplemental feeding (Lembo et al., 2011; Bitew et al., 2011; DiGangi et al., 2012), may have contributed to the high seroprevalence of FCV or FHV-1 observed in the study by Yamaguchi et al. (Yamaguchi et al., 1996) and in our study. Nevertheless, the negative relationship of the FCV prevalence with population density was unexpected. We suspect that external variables may be involved in the observed relationship, such as a possibility of higher mortality in cats due to hypervirulent FCV infection in dense populations (Radford et al., 2007).

In the case of FeLV, its prevalence was significantly higher in districts with a high CCA (with GN and SC exhibiting the highest FeLV prevalence), but unrelated to the population density of stray cats. In comparison to previous studies on FeLV (2-23%) (Levy et al., 2006; Alves et al., 2011; Stojanovic & Foley, 2011), we observed a relatively high prevalence (12-42%), especially in two of our studied districts (GN (H) and SC (H)). Unlike FCV or FHV-1, transmission of FeLV relies less on aerosol or fomite, and its ability to survive outside the host is low (Lutz et al., 2009). Instead, it readily transmits through immediate amicable contacts such as food sharing, licking, and grooming (Rojko & Olsen, 1984; Barratt, 1997). We suggest that the higher FeLV prevalence in the two districts with a high CCA may be due to increased aggregation of cats around food
provisioned by the cat caretakers. A recent simulation study demonstrated that increased aggregation and population density of supplemented cats led to a higher FeLV prevalence, although such impact varied depending on the influence of provisioned food on the immune response of cats (Becker & Hall, 2014). Considering the potential fatality of FeLV infection, we suggest further studies to clarify the long-term effect of providing supplemental food on stray cat populations.

For two pathogens with environmental transmission, *T. gondii* and FPV, we also predicted its prevalence to be positively associated with the population density of cats. In the case of *T. gondii*, the overall number of positive individuals was low in general (Table 3), similar to other studies on *T. gondii* prevalence in urban stray cats, which ranged from 5.61-14.3% (Lee et al., 2011; Wang et al., 2012; Oi et al., 2015). Additionally, its prevalence did not show any significant association with population density or CCA. Unlike feral cats in rural areas, where the prevalence of *T. gondii* in cats have been reported to be associated with the predation of intermediate host species (Afonso et al., 2007), transmission of *T. gondii* is more likely related to direct contact with oocysts in urban cat populations (Lelu et al., 2010). However, even within urban stray cats, fed populations are more likely to consume processed cat food, devoid of infectious *T. gondii* oocysts, while unfed populations would be more prone to rely on hunted prey that may function as intermediate hosts. Considering the potential risk that *T. gondii* may pose on public health as a zoonotic pathogen, we need to better understand the transmission dynamics of *T. gondii* between stray cats and those who are fed or interact closely with them on a daily basis.

The prevalence of FPV in our study ranged from 59-94%. The prevalence of FPV was highest in two districts with the lowest CCA (GC (L) and SD (L)) but showed a non-significant association with the host population density. Feline parvovirus (FPV), the etiologic agent of feline
panleukopenia, is a viral pathogen extremely resistant to external conditions enabling its environmental transmission by contact with various biotic or abiotic materials contaminated with fluids, fomites, or feces from an infected animal (Ikeda et al., 2002; Truyen et al., 2009). We expected the prevalence of FPV to be related to the accumulation of viral contaminants in the environment reflected by the population density in the area, but instead, the result indicated the association of FPV prevalence with CCA. Lack of food provisioning by caretakers in low CCA districts may have enabled stray cats in the area to maintain a larger activity range with a more intensive foraging activity compared to conspecifics in the high CCA districts with a relatively abundant and stable food source (Barratt, 1997; Tennent & Downs, 2008). This altered foraging strategy may lead to higher exposure rates of cats to pathogens transmitted by contact with environmental contaminants (Lepczyk, Lohr & Duffy, 2015). Similar associations have been discussed in other systems such as in the case of the increased infection to *Strongyloides* in wild primates (Parr, Fedigan & Kutz, 2013).

Among the three pathogens selected for their frequency-dependent transmission mode, FIV, *B. henselae*, and feline hemoplasma, none of the pathogens showed an association with CCA or population density as initially predicted. The low prevalence of FIV (total prevalence: 3.6%; 95% C.I. 0.018-0.049) observed in this study has been commonly reported in other population-level studies in free-roaming or household cats (Lee et al., 2002; Levy et al., 2006; Ravi et al., 2010). FIV prevalence is most commonly explained in relation to the breeding ecology of free-roaming cats (Natoli et al., 2005; Fouchet et al., 2009). Urban stray cats are known to maintain a promiscuous mating system due to the high local density of both male and female cats (unlike its rural counterparts, wherein a polygynous mating system is observed (Pontier & Natoli, 1996)) which may lead to fewer aggressive interactions between males during breeding seasons and an
overall low prevalence of FIV in urban male cats (Courchamp, Say & Pontier, 2000; Pontier et al., 2009; Ravi et al., 2010). In addition, neutering/spaying may have an additional impact on lowering the aggressive behavior related to breeding further influencing the prevalence of FIV in urban stray cats.

The prevalence of *B. henselae* also showed no association with the CCA or population density. However, considering that *B. henselae* is a zoonotic pathogen transmitted mostly through fleas, and that transmission of fleas can be facilitated by a high host population density (Krasnov, Khokhlova & Shenbrot, 2002), further attention is required regarding the prevalence of *B. henselae* in urban stray cats and its potential risk to cat caretakers. The prevalence of feline hemoplasma in male cats was higher than in female cats, similar to results from previous studies. It may be due to its transmission through aggressive sexual behavior (Walker Vergara et al., 2016; Bergmann et al., 2017). Overall, the spread of vector-borne and sexually transmitted diseases, such as *B. henselae*, feline hemoplasma, and FIV, are generally considered less impacted by the host population density or close contact among host individuals and is further supported by the results presented here.

To summarize, the findings from this study did not support our original hypothesis. First the population density and CCA did not show positive relationship, which was the fundamental assumption of our study. This shows that urban animal populations whose life-history is heavily interrupted by humans require consideration of multiple ecological and sociological factors to understand their population dynamics. Second, the pathogens considered to use “density-dependent transmission” modes, and originally expected to be positively related to CCA and host population density, such as FCV, FHV, FeLV, T. gondii and FPV, mostly showed non-significant responses toward the two factors or mixed responses to CCA. Specifically, only FeLV and FPV showed significant relationships with CCA, but in different directions, with FeLV higher and FPV
showing lower prevalence in higher CCA districts. This points out the possibility that in addition to the effect of supplemented food, which can increase immediate crowding of animals, its influence through other routes, such as altered foraging behavior, may also affect how these animals interact with their pathogens. However, study results may be limited by small sample size and the nature of convenience samples. Small sample size may have been especially problematic for pathogens with relatively high (FCV and FHV) or low prevalence (T. gondii and FIV) in throughout the studied districts. In addition, the samples used for pathogen testing were opportunistically collected through TNR centers, rather than targeted sampling. Due to the lack of exact overlap between cats surveyed for density analysis and cats used for pathogen testing, data used in this study may not be able to fully represent each other, although they were pooled and interpreted as samples from same district. Future similar studies may benefit from not only a larger sample size, but also by collecting samples specifically of the population where the density survey was performed.

With an increasing population size of stray cats in many urban cities, concerns arise regarding the impact of stray cats on the viability of wildlife populations and their potential role in disease transmission between humans as well as domestic and wild animals (Longcore, Rich & Sullivan, 2009; Lepczyk, Lohr & Duffy, 2015). In attempt to control the population size, sterilization is commonly adopted in many countries. However, it is often overlooked that sterilizing may also have an unexpected impact on the disease ecology of stray cat populations by shifting various behavioral traits of individuals and/or demographic structures (Finkler & Terkel, 2010; Finkler, Gunther & Terkel, 2011). For instance, sterilized cats may have a reduced aggressive or roaming behavior compared to intact cats and therefore have a reduced chance of exposure and transmission of infectious pathogens (Scott et al., 2002; Finkler & Terkel, 2010;
Finkler, Gunther & Terkel, 2011). In contrast, pathogens transmitted through amicable behavior (e.g., conspecific grooming), such as FeLV, may be facilitated in populations where a high number of cats are sterilized (Jeon JK, 2011). Immigration of cats into neutered cat populations has been reported as a common occurrence (Gunther, Finkler & Terkel, 2011; Kilgour et al., 2017) with the potential risk of immigrants carrying and introducing pathogens. Currently, there is lack of concrete information to verify the epidemiological impact of sterilizing cats. Hence, additional efforts are warranted to clarify the impact of sterilization not only on the population control of stray cats but also on the health and welfare of free-roaming cats overall.

Conclusion

In conclusion, our findings did not meet our initial assumption that population density would be lower in high CCA districts. Likewise, the relationships between pathogen prevalence and population density or CCA varied for each tested pathogen rather than showing similar patterns depending on their transmission mode. Among the studied pathogens, only FPV and FeLV showed a significant association with the CCA but no association with population density. Our results suggest that supplemental feeding may influence disease ecology in the subject host population, not only by increasing the population density around the area as observed in previous studies on wildlife (Putman & Staines, 2004; Geisser & Reyer, 2005), but also by potentially changing the behavior or biology of animals, such as an altered aggregation and foraging behavior, which can affect their exposure and/or susceptibility to pathogens. So far, studies on urban stray cats with an emphasis on health aspects have been mostly limited to screening for the prevalence of zoonotic pathogens. However, we suggest that the incorporation of multifaceted information, such as human behaviors and perceptions about urban stray cats, the influence of human behaviors
on the ecology of cats and the transmission of pathogens of interest, would be crucial to better understand the potential epidemiological risk that urban stray cats may pose to wildlife and/or human public health and to design efficient management strategies.

Acknowledgements

We sincerely thank Daniel Becker, Dr. Jefferey Hepinstall-Cymerman, Dr. Annie Page-Karjian and the anonymous reviewers for their insightful comments on the earlier versions of the manuscript.
References

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. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* 282. DOI: 10.1098/rspb.2015.1429.

Afonso E., Germain E., Poulle M-L., Ruette S., Devillard S., Say L., Villena I., Aubert D., Gilot-Fromont E. 2013. Environmental determinants of spatial and temporal variations in the transmission of Toxoplasma gondii in its definitive hosts. *International Journal for Parasitology: Parasites and Wildlife* 2:278–285. DOI: 10.1016/j.ijppaw.2013.09.006.

Afonso E., Thulliez P., Pontier D., Gilot-Fromont E. 2007. Toxoplasmosis in prey species and consequences for prevalence in feral cats: not all prey species are equal. *Parasitology* 134:1963–1971. DOI: 10.1017/S0031182007003320.

Animal and Plant Quarantine Agency 2015. National survey on public attitude toward animal protection. Anyang, Korea

Ballash GA., Dubey JP., Kwok OCH., Shoben AB., Robison TL., Kraft TJ., Dennis PM. 2015. Seroprevalence of Toxoplasma gondii in White-Tailed Deer (Odocoileus virginianus) and Free-Roaming Cats (Felis catus) Across a Suburban to Urban Gradient in Northeastern Ohio. *EcoHealth* 12:359–367. DOI: 10.1007/s10393-014-0975-2.

Bannasch MJ., Foley JE. 2005. Epidemiologic evaluation of multiple respiratory pathogens in cats in animal shelters. *Journal of Feline Medicine & Surgery* 7:109–119. DOI: 10.1016/j.jfms.2004.07.004.

Barratt DG. 1997. Home Range Size, Habitat Utilisation and Movement Patterns of Suburban and Farm Cats Felis catus. *Ecography* 2:71.
Bateman PW., Fleming PA. 2012. Big city life: carnivores in urban environments. *Journal of Zoology* 287:1–23. DOI: 10.1111/j.1469-7998.2011.00887.x.

Bates D., Mächler M., Bolker B., Walker S. 2015. Fitting Linear Mixed-Effects Models Using lme4. *Journal of Statistical Software; Vol 1, Issue 1* (2015).

Becker DJ., Hall RJ. 2014. Too much of a good thing: resource provisioning alters infectious disease dynamics in wildlife. *Biology Letters* 10. DOI: 10.1098/rsbl.2014.0309.

Becker DJ., Streicker DG., Altizer S. 2015. Linking anthropogenic resources to wildlife–pathogen dynamics: a review and meta-analysis. *Ecology Letters* 18:483–495. DOI: 10.1111/ele.12428.

Begon M., Bennett M., Bowers RG., French NP., Hazel SM., Turner J. 2002. A clarification of transmission terms in host-microparasite models: numbers, densities and areas. *Epidemiology and Infection* 129:147–153.

Bergmann M., Englert T., Stuetzer B., Hawley JR., Lappin MR., Hartmann K. 2017. Risk factors of different hemoplasma species infections in cats. *BMC veterinary research* 13:52. DOI: 10.1186/s12917-017-0953-3.

Bitew M., Andargie A., Bekele M., Jenberie S., Ayelet G., Gelaye E. 2011. Serological survey of African horse sickness in selected districts of Jimma zone, Southwestern Ethiopia. *Tropical animal health and production* 43:1543–1547. DOI: 10.1007/s11250-011-9839-8.

Brennan A., Cross PC., Higgs MD., Edwards WH., Scurlock BM., Creel S. 2014. A multi-scale assessment of animal aggregation patterns to understand increasing pathogen seroprevalence. *Ecosphere* 5:1–25. DOI: 10.1890/ES14-00181.1.
Burnham KP., Anderson DR. 1998. Practical Use of the Information-Theoretic Approach. In: Burnham KP, Anderson DR eds. Model Selection and Inference: A Practical Information-Theoretic Approach. New York, NY: Springer New York, 75–117. DOI: 10.1007/978-1-4757-2917-7_3.

Calhoon RE., Haspel C. 1989. Urban Cat Populations Compared by Season, Subhabitat and Supplemental Feeding. Journal of Animal Ecology 58:321–328. DOI: 10.2307/5003.

Centonze LA., Levy JK. 2002. Characteristics of free-roaming cats and their caretakers. Journal of the American Veterinary Medical Association 220:1627–1633.

Chomel BB., Boulouis H-J., Breitschwerdt EB., Kasten RW., Vayssier-Taussat M., Birtles RJ., Koehler JE., Dehio C. 2009. Ecological fitness and strategies of adaptation of Bartonella species to their hosts and vectors. Veterinary Research 40:29. DOI: 10.1051/vetres/2009011.

CHOMEL BB., KASTEN RW., HENN JB., MOLIA S. 2006. Bartonella Infection in Domestic Cats and Wild Felids. Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences 1078:410–415. DOI: 10.1196/annals.1374.080.

Cooch E., White G. 2001. Program Mark. A Gentle Introduction.(Colorado State University.) Available at http://www. phidot. org/software/mark/docs/book/[Verified 15 June 2011].

Courchamp F., Say L., Pontier D. 2000. Transmission of Feline Immunodeficiency Virus in a population of cats (Felis catus). Wildlife Research 27:603–611.

Criado-Fornelio A., Martinez-Marcos A., Buling-Sarana A., Barba-Carretero JC. 2003. Presence of Mycoplasma haemofelis, Mycoplasma haemominutum and piroplasmids in cats from southern Europe: a molecular study. Veterinary microbiology 93:307–317.
DiGangi BA., Levy JK., Griffin B., McGorray SP., Dubovi EJ., Dingman PA., Tucker SJ. 2012. Prevalence of serum antibody titers against feline panleukopenia virus, feline herpesvirus 1, and feline calicivirus in cats entering a Florida animal shelter. *Journal of the American Veterinary Medical Association* 241:1320–1325. DOI: 10.2460/javma.241.10.1320.

Dobson A., Meagher M. 1996. The Population Dynamics of Brucellosis in the Yellowstone National Park. *Ecology* 77:1026–1036. DOI: 10.2307/2265573.

Fabiana Alves, Daniela D.S. Rajao, Helen L.D. Puerto, Gissandra F. Braz, Romulo C. Leite, Carlos Mazur, Almir S. Martins and Jenner K.P.D. Reis 2011. Occurrence of Feline Immunodeficiency Virus and Feline Leukemia Virus Infection in Cats. *American Journal of Animal and Veterinary Sciences* 6:125–129.

Fenton A., Fairbairn JP., Norman R., Hudson PJ. 2002. Parasite transmission: reconciling theory and reality. *Journal of Animal Ecology* 71:893–905. DOI: 10.1046/j.1365-2656.2002.00656.x.

Finkler H., Gunther I., Terkel J. 2011. Behavioral differences between urban feeding groups of neutered and sexually intact free-roaming cats following a trap-neuter-return procedure. *Journal of the American Veterinary Medical Association* 238:1141–1149. DOI: 10.2460/javma.238.9.1141.

Finkler H., Hatna E., Terkel J. 2011a. The influence of neighbourhood socio-demographic factors on densities of free-roaming cat populations in an urban ecosystem in Israel. *Wildlife Research* 38:235–243.

Finkler H., Hatna E., Terkel J. 2011b. The Impact of Anthropogenic Factors on the Behavior, Reproduction, Management and Welfare of Urban, Free-Roaming Cat Populations. *Anthrozoös* 24:31–49. DOI: 10.2752/175303711X12923300467320.
Finkler H., Terkel J. 2010. Cortisol levels and aggression in neutered and intact free-roaming female cats living in urban social groups. *Physiology & behavior* 99:343–347. DOI: 10.1016/j.physbeh.2009.11.014.

Fischer C., Reperant L.A., Weber J.M., Hegglin D., Deplazes P. 2005. Echinococcus multilocularis infections of rural, residential and urban foxes (*Vulpes vulpes*) in the canton of Geneva, Switzerland. *Parasite (Paris, France)* 12:339–346.

Flockhart D.T.T., Norris D.R., Coe J.B. 2016. Predicting free-roaming cat population densities in urban areas. *Animal Conservation* 19:472–483. DOI: 10.1111/acv.12264.

Forristal V.E., Creel S., Taper M.L., Scurlock B.M., Cross P.C. 2012. Effects of supplemental feeding and aggregation on fecal glucocorticoid metabolite concentrations in elk. *The Journal of Wildlife Management* 76:694–702. DOI: 10.1002/jwmg.312.

Fouchet D., Leblanc G., Sauvage F., Guiserix M., Poulet H., Pontier D. 2009. Using Dynamic Stochastic Modelling to Estimate Population Risk Factors in Infectious Disease: The Example of FIV in 15 Cat Populations. *PLOS ONE* 4:e7377. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0007377.

Galbraith J.A., Beggs J.R., Jones D.N., Stanley M.C. 2015. Supplementary feeding restructures urban bird communities. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 112:E2648–E2657. DOI: 10.1073/pnas.1501489112.

Geisser H., Reyer H-U. 2005. The influence of food and temperature on population density of wild boar *Sus scrofa* in the Thurgau (Switzerland). *Journal of Zoology* 267:89–96. DOI: 10.1017/S095283690500734X.

Gerhold R.W., Jessup D.A. 2013. Zoonotic diseases associated with free-roaming cats. *Zoonoses and Public Health* 60:189–195. DOI: 10.1111/j.1863-2378.2012.01522.x.
Greer AL., Briggs CJ., Collins JP. 2008. Testing a key assumption of host-pathogen theory: density and disease transmission. *Oikos* 117:1667–1673. DOI: 10.1111/j.1600-0706.2008.16783.x.

Gross J., Elvinger F., Hungerford LL., Gehrt SD. 2011. Raccoon use of the urban matrix in the Baltimore Metropolitan Area, Maryland. *Urban Ecosystems* 15:667–682. DOI: 10.1007/s11252-011-0218-z.

Gunther I., Finkler H., Terkel J. 2011. Demographic differences between urban feeding groups of neutered and sexually intact free-roaming cats following a trap-neuter-return procedure. *Journal of the American Veterinary Medical Association* 238:1134–1140. DOI: 10.2460/javma.238.9.1134.

Harihar Abishek, Ghosh Mousumi, Fernandes Merwyn, Pandav Bivash, Goyal Surendra P. 2009. Use of photographic capture-recapture sampling to estimate density of Striped Hyena (*Hyaena hyaena*): implications for conservation. *mammalia* 74:83. DOI: 10.1515/mamm.2009.072.

Horn JA., Mateus-Pinilla N., Warner RE., Heske EJ. 2011. Home range, habitat use, and activity patterns of free-roaming domestic cats. *The Journal of Wildlife Management* 75:1177–1185. DOI: 10.1002/jwmg.145.

Ikeda Y., Nakamura K., Miyazawa T., Tohya Y., Takahashi E., Mochizuki M. 2002. Feline Host Range of Canine parvovirus: Recent Emergence of New Antigenic Types in Cats. *Emerging Infectious Diseases* 8:341–346. DOI: 10.3201/eid0804.010228.

Izawa M. 1983. Daily Activities of the Feral Cat Felis catus LINN. *Journal of the Mammalogical Society of Japan* 9:219–228. DOI: 10.11238/jmammsocjapan1952.9.219.
Jeon JK 2011. Social organization and behaviouiral patterns of a neutered feral cat colony in an urban environment (Felis catus).

Jessop TS., Smissen P., Scheelings F., Dempster T. 2012. Demographic and Phenotypic Effects of Human Mediated Trophic Subsidy on a Large Australian Lizard (Varanus varius): Meal Ticket or Last Supper? *PLoS ONE* 7:e34069. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0034069.

Kilgour RJ., Magle SB., Slater M., Christian A., Weiss E., DiTullio M. 2017. Estimating free-roaming cat populations and the effects of one year Trap-Neuter-Return management effort in a highly urban area. *Urban Ecosystems* 20:207–216. DOI: 10.1007/s11252-016-0583-8.

Kim Y-H., Baik J-J. 2005. Spatial and Temporal Structure of the Urban Heat Island in Seoul. *Journal of Applied Meteorology* 44:591–605. DOI: 10.1175/JAM2226.1.

Kim J, Hwang JS, MS Min, Chun MS, Lee H 2016. Socioeconomic characteristics and cat caretaking behavior of cat caretakers in Korea. *Journal of Korean Veterinary Medical Association*.

Krasnov B., Khokhlova I., Shenbrot G. 2002. The Effect of Host Density on Ectoparasite Distribution: An Example of a Rodent Parasitized by Fleas. *Ecology* 83:164–175. DOI: 10.2307/2680129.

Lappin MR., Andrews J., Simpson D., Jensen WA. 2002. Use of serologic tests to predict resistance to feline herpesvirus 1, feline calicivirus, and feline parvovirus infection in cats. *Journal of the American Veterinary Medical Association* 220:38–42.

Lee S-E., Kim N-H., Chae H-S., Cho S-H., Nam H-W., Lee W-J., Kim S-H., Lee J-H. 2011. Prevalence of Toxoplasma gondii Infection in Feral Cats in Seoul, Korea. *Journal of Parasitology* 97:153–155. DOI: 10.1645/GE-2455.1.
Lee IT., Levy JK., Gorman SP., Crawford PC., Slater MR. 2002. Prevalence of feline leukemia virus infection and serum antibodies against feline immunodeficiency virus in unowned free-roaming cats. *Journal of the American Veterinary Medical Association* 220:620–622.

Lelu M., Langlais M., Poulle M-L., Gilot-Fromont E. 2010. Transmission dynamics of *Toxoplasma gondii* along an urban-rural gradient. *Theoretical population biology* 78:139–147. DOI: 10.1016/j.tpb.2010.05.005.

Lembo T., Hampson K., Auty H., Beesley CA., Bessell P., Packer C., Halliday J., FYumagwa R., Hoare R., Ernest E., Mentzel C., Mlengeya T., Stamey K., Wilkins PP., Cleaveland S. 2011. Serologic Surveillance of Anthrax in the Serengeti Ecosystem, Tanzania, 1996–2009. *Emerging Infectious Diseases* 17:387–394. DOI: 10.3201/eid1703.101290.

Lepczyk CA., Lohr CA., Duffy DC. 2015. A review of cat behavior in relation to disease risk and management options. *Applied Animal Behaviour Science* 173:29–39. DOI: 10.1016/j.applanim.2015.07.002.

Levy JK., Scott HM., Lachtara JL., Crawford PC. 2006. Seroprevalence of feline leukemia virus and feline immunodeficiency virus infection among cats in North America and risk factors for seropositivity. *J Am Vet Med Assoc* 228. DOI: 10.2460/javma.228.3.371.

Lickey ALA., Kennedy M., Patton S., Ramsay EC. 2005. Serologic Survey of Domestic Felids in the Petén Region of Guatemala. *Journal of Zoo and Wildlife Medicine* 36:121–123.

Longcore T., Rich C., Sullivan LM. 2009. Critical assessment of claims regarding management of feral cats by trap-neuter-return. *Conservation Biology: The Journal of the Society for Conservation Biology* 23:887–894. DOI: 10.1111/j.1523-1739.2009.01174.x.
López-Bao JV., Palomares F., Rodríguez A., Delibes M. 2010. Effects of food supplementation on home-range size, reproductive success, productivity and recruitment in a small population of Iberian lynx. *Animal Conservation* 13:35–42. DOI: 10.1111/j.1469-1795.2009.00300.x.

Lutz H., Addie D., Belak S., Boucraut-Baralon C., Egberink H., Frymus T., Gruffydd-Jones T., Hartmann K., Hosie MJ., Lloret A., Marsilio F., Pennisi MG., Radford AD., Thiry E., Truyen U., Horzinek MC. 2009. Feline leukaemia. ABCD guidelines on prevention and management. *Journal of feline medicine and surgery* 11:565–574. DOI: 10.1016/j.jfms.2009.05.005.

Mazerolle MJ. 2017. *AICcmodavg: Model Selection and Multimodel Inference Based on (Q)AIC(c)*.

Miller R., Kaneene JB., Fitzgerald SD., Schmitt SM. 2003. Evaluation of the influence of supplemental feeding of white-tailed deer (*Odocoileus virginianus*) on the prevalence of bovine tuberculosis in the Michigan wild deer population. *Journal of Wildlife Diseases* 39:84–95. DOI: 10.7589/0090-3558-39.1.84.

Moyers SC. 2017. Behavioral Heterogeneity and Disease Dynamics in House Finches (*Haemorhous mexicanus*). Doctoral Dissertation Thesis. Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University.

Murray MH., Becker DJ., Hall RJ., Hernandez SM. 2016. Wildlife health and supplemental feeding: A review and management recommendations. *Biological Conservation* 204, Part B:163–174. DOI: 10.1016/j.biocon.2016.10.034.

Natoli E., Say L., Cafazzo S., Bonanni R., Schmid M., Pontier D. 2005. Bold attitude makes male urban feral domestic cats more vulnerable to Feline Immunodeficiency Virus.
Individual differences in behavior and physiology; causes and consequences 29:151–157.
DOI: 10.1016/j.neubiorev.2004.06.011.

Oi M., Yoshikawa S., Maruyama S., Nogami S. 2015. Comparison of Toxoplasma gondii Seroprevalence in Shelter Cats and Dogs during 1999–2001 and 2009–2011 in Tokyo, Japan. *PLoS ONE* 10:e0135956. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0135956.

Oro D., Genovart M., Tavecchia G., Fowler MS., Martínez-Abraín A. 2013. Ecological and evolutionary implications of food subsidies from humans. *Ecology Letters* 16:1501–1514. DOI: 10.1111/ele.12187.

Parr NA., Fedigan LM., Kutz SJ. 2013. Predictors of Parasitism in Wild White-Faced Capuchins (Cebus capucinus). *International Journal of Primatology* 34:1137–1152. DOI: 10.1007/s10764-013-9728-2.

Peterson MN., Hartis B., Rodriguez S., Green M., Lepczyk CA. 2012. Opinions from the Front Lines of Cat Colony Management Conflict. *PLOS ONE* 7:e44616. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0044616.

Plummer KE., Bearhop S., Leech DI., Chamberlain DE., Blount JD. 2013. Winter food provisioning reduces future breeding performance in a wild bird. *Scientific Reports* 3:2002.

Pontier D., Fouchet D., Bahi-Jaber N., Poulet H., Guiserix M., Natoli E., Sauvage F. 2009. When domestic cat (Felis silvestris catus) population structures interact with their viruses. *Comptes rendus biologies* 332:321–328. DOI: 10.1016/j.crvi.2008.07.012.

Pontier D., Natoli E. 1996. Male reproductive success in the domestic cat (Felis catus L.): A case history. *Behavioural Processes* 37:85–88. DOI: 10.1016/0376-6357(95)00070-4.
PUTMAN RJ., STAINES BW. 2004. Supplementary winter feeding of wild red deer Cervus elaphus in Europe and North America: justifications, feeding practice and effectiveness. *Mammal Review* 34:285–306. DOI: 10.1111/j.1365-2907.2004.00044.x.

Radford AD., Addie D., Belak S., Boucraut-Baralon C., Egberink H., Frymus T., Gruffydd-Jones T., Hartmann K., Hosie MJ., Lloret A., Lutz H., Marsilio F., Pennisi MG., Thiry E., Truyen U., Horzinek MC. 2009. Feline calicivirus infection. ABCD guidelines on prevention and management. *Journal of feline medicine and surgery* 11:556–564. DOI: 10.1016/j.jfms.2009.05.004.

Radford AD., Coyne KP., Dawson S., Porter CJ., Gaskell RM. 2007. Feline calicivirus. *Vet. Res.* 38:319–335.

Ravi M., Wobeser GA., Taylor SM., Jackson ML. 2010. Naturally acquired feline immunodeficiency virus (FIV) infection in cats from western Canada: Prevalence, disease associations, and survival analysis. *The Canadian Veterinary Journal* 51:271–276.

Rickett J., Dey CJ., Stohtar J., O’Connor CM., Quinn JS., Ji W. 2013. The influence of supplemental feeding on survival, dispersal and competition in translocated Brown Teal, or Pateke (Anas chlorotis). *Emu - Austral Ornithology* 113:62–68. DOI: 10.1071/MU12053.

Robb GN., McDonald RA., Chamberlain DE., Bearhop S. 2008. Food for thought: supplementary feeding as a driver of ecological change in avian populations. *Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment* 6:476–484. DOI: 10.1890/060152.
Rodriguez-Hidalgo P., Gortazar C., Tortosa FS., Rodriguez-Vigal C., Fierro Y., Vicente J. 2010. Effects of density, climate, and supplementary forage on body mass and pregnancy rates of female red deer in Spain. *Oecologia* 164:389–398. DOI: 10.1007/s00442-010-1663-8.

Rojko JL., Olsen RG. 1984. The immunobiology of the feline leukemia virus. *Veterinary immunology and immunopathology* 6:107–165.

Scott KC., Levy JK., Gorman SP., Newell SM. 2002. Body condition of feral cats and the effect of neutering. *Journal of applied animal welfare science: JAAWS* 5:203–213. DOI: 10.1207/S15327604JAWS0503_04.

Seber GAF. 1992. A Review of Estimating Animal Abundance II. *International Statistical Review / Revue Internationale de Statistique* 60:129–166. DOI: 10.2307/1403646.

Semeniuk CAD, Rothley KD 2008. Costs of group-living for a normally solitary forager: effects of provisioning tourism on southern stingrays Dasyatis americana. *Marine Ecology Progress Series* 357:271–282.

Spada E., Proverbio D., Galluzzo P., Della Pepa A., Perego R., Bagnagatti De Giorgi G., Ferro E. 2014. Molecular study on selected vector-borne infections in urban stray colony cats in northern Italy. *Journal of feline medicine and surgery* 16:684–688. DOI: 10.1177/1098612X13514422.

Stojanovic V., Foley P. 2011. Infectious disease prevalence in a feral cat population on Prince Edward Island, Canada. *Canadian Veterinary Journal* 52:979–982.

Tennent J., Downs CT. 2008. Abundance and home ranges of feral cats in an urban conservancy where there is supplemental feeding: a case study from South Africa. *African Zoology* 43:218–229. DOI: 10.3377/1562-7020-43.2.218.
Thiry E., Addie D., Belak S., Boucraut-Baralon C., Egberink H., Frymus T., Gruffydd-Jones T., Hartmann K., Hosie MJ., Lloret A., Lutz H., Marsilio F., Pennisi MG., Radford AD., Truyen U., Horzinek MC. 2009. Feline herpesvirus infection. ABCD guidelines on prevention and management. *Journal of feline medicine and surgery* 11:547–555. DOI: 10.1016/j.jfms.2009.05.003.

Thrall PH., Antonovics J., Hall DW. 1993. Host and Pathogen Coexistence in Sexually Transmitted and Vector-Borne Diseases Characterized by Frequency-Dependent Disease Transmission. *The American Naturalist*:543.

Truyen U., Addie D., Belak S., Boucraut-Baralon C., Egberink H., Frymus T., Gruffydd-Jones T., Hartmann K., Hosie MJ., Lloret A., Lutz H., Marsilio F., Pennisi MG., Radford AD., Thiry E., Horzinek MC. 2009. Feline panleukopenia. ABCD guidelines on prevention and management. *Journal of feline medicine and surgery* 11:538–546. DOI: 10.1016/j.jfms.2009.05.002.

Vicente J., Hofle U., Fernandez-De-Mera IG., Gortazar C. 2007. The importance of parasite life history and host density in predicting the impact of infections in red deer. *Oecologia* 152:655–664. DOI: 10.1007/s00442-007-0690-6.

Walker Vergara R., Morera Galleguillos F., Gómez Jaramillo M., Pereira Almosny NR., Arauna Martínez P., Grob Behne P., Acosta-Jamett G., Müller A. 2016. Prevalence, risk factor analysis, and hematological findings of hemoplasma infection in domestic cats from Valdivia, Southern Chile. *Comparative Immunology, Microbiology and Infectious Diseases* 46:20–26. DOI: 10.1016/j.cimid.2016.03.004.
Wang Q., Jiang W., Chen Y-J., Liu C-Y., Shi J., Li X. 2012. Prevalence of Toxoplasma gondii antibodies, circulating antigens and DNA in stray cats in Shanghai, China. *Parasites & vectors* 5:190. DOI: 10.1186/1756-3305-5-190.

Willi B., Boretti FS., Tasker S., Meli ML., Wengi N., Reusch CE., Lutz H., Hofmann-Lehmann R. 2007. From Haemobartonella to hemoplasma: Molecular methods provide new insights. *Veterinary Microbiology* 125:197–209. DOI: 10.1016/j.vetmic.2007.06.027.

Wright AN., Gompper ME. 2005. Altered parasite assemblages in raccoons in response to manipulated resource availability. *Oecologia* 144:148–156. DOI: 10.1007/s00442-005-0018-3.

Yamaguchi N., Macdonald DW., Passanisi WC., Harbour DA., Hopper CD. 1996. Parasite prevalence in free-ranging farm cats, Felis silvestris catus. *Epidemiology and infection* 116:217–223.
S1 Figure. Typical landscape of residential area of Seoul where the density survey was performed
Figure 1

CCA (PC1) in the districts of Seoul based on the PCA result

The six districts selected are; GN, SC and MP on the upper right side (high CCA districts; yellow), and GC, DDM and SD on the lower left side (lower CCA districts; blue). District SP and GD was excluded from the study site due to logistical reasons.

*Two sites, SP and GB, were not included in six selected study sites. Refer to text for specifics.*
Figure 2

Map of Seoul showing the 6 districts where the study was performed

High CCA districts in red letters and low CCA districts in blue letters.
Figure 3

Cat population density estimates (95% confidence intervals) from the 12 survey sites
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Table 1 (on next page)

Transmission modes of studied pathogens.

Specific transmission routes of studied pathogens and its relative position along the continuum between density-dependent and frequency-dependent transmission.
| Pathogens                        | Transmission modes                                      | Relative position of pathogens on continuum of transmission modes |
|---------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Feline Calicivirus (FCV)        | Aerosol in close proximity, direct contact with contaminated objects or infected cats | Density-dependent transmission                                       |
| Feline Herpesvirus (FHV)        | Aerosol in close proximity, direct contact with contaminated objects or infected cats |                                                                     |
| Feline leukemia virus (FeLV)    | Saliva, aerosol in close proximity                      |                                                                     |
| *Toxoplasma gondii*             | Prey consumption contact with contaminated abiotic materials (e.g. feces) | Frequency-dependent transmission                                     |
| Feline Parvovirus (FPV)         | Saliva, blood, urine and feces                         |                                                                     |
| *Bartonella henselae*           | Vector-borne, mostly flea                               |                                                                     |
| Hemoplasma                      | Through saliva and/or arthropod vectors                |                                                                     |
| Feline Immunodeficiency Virus (FIV) | Aggressive behavior during breeding seasons-saliva and bite wounds |                                                                     |
Table 2 (on next page)

Principal components (PC1 and PC2) eigenvalues and PC loadings for the CCA parameters
|                              | PC1  | PC2  |
|------------------------------|------|------|
| **Eigenvalue**               | 3.12 | 1.41 |
| **Percentage variation explained** | 0.39 | 0.18 |
| **Eigenvectors**             |      |      |
| Matriculation rate           | 0.45 | -0.27|
| Property tax                 | 0.46 | -0.11|
| Proportion of survey respondents | 0.37 | -0.42|
| Proportion of respondents taking care | 0.24 | 0.58|
| of more than ten cats        |      |      |
| Proportion of cat caretakers with more than five years of experience | 0.29 | 0.39|
| Provide food supplement daily in a regular manner | 0.27 | 0.41|
| Provide food in areas further than a 100-meter radius from their house | 0.25 | -0.27|
| Subjective score about the intensity of the CCA in his/her residing district | 0.42 | 0.08|
**Table 3 (on next page)**

Estimated population densities (95% confidence intervals) and proportion of observed cats with the sterilization mark from the six districts (CCA indicated in parenthesis; high-H, low-L)
| District (CCA) | Site ID | Area (km²) | Estimated cat density (95% CI cats per km²) | Proportion of sterilized cats* |
|---------------|---------|------------|---------------------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| GN (H)        | GN1     | 0.14       | 155 (127-246)                              | 0.24                        |
|               | GN2     | 0.17       | 168 (132-288)                              | 0.68                        |
| SC (H)        | SC1     | 0.19       | 185 (151-295)                              | 0.30                        |
|               | SC2     | 0.17       | 172 (129-312)                              | 0.22                        |
| MP (H)        | MP1     | 0.15       | 166 (146-232)                              | 0.14                        |
|               | MP2     | 0.18       | 182 (155-280)                              | 0.58                        |
| DDM (L)       | DDM1    | 0.18       | 132 (126-172)                              | 0.19                        |
|               | DDM2    | 0.13       | 175 (152-266)                              | 0.00                        |
| GC (L)        | GC1     | 0.19       | 189 (158-289)                              | 0.22                        |
|               | GC2     | 0.16       | 206 (167-328)                              | 0.08                        |
| SD (L)        | SD1     | 0.18       | 243 (209-349)                              | 0.00                        |
|               | SD2     | 0.21       | 268 (189-466)                              | 0.10                        |

1 * Calculated as ‘number of observed cats with an ear mark/ number of total observed cats’.
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Table 4 (on next page)

Prevalence (%), 95% confidence interval and sample size (n)) of each pathogen from the stray cats in the six studied districts (Letter inside the parentheses indicates the CCA of each district; H-high, L-low)
| District | FIV | Feline | B. henselae | T. gondii | FPV | FeLV | FCV | FHV-1 |
|----------|-----|--------|-------------|-----------|-----|------|-----|-------|
| GN (H)   | 0 % (0.00-0.05, n = 50) | 26.0 % (0.15-0.39, n = 50) | 42.0 % (0.29-0.56, n = 50) | 6.0 % (0.02-0.15, n = 50) | 59.0 % (0.45-0.72, n = 49) | 42.0 % (0.28-0.56, n = 50) | 100 % (0.95-1.00, n = 50) | 100 % (0.95-1.00, n = 50) |
| SC (H)   | 6.0 % (0.02-0.15, n = 50) | 38.0 % (0.26-0.52, n = 50) | 30.0 % (0.19-0.44, n = 50) | 6.0 % (0.02-0.15, n = 50) | 76.0 % (0.63-0.86, n = 50) | 36.0 % (0.24-0.50, n = 50) | 92.0 % (0.82-0.97, n = 50) | 94.0 % (0.85-0.98, n = 50) |
| MP (H)   | 6.0 % (0.02-0.15, n = 50) | 48.0 % (0.35-0.62, n = 50) | 42.0 % (0.29-0.56, n = 50) | 6.3 % (0.02-0.16, n = 48) | 75.5 % (0.64-0.87, n = 49) | 12.0 % (0.03-0.21, n = 49) | 98.0 % (0.91-1.00, n = 49) | 96.0 % (0.88-0.99, n = 49) |
|        | DDM (L) |        | GC (L) |        | SD (L) |
|--------|---------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
|        | 4.0%    | 28.0%  | 32.0%  | 4.0%   | 94.0%  | 20.0%  | 100%  | 100%  |
|        | (0.01-0.12, n = 50) | (0.17-0.41, n = 50) | (0.20-0.46, n = 50) | (0.01-0.12, n = 50) | (0.85-0.98, n = 50) | (0.11-0.33, n = 50) | (0.95-1.00, n = 50) | (0.95-1.00, n = 50) |
|        | 28.0%   | 32.0%  | 28.0%  | 34.0%  | 12.0%  | 80.0%  | 14.0%  | 92.0%  | 100%  |
|        | (0.17-0.41, n = 50) | (0.20-0.46, n = 50) | (0.18-0.42, n = 50) | (0.22-0.48, n = 50) | (0.05-0.23, n = 50) | (0.67-0.89, n = 50) | (0.07-0.26, n = 50) | (0.82-0.97, n = 50) | (0.95-1.00, n = 50) |
|        | 32.0%   | 28.0%  | 32.0%  | 34.0%  | 12.0%  | 80.0%  | 14.0%  | 92.0%  | 100%  |
|        | (0.20-0.46, n = 50) | (0.18-0.42, n = 50) | (0.18-0.42, n = 50) | (0.22-0.48, n = 50) | (0.05-0.23, n = 50) | (0.67-0.89, n = 50) | (0.07-0.26, n = 50) | (0.82-0.97, n = 50) | (0.95-1.00, n = 50) |
|        |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       | 1.9%    |
|        |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       | (0.00-0.09, n = 52) |
|        |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       | 26.9%   |
|        |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       | (0.16-0.5, n = 52) |
|        |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       | 28.8%   |
|        |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       | (0.18-0.42, n = 52) |
|        |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       | 12.0%   |
|        |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       | (0.05-0.23, n = 50) |
|        |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       | 90.0%   |
|        |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       | (0.80-0.96, n = 50) |
|        |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       | 15.4%   |
|        |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       | (0.08-0.27, n = 52) |
|        |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       | 86.0%   |
|        |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       | (0.75-0.94, n = 50) |
|        |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       | 100%    |
|        |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       | (0.95-1.00, n = 50) |
Table 5 (on next page)

AICc values and AICc weights of the most parsimonious candidate models (models within 2 units of the ΔAICc) testing the effect of the explanatory variables (sex, population density (pd) and CCA) on the prevalence of the eight studied pathogens.
| Pathogen         | Model*                      | K | AICc   | ΔAICc | AICc weight |
|------------------|-----------------------------|---|--------|-------|-------------|
| FeLV             | sex+CCA                     | 4 | 318.97 | 0.00  | 0.62        |
|                  | sex+pd+CCA                  | 5 | 320.80 | 1.84  | 0.25        |
|                  | CCA                         | 3 | 294.25 | 0.00  | 0.39        |
|                  | sex+CCA                     | 4 | 294.57 | 0.31  | 0.34        |
| Hemoplasma       | sex+CCA                     | 4 | 375.39 | 0.00  | 0.35        |
|                  | sex                         | 3 | 375.50 | 0.12  | 0.33        |
|                  | sex+pd                      | 4 | 376.86 | 1.48  | 0.17        |
| Toxoplasma gondii| sex+pd                      | 4 | 159.77 | 0.00  | 0.34        |
|                  | sex                         | 3 | 160.29 | 0.52  | 0.26        |
|                  | sex+CCA                     | 4 | 161.64 | 1.87  | 0.13        |
| FCV              | pd                          | 3 | 117.76 | 0.00  | 0.38        |
|                  | pd+sex                      | 4 | 118.19 | 0.43  | 0.31        |
|                  | pd+CCA                      | 4 | 119.47 | 1.71  | 0.16        |
| FHV-1            | pd+CCA                      | 4 | 47.73  | 0.00  | 0.27        |
|                  | CCA                         | 3 | 47.81  | 0.09  | 0.25        |
|                  | sex+pd+CCA                  | 5 | 48.16  | 0.43  | 0.21        |
|                  | sex+CCA                     | 4 | 48.30  | 0.57  | 0.20        |
| FIV              | Null                        | 2 | 96.56  | 0.00  | 0.37        |
|                  | pd                          | 3 | 98.34  | 1.78  | 0.15        |
|                  | CCA                         | 3 | 98.48  | 1.93  | 0.14        |
|                  | sex                         | 3 | 98.52  | 1.96  | 0.14        |
| Bartonella henselae| Null                       | 2 | 392.20 | 0.00  | 0.25        |
|                  | CCA                         | 3 | 392.85 | 0.65  | 0.18        |
|                  | pd                          | 3 | 392.98 | 0.78  | 0.17        |
|                  | sex                         | 3 | 393.87 | 1.67  | 0.11        |

1 *Abbreviated model variables: pd=population density, CCA=cat caretaker activity
Table 6 (on next page)

Model-averaged parameter estimates included in the most parsimonious models (models within 2 units of the ΔAICc) for each pathogen
|                  | Coefficient | S.E. | Upper CI | Lower CI | Odds ratio | P-value |
|------------------|-------------|------|----------|----------|------------|---------|
| **FeLV**         |             |      |          |          |            |         |
| CCA; low sex; male | -0.81       | 0.30 | -1.42    | -0.20    | 0.44       | <0.01   |
|                  | -0.74       | 0.29 | -1.32    | -0.17    | 0.48       | 0.01    |
|                  | -0.00       | 0.01 | -0.02    | 0.01     | 0.99       | 0.41    |
| **FPV**          |             |      |          |          |            |         |
| CCA; low sex; male | 1.12        | 0.31 | 0.52     | 1.74     | 3.08       | <0.01   |
|                  | -0.35       | 0.30 | -0.93    | 0.23     | 0.70       | 0.24    |
| **hemoplasma**   |             |      |          |          |            |         |
| CCA; low sex; male | -0.37       | 0.25 | -0.91    | 0.07     | 0.66       | 0.15    |
|                  | 0.79        | 0.26 | 0.30     | 1.30     | 2.23       | <0.01   |
|                  | -0.00       | 0.00 | -0.01    | 0.01     | 0.99       | 0.67    |
| **Toxoplasma gondii** |           |      |          |          |            |         |
| CCA; low sex; male | 0.38        | 0.45 | -0.50    | 1.27     | 1.47       | 0.40    |
|                  | -1.11       | 0.49 | -2.07    | -0.14    | 0.33       | 0.03    |
|                  | 0.01        | 0.01 | -0.00    | 0.02     | 1.01       | 0.08    |
| **FCV**          |             |      |          |          |            |         |
| CCA; low sex; male | 0.38        | 0.82 | -1.28    | 1.99     | 1.47       | 0.64    |
|                  | -0.63       | 0.55 | -1.70    | -0.45    | 0.54       | 0.25    |
|                  | -0.02       | 0.01 | -0.04    | 0.01     | 0.98       | <0.01   |
| **FHV-1**        |             |      |          |          |            |         |
| CCA; low sex; male | 27.53       | 2701.87 | 5323.11 | 9.08x10^11 | 0.99       | 0.99    |
|                  | -1.25       | 1.14 | -3.49    | 0.99     | 0.29       | 0.28    |
|                  | -0.18       | 0.13 | -0.43    | 0.07     | 0.84       | 0.16    |
| **FIV**          |             |      |          |          |            |         |
| CCA; low sex; male | -0.14       | 0.65 | -1.28    | 1.25     | 0.99       | 0.98    |
|                  | 0.14        | 0.65 | -1.25    | 1.28     | 1.01       | 0.98    |
|                  | -0.00       | 0.01 | -0.02    | 0.02     | 1.00       | 0.82    |
| **Bartonella henselae** |         |      |          |          |            |         |
| CCA; low sex; male | -0.29       | 0.25 | -0.77    | 0.19     | 0.75       | 0.24    |
|                  | -0.19       | 0.25 | -0.67    | 0.29     | 0.83       | 0.44    |
|                  | -0.00       | 0.00 | -0.01    | 0.00     | 1.00       | 0.35    |