


Required software to e-Annotate PDFs: **Adobe Acrobat Professional** or **Adobe Reader** (version 11 or above). (Note that this document uses screenshots from **Adobe Reader DC**.)

The latest version of Acrobat Reader can be downloaded for free at: <http://get.adobe.com/reader/>

Once you have Acrobat Reader open on your computer, click on the **Comment** tab (right-hand panel or under the Tools menu).

This will open up a ribbon panel at the top of the document. Using a tool will place a comment in the right-hand panel. The tools you will use for annotating your proof are shown below:





1. Replace (Ins) Tool – for replacing text.



Strikes a line through text and opens up a text box where replacement text can be entered.

How to use it:

- Highlight a word or sentence.
- Click on .
- Type the replacement text into the blue box that appears.




2. Strikethrough (Del) Tool – for deleting text.



Strikes a red line through text that is to be deleted.

How to use it:

- Highlight a word or sentence.
- Click on .
- The text will be struck out in red.

experimental data if available. For ORFs to be had to meet all of the following criteria:



1. Small size (35-250 amino acids).
2. Absence of similarity to known proteins.
3. Absence of functional data which could not be the real overlapping gene.
4. Greater than 25% overlap at the N-terminus terminus with another coding feature; over both ends; or ORF containing a tRNA.


3. Commenting Tool – for highlighting a section to be changed to bold or italic or for general comments.



Use these 2 tools to highlight the text where a comment is then made.


How to use it:

- Click on .
- Click and drag over the text you need to highlight for the comment you will add.
- Click on .
- Click close to the text you just highlighted.
- Type any instructions regarding the text to be altered into the box that appears.

informal invariance:  for
A: Math. Gen., Vol. 12, N

lified theory for a matrix
'ol. 8, 1984, pp. 305-323

id manuscript, 1984.
ching fractions for $D_0 \rightarrow K+K$
relation in D_0 decays' Phys





4. Insert Tool – for inserting missing text at specific points in the text.



Marks an insertion point in the text and opens up a text box where comments can be entered.

How to use it:

- Click on .
- Click at the point in the proof where the comment should be inserted.
- Type the comment into the box that appears.



5. Attach File Tool – for inserting large amounts of text or replacement figures.



Inserts an icon linking to the attached file in the appropriate place in the text.

How to use it:

- Click on .
- Click on the proof to where you'd like the attached file to be linked.
- Select the file to be attached from your computer or network.
- Select the colour and type of icon that will appear in the proof. Click OK.

The attachment appears in the right-hand panel.

chondrial preparator
ative damage injury
the extent of membra
malondialdehyde (TBARS) formation.
used by high perform

6. Add stamp Tool – for approving a proof if no corrections are required.



Inserts a selected stamp onto an appropriate place in the proof.

How to use it:


- Click on .
- Select the stamp you want to use. (The [Approved](#) stamp is usually available directly in the menu that appears. Others are shown under *Dynamic*, *Sign Here*, *Standard Business*).
- Fill in any details and then click on the proof where you'd like the stamp to appear. (Where a proof is to be approved as it is, this would normally be on the first page).

of the business cycle, starting with the
on perfect competition, constant ret
production. In this environment goods
extra costs are incurred to make marks
he total cost of production is deter
etermined by the model. The New-Key
otaki (1987), has introduced produc
general equilibrium models with nomin
and supply shocks. Most of this litera

APPROVED



Drawing tools available on comment ribbon




7. Drawing Markups Tools – for drawing shapes, lines, and freeform annotations on proofs and commenting on these marks.


Allows shapes, lines, and freeform annotations to be drawn on proofs and for comments to be made on these marks.

How to use it:

- Click on one of the shapes in the [Drawing Markups](#) section.
- Click on the proof at the relevant point and draw the selected shape with the cursor.
- To add a comment to the drawn shape, right-click on shape and select *Open Pop-up Note*.
- Type any text in the red box that appears.



For further information on how to annotate proofs, click on the [Help](#) menu to reveal a list of further options:



Author Query Form

WILEY

Journal: ECS2

Article: 2804

Dear Author,

During the copyediting of your manuscript the following queries arose.

Please refer to the query reference callout numbers in the page proofs and respond to each by marking the necessary comments using the PDF annotation tools.

Please remember illegible or unclear comments and corrections may delay publication.

Many thanks for your assistance.

Query reference	Query	Remarks
1	AUTHOR: Please confirm that given names (blue) and surnames/family names (vermilion) have been identified correctly.	
2	AUTHOR: Please check that authors and their affiliations are correct.	
3	AUTHOR: Please suggest whether the phrase 'host-plant' can be changed as 'host plant' in the sentence 'Some species traits or trait combinations...distant host-plant species)' to maintain the consistency.	
4	AUTHOR: Please suggest whether the phrase 'Himalayan Balsam' can be changed as 'Himalayan balsam' in the sentence 'This alien invasive plant, known as Himalayan...rewarding flowers.'	
5	AUTHOR: Please give address information for Applied Biosystems: town, state (if applicable), and country.	
6	AUTHOR: Please give address information for GE Healthcare: town, state (if applicable), and country.	
7	AUTHOR: Please suggest whether the term "microsporidia" can be changed as "microsporidian" in the sentence "While the microsporidia <i>N. bombi</i> is...remains unclear."	
8	AUTHOR: Please suggest whether the phrase 'could be not meaningful' can be changed as 'could not be meaningful' in the sentence 'This interaction effect indicated that...not meaningful.'	

9	AUTHOR: Please check whether the usage of the phrase ‘parasite transmission via flowers, and hence high parasite prevalence, were expected’ in the sentence ‘Given that the bell-shape morphology...at invaded sites’ is OK.	
10	AUTHOR: Please check whether the sentence ‘MV is FNRS grant fellowship...’’Chargé de recherches’’ in the ‘Acknowledgments’ section conveys the intended meaning.	
11	AUTHOR: Bolker et al. (2009) has not been cited in the text. Please indicate where it should be cited; or delete from the Reference List.	

Funding Info Query Form

Please confirm that the funding sponsor list below was correctly extracted from your article: that it includes all funders and that the text has been matched to the correct FundRef Registry organization names. If a name was not found in the FundRef registry, it may not be the canonical name form, it may be a program name rather than an organization name, or it may be an organization not yet included in FundRef Registry. If you know of another name form or a parent organization name for a “not found” item on this list below, please share that information.

FundRef name	FundRef Organization Name
Federaal Wetenschapsbeleid	Federaal Wetenschapsbeleid
Fonds De La Recherche Scientifique - FNRS	Fonds De La Recherche Scientifique - FNRS

Bumble bee parasite prevalence but not genetic diversity impacted by the invasive plant *Impatiens glandulifera*

MARYSE VANDERPLANCK,^{1,2,†} NATHALIE ROGER,¹ ROMAIN MOERMAN,^{1,3} GUILLAUME GHISBAIN,¹ MAXENCE GÉRARD,¹ DOMINIK POPOWSKI,⁴ SEBASTIAN GRANICA,⁴ DENIS FOURNIER,³ IVAN MEEUS,⁵ NIELS PIOT,⁵ GUY SMAGGHE,⁵ LUCAS TERRANA,⁶ AND DENIS MICHEZ¹

¹Research Institute for Biosciences, Laboratory of Zoology, University of Mons, Place du Parc 20, Mons B-7000 Belgium

²Evo-Eco-Paleo - UMR 8198, CNRS, Université de Lille, Lille F-59000 France

³Evolutionary Biology and Ecology, Université libre de Bruxelles, Av. F.D. Roosevelt 50, Brussels B-1000 Belgium

⁴Department of Pharmacognosy and Molecular Basis of Phytotherapy, Medical University of Warsaw, Banacha 1, Warsaw 02-097 Poland

⁵Department of Crop Protection, Faculty of Bioscience Engineering, Laboratory of Agrozoology, Ghent University, Coupure Links 653, Ghent B-9000 Belgium

⁶Research Institute for Biosciences, Biology of Marine Organisms and Biomimetics, University of Mons, Place du Parc 20, Mons B-7000 Belgium

Citation: Vanderplanck, M., N. Roger, R. Moerman, G. Ghisbain, M. Gérard, D. Popowski, S. Granica, D. Fournier, I. Meeus, N. Piot, G. Smagghe, L. Terrana, and D. Michez. 2019. Bumble bee parasite prevalence but not genetic diversity impacted by the invasive plant *Impatiens glandulifera*. *Ecosphere* 00(00):e02804. 10.1002/ecs2.2804

Abstract. While many bee species are experiencing population declines, some host plant generalist bees remain common in Europe, partly because they seem able to shift to new resources. However, foraging on a new alternative plant, such as an invasive species, can modify diet quality and have a potentially detrimental effect on bee health. Herein, we investigated whether the spread of the invasive plant *Impatiens glandulifera* affects *Bombus pascuorum* population regarding parasite prevalence, genetic structure, and nest density in Belgium. While no difference in bumble bee genetic structure was detected between invaded and uninvaded sites, we show that *I. glandulifera* occurrence was significantly correlated with a decrease in the prevalence of *Apicystis bombi* but not the prevalence of three other parasite species (i.e., *Crithidia bombi*, *Nosema bombi*, *Nosema ceranae*, and *Nosema* sp.). Regarding our investigations, this effect was likely not due to variation in local bumble bee population fitness before *I. glandulifera* flowering, nor to the relative abundance of other pollinators such as *Apis mellifera*, but the unique chemical composition (i.e., polyphenol rich) of the pollen of *I. glandulifera* remained as an interesting hypothesis. Whereas *B. pascuorum* queens probably colonize all the potential nesting sites in an area, invaded by *I. glandulifera* or not, the abundance of polyphenol ameloposin in pollen from *I. glandulifera* pollen might reduce local parasite prevalence. Our field study confirms that bumble bee parasite prevalence is potentially related to the particular chemical composition of collected pollen. Plant traits such as secondary metabolite occurrence could play a key role in the health and conservation of bumble bees.

Key words: bumble bee; conservation; insect pollinator; invasive plants; parasites; population genetic diversity.

Received 6 November 2018; revised 28 May 2019; accepted 5 June 2019. Corresponding Editor: T'ai Roulston.

Copyright: © 2019 The Authors. This is an open access article under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

† E-mail: maryse.vanderplanck@umons.ac.be

INTRODUCTION

Bees play a key role in natural and agricultural ecosystem maintenance through the pollination of flowering plants (Ollerton et al. 2011). It is

now well established that several wild and domesticated bee species are experiencing significant population declines, which raises concerns about the services they provide (Nieto et al. 2014). The key drivers of these declines are the

loss and fragmentation of habitats, pesticide spread, climate change, changes in land management practices, and alien plant invasion (Scheper et al. 2014, Goulson et al. 2015, Kerr et al. 2015, Woodcock et al. 2016). However, some bumble bee species remain common in Europe, as it is the case for the so-called big-six: *Bombus hortorum*, *B. lapidarius*, *B. lucorum*, *B. pratorum*, *B. pascuorum*, and *B. terrestris* (Goulson et al. 2008).

3 Some species traits or trait combinations common to this group are assumed to partly explain such population stability: (1) large climatic ranges (i.e., being more resilient to extreme climatic events; Williams and Osborne 2009); (2) early emergence (i.e., having access to early floral resources with low competition; Williams and Osborne 2009); (3) flexibility in choice of nesting substrate (i.e., occupying a high diversity of sites; Darvill et al. 2004); and (4) generalist foraging behavior (i.e., foraging on a large range of phylogenetically distant host-plant species; Goulson and Darvill 2004). In particular, generalist foraging behavior could allow bumble bees to deal with a change in habitat quality such as the spread of invasive plants by integrating these plants into their diets as new floral resources (Chittka and Schurkens 2001).

However, new host plant occurrence as well as decrease in plant diversity that may result from plant invasion can comprise an alternative diet that may contain low concentration of primary nutrients (e.g., protein content [Roulston and Cane 2000] or amino acid content [Roger et al. 2017]) or detrimental secondary metabolites (Bennet and Wallsgrove 1994). Many studies have already highlighted that pollen diets with low protein concentration may negatively affect colony development (i.e., total brood mass; Vanderplanck et al. 2014, 2018), individual size (Moerman et al. 2016), and the immune system of bumble bees (Brunner et al. 2014). In addition, some plants also contain secondary metabolites in their pollen and nectar, which evolved to deter herbivores or plant parasites (Hadacek 2002). These secondary compounds can have a wide range of negative biological effects such as poisoning bees (e.g., alkaloids, saponins, cardiac glycosides, and cyanogenic glycosides; Detzel and Wink 1993) or reducing colony fitness when consumed (e.g., lupanine; Arnold et al. 2014). Alternatively, some secondary metabolites can

display positive effects on bees by improving memory and foraging efficiency (e.g., caffeine [Wright et al. 2013]; iridoid glycosides [Richardson et al. 2016]), and also decreasing parasite infection (e.g., gelsemine [Manson et al. 2010]; anabesine, catalpol, nicotine, and thymol [Richardson et al. 2015]). Moreover, some studies have shown that infected bees could actively self-medicate by consuming plant secondary metabolites (Gherman et al. 2014, Baracchi et al. 2015). Finally, the spread of new plant species can modify pollinator–flower interaction networks through different plant traits, including floral resource quantity and quality, spatial and temporal availability, and accessibility (Ghazoul 2002, Nienhuis et al. 2009, Stout and Tiedeken 2017). The impacts of invasive plants can occur at the individual and population levels, including decreasing interspecific competition among pollinators (Fontaine et al. 2008) and pathogen transmission (Tylianakis et al. 2008). Moreover, these impacts are species-dependent as different plant species can impact pollinators in different ways and pollinators do not all respond uniformly to new plant species (Tiedeken et al. 2016, Stout and Tiedeken 2017). Invasive plants could therefore impact pollinators at individual (i.e., nutrition, health, and fitness) and population levels in terms of size, density, and growth rates, but also population genetic diversity and structure (e.g., heterozygosity; Lenda et al. 2013).

To evaluate positive, neutral, or negative impacts of a new floral resource on the health and genetic diversity of common bumble bees, we need additional field studies comparing invaded and uninvaded sites. Here, we investigated whether the spread of the alien species *Impatiens glandulifera* impacted a common bumble bee species in Belgium, *Bombus pascuorum*. We estimated the impact of this plant on bumble bee health by assessing the prevalence of common parasite species (i.e., *Apicystis bombi*, *Crithidia bombi*, *Nosema* species) in bumble bee populations at invaded and uninvaded sites during two consecutive years. Moreover, we used DNA sampling of workers to determine the population genetic diversity and infer the number of nests at each site. Our hypothesis is that even a common and generalist bumble bee species like *Bombus pascuorum* will display a higher parasite prevalence or a decrease in genetic diversity and

nest density, following the invasion of *Impatiens glandulifera*.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Selected species

Bombus pascuorum is a ubiquitous, generalist, and medium-tongued bumble bee species (Goulson et al. 2008), which is easy to identify in Belgium thanks to its typical ginger-colored thorax. Like most bumble bees, *B. pascuorum* is primitively eusocial with an annual life cycle, with queens emerging at the beginning of the spring and workers active until October (Goulson and Darvill 2004). It has a flexible diet (Goulson and Darvill 2004), which can include *Impatiens glandulifera* in Belgium, The Netherlands, and the United Kingdom (Kleijn and Raemakers 2008). This alien invasive plant, known as Himalayan Balsam, is spreading rapidly across Europe and quickly integrating into pollination networks because of its highly rewarding flowers (Chittka and Schurkens 2001, Lopezariza-Mikel et al. 2007). Its flowering period starts at the beginning of July until the end of August. Many bee species have been recorded foraging on this plant in Europe, including bumble bees, honey bees, and solitary bees (Nienhuis et al. 2009).

Three taxa of potential bumble bee parasites were investigated: the intestinal trypanosomatid *Crithidia bombi*, the neogregarine *Apicystis bombi* which mainly infects the fat body, and the obligate intracellular microsporidian *Nosema* sp. (including *Nosema bombi*, *Nosema ceranae*, and *Nosema apis*; Meeus et al. 2011). *Crithidia bombi* is primarily transmitted among individuals from the same colony through contact with contaminated materials within the nest (e.g., feces), but parasite cells may also pass from infected members to healthy ones, and eventually to future queens (Imhoof and Schmid-Hempel 1999, Folly et al. 2017). Transmission may also occur via flowers (Durrer and Schmid-Hempel 1994) among individuals from the same species but also across bumble bee species (Ruiz-González et al. 2012) or vectored by non-susceptible honey bees (Ruiz-González and Brown 2006). Little is known about *Apicystis bombi* transmission or epidemiology (Meeus et al. 2011), but interspecific transmission has been detected between honey bees and bumble bees (Graystock et al. 2015).

The principal transmission mode for *Nosema bombi* is horizontal and occurs when larvae feed on food contaminated by long-lived spores (Rutrecht and Brown 2008). We additionally screened for the presence of other *Nosema* species since spillover from *Apis* to *Bombus* has been described (e.g., *Nosema apis* and *N. ceranae*; Plischuk et al. 2009, Li et al. 2012, Graystock et al. 2013, 2014) with detrimental effects partly demonstrated (Graystock et al. 2013).

Study sites and sampling

This study was conducted along various watercourses near Mons (Belgium) where *I. glandulifera* was patchily distributed. Ten sites of approximately 30×5 m were selected in six localities (Dour, Havré, La Louvière, Mons, Quévy, Tertre; Appendix S5: Table S1), including five sites where density of *I. glandulifera* did not significantly differ (85 ± 38 flowers/m², $F_{4,15} = 2.51$, $P = 0.086$) and five other sites where the plant was absent (Appendix S5: Table S1). As *B. pascuorum* workers have relatively short foraging ranges for bumble bees (maximum foraging range of 363 m; Wood et al. 2015), we considered sites at least 600 m apart to ensure that sampled workers from different sites came from different colonies (Schmid-Hempel 2001).

As bumble bees and honey bees share pathogens (Graystock et al. 2014), we conducted a survey of the beekeepers with the local association (CEIAM, Centre d'étude et d'information apicole de Mons) to avoid sites with potential high density of hives. It was impossible to locate all hives in the area, but we had confirmation of a regular density of hives around the sites (i.e., all apiaries included less than ten hives and maximum five beekeepers per locality, which are average values for Belgium; Chauzat et al. 2013). Moreover, we assessed the abundance of flower visitors to *I. glandulifera*, including *Apis mellifera*, at the different study sites (Appendix S1). In the ten sites, flower visitors were clearly dominated by *B. pascuorum* (64.5%), followed by *B. terrestris* (11%), *A. mellifera* (6.6%), and *B. lapidarius* (6%). Floral visitor communities (i.e., proportions of visitors recorded in the ten sites) significantly differed between the site types ($F_{1,9} = 5.64$, $P = 0.014$) with *Bombus pascuorum* being more abundant in invaded sites ($IC = 0.64$, $p = 0.013$) and *Bombus lapidarius* in uninvaded sites ($IC = 0.95$,

$P = 0.020$; Appendix S5: Table S2; see Appendix S1 for statistical details). As no significant difference was detected for *A. mellifera* and *B. terrestris*, we can argue that any potential difference in parasite prevalence between the site types was likely not due to managed pollinators.

We collected foragers of *B. pascuorum* from all sites for both 2014 and 2015 at the peak flowering of *Impatiens glandulifera* (sampling on one single day in mid-July), for a total number of 536 specimens ($n = 22\text{--}38$ per site). We put individuals directly into 70% ethanol and stored them at -20°C . We used all specimens for genetic structure analyses and 12 randomly selected specimens from each site and each year for parasite detection. At each site, we recorded all plants in bloom as well as *Bombus* host plant species (i.e., plants visited by bumble bees; Appendix S5: Table S1). At invaded sites, all collected workers were foraging for pollen on *I. glandulifera*, the dominant species. At uninvaded sites, workers were caught on different plant species (Appendix S5: Table S1).

Floral resources and bumble bee population fitness

To assess how the pollen of *I. glandulifera* was integrated into the diet of *B. pascuorum* at invaded sites, we performed palynological analysis of pollen loads from 101 workers (Appendix S2) that were randomly collected at the studied sites. Regarding the chemical composition of the floral resources of *I. glandulifera*, the composition of pollen and nectar has already been determined for some compounds including sugar and protein, but secondary metabolites have only been analyzed for the whole flower (Vieira et al. 2016, Roger et al. 2017). We analyzed the polyphenols from pollen and nectar of this alien invasive species (Appendix S3).

To check whether the local bumble bee population fitness was similar between invaded and uninvaded sites before the flowering period of *I. glandulifera*, we assessed wing size of foraging workers as a body size proxy measurement (Appendix S4). Based on previous studies, we made the assumption that body size may contribute to colony-level fitness. Indeed, worker size positively correlates with the numbers of egg cells and emerging workers produced (Cnaani and Hefetz 1994). Larger workers are

also known to bring back more resources to the colony than smaller ones, and they are more resistant to starvation, fly at cooler temperatures, and could be less prone to predation (Goulson et al. 2002, Spaethe and Weidenmüller 2002, Couvillon and Dornhaus 2010, De Luca et al. 2013). Moreover, larger workers forage at longer distances, which is an advantage in fragmented landscape displaying unsuitable habitats and disconnection between nesting places and foraging places (Tscharntke and Brandl 2004, Greenleaf et al. 2007). Besides, body size can be affected by resource availability and quality in a landscape or other environmental stresses and landscape simplification can decrease adult size (Chown and Gaston 2010, Persson and Smith 2011, Renaud et al. 2016, Gérard et al. 2018). It can then be viewed as a valuable proxy of local bumble bee population fitness on both uninvaded and invaded sites and is related to the conditions before the flowering period of *I. glandulifera*. If resource availability or suitability was, for instance, lower in invaded sites than in uninvaded ones prior to the flowering of *I. glandulifera*, foraging workers fed as larvae before *I. glandulifera* flowering should be smaller (see Appendix S4 for statistical details).

Genetic structure and sibship reconstruction

Total genomic DNA was extracted from the last third of the median leg using 5% Chelex 100 resin (Walsh et al. 1991). Genotypes of individuals were determined at ten statistically independent microsatellite loci (Estoup et al. 1995, 1996) divided into two multiplex sets (set M1: B10, B11, B96, B121, and B131; set M2: B100, B118, B124, B126, and B132). Polymerase chain reaction (PCR) amplifications were carried out in a 10 μL volume containing 1 μL of genomic DNA, 5 μL of 2 \times Qiagen Multiplex PCR Master Mix, 1 μL of 5 \times Q-solution, and 0.5 μL of 10 \times primer mix (2 μM of each primer). Amplifications were performed in a TProfessional thermocycler. The PCR conditions were as follows: An initial denaturing step of 15 min at 95°C was followed by 35 cycles of 30 s at 94°C , 90 s at 49°C , and 90 s at 72°C and terminated with a final extension step of 30 min at 72°C . Analysis of the PCR products was performed by capillary electrophoresis on an ABI 3100 automated DNA sequencer (Applied Biosystems). Data were visualized and

allele sizes were scored using GeneMapper software (version 4.0; Applied Biosystems). In total, all 536 sampled workers were successfully genotyped. The presence of null alleles, errors due to microsatellite stuttering, and large-allele dropout were checked using Micro-Checker version 2.2.3 (Van Osterhout et al. 2006). Tests of deviations from Hardy–Weinberg equilibrium and linkage disequilibrium were conducted in Fstat 2.9.3 (Goudet 1995).

Genetic diversity parameters (i.e., the number of alleles, allelic richness, and expected and observed heterozygosities) and fixation indices were estimated using Fstat 2.9.3 and averaged across loci. Genetic differentiation among sites was calculated using F_{ST} and pairwise exact tests of genetic differentiation with GenAlEx 6.3 (Peakall and Smouse 2012). Measures of gene flow (Nm) among sites were calculated from pairwise estimates of F_{ST} (Wright 1949). Mean allelic richness, expected and observed heterozygosities, and genetic differentiation were compared between site types (i.e., invaded versus uninvaded sites) using a two-sided permutation test implemented in Fstat 2.9.3.

The computer program Colony version 2.0 (Jones and Wang 2010) was used to detect sister relationships among workers. Three runs with different random number seeds were conducted for each replicate. Each Colony run was a short run, with both sexes selected as monogamous (Schmid-Hempel and Schmid-Hempel 2000), without inbreeding, with the full likelihood method (Wang 2012) and medium precision, and assuming an error rate of 0.05 for both allelic dropout and genotyping error. Allele frequencies were set as unknown and were not updated. The best configuration (as indicated by the highest likelihood score) was used to determine the number of nests within a site. The complete database of genetic data is available from the Dryad Digital Repository: <http://datadryad.org/review?doi=doi:10.5061/dryad.n8g87>.

Parasite prevalence

The abdomen of sampled workers was cut off with a sterile scalpel, rinsed with distilled water, and immediately put into a 1.5-mL reaction tube. Abdomens were crushed, and genomic DNA was extracted with the Invisorb® Spin Tissue Mini Kit (Strattec, Berlin, Germany). DNA

extraction was performed according to the manufacturer's instructions. DNA extracts were stored at -20°C and used as a template for PCR.

Parasite diagnostics were conducted using Ready-To-Go PCR Beads (GE Healthcare). For each PCR, negative controls (i.e., water instead of the DNA extract) were run together with DNA extracts. To detect *C. bombi* and *A. bombi* (i.e., presence/absence data), we amplified fragments of the small subunit 18S ribosomal DNA using the primers SEF/SER and NeoF/NeoR, respectively (see Appendix S5: Table S3 for the sequences; Meeus et al. 2010). Bumble bees' 18S rDNA was amplified with the primers ApidaeF/ApidaeR as positive control (see Appendix S5: Table S3 for the sequences; Meeus et al. 2010). Each reaction was performed in a total volume of 25 μL with 1 μL of genomic DNA. Multiplex PCR conditions were as follows: 2 min at 94°C , 35 amplification cycles of 30 s at 94°C , 30 s at 57°C , 45 s at 72°C , and a final elongation step of 3 min at 72°C . To confirm that amplicons belonged to hosts and parasites, some PCR products were randomly chosen and sent for Sanger sequencing (LGC Genomics, Berlin, Germany).

A second PCR was performed on the same DNA extracts to detect the presence of *Nosema* parasites. The universal forward primer UF was used with the three specific reverse primers Ra, Rb, and Rc amplifying *N. apis*, *N. bombi*, and *N. ceranae*, respectively (see Appendix S5: Table S3 for the sequences; Menail et al. 2016). PCR conditions were as follows: 2 min at 95°C , 35 amplification cycles of 30 s at 95°C , 30 s at 60°C , 1 min at 72°C , and a final elongation step of 2 min at 72°C . Electrophoreses were run on a 1% agarose gel containing 0.05 $\mu\text{L}/\text{mL}$ of GelRed. This did not allow species differentiation. All *Nosema*-positive samples were PCR-amplified with general *Nosema* screening primers as described by Ravoet et al. (2013) and sent for Sanger sequencing (LGC Genomics, Berlin, Germany) to identify the species level. We report both *N. bombi* and *N. ceranae* up to species level as both species were reported in bumble bees. While the microsporidia *N. bombi* is described to cause real infection in bumble bees, the *N. ceranae* virulence in bumble bees remains unclear (Brown 2017). *N. apis* has not been reported in bumble bees. The resulting *Nosema* sp. group also contains sequences which do not match with

N. apis nor *N. ceranae*, indicating that the initially used multiplex primer set has cross-reactivity with other *Nosema* species. Species identification of these and whether they cause real infections are beyond the scope of this manuscript. The complete database of parasite prevalence is available from the Dryad Digital Repository: <http://datadryad.org/review?doi=doi:10.5061/dryad.n8g87>.

Statistical analyses

To test for the effects of *Impatiens glandulifera* and parasite species (i.e., independent variables) on the prevalence of parasites in *Bombus pascuorum* (i.e., dependent variable), we performed a generalized linear mixed model (GLMM; lmer function, R package lmerTest; Kuznetsova et al. 2014) with the categorical variables Site type (two levels), Parasite species (five levels), and their interaction term as fixed-effect terms, as well as the categorical variables Year (two levels) and Site nested within Site type (five levels per site type) as random-effect terms. Parasite prevalence (which was a proportion variable) was analyzed using binomial model with the number of infected bees (successes) and the number of non-infected bees (failures) as a bivariate response. After checking for overdispersion, a type III ANOVA was performed to determine the effect of plant invasion and parasite species on the prevalence of parasites (ANOVA function, R package car; Fox and Weisberg 2011). When a significant difference was found, multiple pairwise comparison tests were performed using Tukey contrasts (glht function, R package multcomp; Hothorn et al. 2008). Besides, we tested whether the prevalence of the different parasites was correlated across sites using Pearson's r correlation coefficients on log-transformed data (rcorr function, R package Hmisc; Harrell 2015).

We used a second Gaussian GLMM to evaluate the effect of the year on the prevalence of parasites in *Bombus pascuorum*. We included the categorical variables Year (two levels), Parasite species (five levels), and their interaction term as fixed-effect terms, as well as the categorical variable Site (ten levels) as a random-effect term. The dependent variable (i.e., parasite prevalence expressed as proportions) was log-transformed to achieve normality of the residuals. Assumptions (i.e., normality of residuals and overdispersion) were

checked, and the effects of fixed and random factors were assessed using the step function.

Finally, the impact of *I. glandulifera* on the parasite community (i.e., number of parasite species per specimen as dependent variable) was assessed using a third GLMM with a Poisson probability distribution for modeling count data (glmer function, R package lme4; Bates et al. 2015). We included the categorical variable Site type (two levels) as a fixed-effect term as well as the categorical variables Year (two levels) and Site nested within Site type (five levels per site type) as random-effect terms. After checking for overdispersion, a type III ANOVA was performed to determine the effect of plant invasion on bumble bee infection. All analyses were performed in R version 3.0.2 (R Development Core Team 2013).

RESULTS

Floral resources and local bumble bee population fitness

Among the 101 pollen loads collected at invaded sites, a total of 54 loads (53.5%) contained pollen of *I. glandulifera* represented by more than 10% of the counted grains, a threshold which prevents biases due to contamination (Müller and Kuhlmann 2008). For twenty of these loads, the percentage of *Impatiens* pollen was over 50%, eight of them being pure loads (more than 95% of the counted grains). Whereas no compounds were detected in nectar, five polyphenols were identified and quantified in pollen, ampelopsin being the major one (13.81 ± 1.26 mg/g; Appendix S5: Table S4).

The two-way nested ANOVA conducted on the wing size of foraging workers (i.e., body size proxy related to population fitness components) detected a significant effect of the site type ($F_{1, 334} = 36.72$, $P < 0.001$) but also a significant interaction between site type and sites (interaction term; $F_{8, 334} = 4.37$, $P < 0.001$). This interaction effect indicated that the difference in wing size of foraging workers between site types (main effect) depended on the site itself and could be not meaningful. Biological interpretation had then to rely on a careful analysis of the interaction effect: Multiple pairwise comparisons revealed that the uninvaded sites were not more similar to one another than to invaded sites (Appendix S5: Table S5). This indicated that the

local bumble bee population fitness was overall quite similar between invaded and uninvaded sites before the flowering of *I. glandulifera*, but was variable among sites.

Population genetic and worker sibship

Populations of 2014 and 2015 were in Hardy–Weinberg equilibrium, and no linkage disequilibrium was detected (data not shown). No evidence of stuttering or large-allele dropout was detected. Null alleles seem to be present at loci B10, B118, and B121. These three loci showed similar values of heterozygosity than loci for which null alleles were not detected.

Across all the study sites, the number of alleles per locus varied from 7.25 to 10.13 and the allelic

richness (A_r) from 6.95 to 9.58 (Table 1). Observed and expected heterozygosities ranged from 0.68 to 0.80 and from 0.71 to 0.77, respectively (Table 1). Mean F_{IS} values over all sites were low and were not significantly different from zero, as indicated by their 95% CI (Table 1). Low mean F_{ST} values indicate that there is little divergence among the populations (Table 1). Thirteen and 16 different private alleles have appeared in 2014 and 2015, respectively (these variations between sites and years may be due to small numbers of samples taken). Deduced from the F_{ST} values, the levels of gene flow (Nm) were estimated at 7.90 (range, 5.82–10.33) and 9.03 (range, 5.35–11.5) for 2014 and 2015, respectively. There was no difference in genetic diversity

Table 1

Table 1. Comparison of genetic parameters, nest size, and number of colonies among sites.

	A_r	H_o	H_s	F	Nest size	Nbr colonies
2014						
Invaded						
Dour 1 ($n = 31$)	8.553	0.714	0.782	0.056	1.4	23
Mons 1 ($n = 25$)	8.141	0.719	0.736	0.041	1.5	17
Mons 2 ($n = 25$)	7.849	0.695	0.724	0.039	1.7	15
Havré 1 ($n = 27$)	8.435	0.694	0.737	0.034	2.5	18
Quévy ($n = 25$)	8.104	0.795	0.767	0.048	1.9	13
Mean (SD)	8.216 (0.280)	0.723 (0.042)	0.749 (0.024)	0.044 (0.009)	1.8 (0.4)	17 (4)
Uninvaded						
Dour 2 ($n = 22$)	7.215	0.766	0.770	0.054	1.8	12
La Louvière ($n = 29$)	6.945	0.754	0.720	0.036	1.5	14
Havré 2 ($n = 29$)	9.150	0.758	0.778	0.032	1.2	24
Tertre 1 ($n = 30$)	8.469	0.787	0.775	0.035	1.6	19
Tertre 2 ($n = 38$)	8.178	0.799	0.768	0.052	1.8	21
Mean (SD)	7.991 (0.909)	0.773 (0.019)	0.762 (0.024)	0.042 (0.010)	1.6 (0.2)	18 (5)
Between-site-type comparison	$P = 0.633$	$P = 0.042^*$	$P = 0.462$	$P = 0.084$	$P = 0.528$	$P = 0.781$
2015						
Invaded						
Dour 1 ($n = 25$)	8.558	0.710	0.771	0.035	1.6	16
Mons 1 ($n = 29$)	8.396	0.707	0.734	0.007	1.5	19
Mons 2 ($n = 27$)	9.335	0.773	0.749	−0.056	1.4	19
Havré 1 ($n = 23$)	8.000	0.690	0.76	0.050	1.3	18
Quévy ($n = 25$)	8.564	0.735	0.758	−0.011	1.6	16
Mean (SD)	8.571 (0.485)	0.723 (0.032)	0.754 (0.014)	0.005 (0.042)	1.5 (0.1)	18 (2)
Uninvaded						
Dour 2 ($n = 25$)	9.041	0.740	0.760	−0.027	1.4	18
La Louvière ($n = 26$)	8.630	0.739	0.766	−0.005	1.5	17
Havré 2 ($n = 27$)	9.584	0.745	0.768	−0.007	1.3	20
Tertre 1 ($n = 25$)	8.468	0.735	0.745	−0.029	1.4	18
Tertre 2 ($n = 23$)	9.125	0.679	0.764	0.055	1.3	17
Mean (SD)	8.970 (0.440)	0.728 (0.027)	0.761 (0.009)	−0.003 (0.034)	1.4 (0.1)	18 (1)
Between-site-type comparison	$P = 0.226$	$P = 0.817$	$P = 0.402$	$P = 0.922$	$P = 0.196$	$P = 0.659$

Notes: A_r : allelic richness; H_o : observed heterozygosity; H_s : gene diversity; F : fixation index. P -values are obtained based on 2000 permutations (* $P < 0.05$). Nbr colonies: number of colonies per site; Nest size: mean of the number of workers per nest within site.

parameters between uninvaded and invaded sites (Table 1, Fig. 1).

Twelve to 24 full-sibships per site were reconstructed by Colony from the genotypes of workers (Table 1). Worker sibships are of sizes 1–7 for a probability of inference of 0.17 to 1.00. 65% of sibships were reconstructed from only one worker, and for more 85% of full-sib families, configurations inferred by Colony exhibited high probabilities (>0.8) of including all full-sib individuals in a given family. Regardless of the effect of site, the number of nests varied from 12 to 24 with no significant differences between invaded and uninvaded sites (Table 1). No difference in the mean number of workers within sibships was

observed between types of sites (i.e., with or without *I. glandulifera*; Mann–Whitney *U*-tests; 2014: $U = 4271$, $P = 0.179$; 2015: $U = 4080$, $P = 0.679$; Table 1).

Parasite prevalence and parasite community

Out of 240 workers, 112 were infected with *Apicystis bombi*, 50 with *Crithidia bombi*, 46 with *Nosema bombi*, five with *N. ceranae*-infected, and 10 with *Nosema* sp. (Appendix S5: Table S6). We found a significant difference in prevalence among the different parasite species (Wald $\chi^2 = 47.87$, $P < 0.001$). Overall, the prevalence of *A. bombi* was significantly higher than for all other parasites ($P < 0.05$; Fig. 2). Except for *N. bombi* ($P = 0.708$), the prevalence of *C. bombi* was significantly higher than for *Nosema* species ($P < 0.01$; Fig. 2). *Nosema* sp. prevalence did not significantly differ from *N. bombi* prevalence ($P = 0.100$; Fig. 2) and *N. ceranae* prevalence ($P = 0.534$; Fig. 2). The effect of year was significant for the prevalence of *A. bombi* ($P = 0.048$), *N. bombi* ($P = 0.026$), and *Nosema* sp. ($P = 0.036$), with there being lower prevalence of each parasite in 2015 than in 2014 (Table 2).

Half of specimens had just one parasite species (50%) while a few specimens were jointly infected with 2 or 3 parasites (7% and 3%, respectively). Using a Pearson correlation test, there was no correlation between the prevalence of the different parasites ($P > 0.05$) at site level regardless of study site, sampling year, and the occurrence of *I. glandulifera*.

Impact of invasive plant on parasite prevalence and parasite community

At uninvaded sites, out of 120 workers, 69 were infected with *A. bombi*, 27 with *C. bombi*, 30 with *N. bombi*, four with *N. ceranae*, and five with *Nosema* sp. (Fig. 2; Appendix S5: Table S6). Only 21% of the specimens did not show any infection, while 50% had a single parasite species, 25% had two parasites, and 4% had three parasites. At invaded sites, out of 120 workers, 43 were infected with *A. bombi*, 23 with *C. bombi*, 16 with *N. bombi*, one with *N. ceranae*, and five with *Nosema* sp. (Fig. 2; Appendix S5: Table S6). Forty percent of the specimens were not infected with any of the investigated parasites. Regardless of parasite species, the proportion of infected bumble bee workers was significantly lower in sites invaded by




Fig. 1. Comparison of the allelic richness (*Ar*) in invaded and uninvaded sites for the two years of sample collections (2014 and 2015). Independently of the year, no significant difference was observed between site types (n.s., non-significant difference). Error bars represent standard error of the mean.




Fig. 2. Prevalence of *Apicystis bombi*, *Crithidia bombi*, *Nosema bombi*, *Nosema ceranae*, and *Nosema sp.* for the 2 yr of study for the *Impatiens glandulifera*-invaded sites and the uninvaded ones. Parasite prevalences differing significantly from each other, regardless of invasive plant occurrence, are marked with different letters. For each parasite, comparisons between invaded and uninvaded sites were also performed (n.s., non-significant difference; ** $P \leq 0.01$). Error bars represent standard error of the mean.

Table 2. *Bombus pascuorum* parasite prevalence according to the year (n.s., non-significant difference; * $P < 0.05$).

	2014	Significance	2015
<i>Apicystis bombi</i>	55.82 ± 26.95%	*	37.49 ± 17.25%
<i>Crithidia bombi</i>	22.49 ± 11.83%	n.s.	19.16 ± 11.83%
<i>Nosema bombi</i>	26.66 ± 19.57%	*	11.66 ± 8.97%
<i>Nosema ceranae</i>	2.50 ± 5.63%	n.s.	1.66 ± 3.50%
<i>Nosema sp.</i>	7.50 ± 7.31%	*	0.83 ± 2.62%

Impatiens glandulifera (Wald $\chi^2 = 11.45$, $P < 0.001$). However, separate analyses performed on each parasite species revealed that this difference between invaded and uninvaded sites was more or less pronounced according to the parasite species (Fig. 2; Appendix S5: Table S6). Whereas *C. bombi* (Wald $\chi^2 = 0.40$, $P = 0.525$), *N. bombi*

(Wald $\chi^2 = 3.30$, $P = 0.069$), *N. ceranae* (Wald $\chi^2 = 1.04$, $P = 0.308$), and *Nosema sp.* (Wald $\chi^2 = 0$, $P = 1$) prevalence did not differ between site types, the proportion of *A. bombi*-infected workers was significantly lower in invaded sites than in uninvaded ones (Wald $\chi^2 = 4.45$, $P = 0.035$; Fig. 2; Appendix S5: Table S6).

Regarding the parasite community, the presence of *I. glandulifera* was associated with a significant decrease in the amount of co-infecting parasite species per bumble bee (Wald $\chi^2 = 9.79$, $P = 0.002$), with 0.73 ± 0.73 parasites for bumble bees in invaded sites and 1.13 ± 0.78 in uninvaded ones.

DISCUSSION

Genetic structure and nest densities

We detected an average of 18 nests per site, with this total unaffected by the presence of the invasive plant *I. glandulifera*. It must be noted that

the number of detected nests was probably underestimated (Darvill et al. 2004), but since sampling effort was similar between invaded and uninvaded sites, data comparisons on genetic diversity (i.e., number of alleles and heterozygosities) remain reliable. Interestingly, the most available resource (pollen and nectar) in the invaded sites during our sampling period was nearly exclusively *I. glandulifera* (see Appendix S5: Table S1), while nutritive sources at the uninvaded sites were mostly Fabaceae species (*Trifolium pratense*, *T. repens*, *Lotus corniculatus*, *Vicia cracca*; see Appendix S5: Table S1). These results seem to confirm that *I. glandulifera*-invaded areas can support populations of *B. pascuorum* which are at least similar to those of uninvaded Fabaceae-rich sites (Appendix S5: Table S2).

We did not detect any difference in bumble bee genetic structure between invaded and uninvaded sites. This confirms that bumble bee populations exhibit low levels of genetic structuring at a fine spatial scale (Dreier et al. 2014) and that geographical distance is a poor predictor of genetic divergence among populations (Widmer and Schmid-Hempel 1999). Our results reveal that new queens of *B. pascuorum*, able to disperse by at least 3 km (Lepais et al. 2010) near the flowering site, do not preferentially establish in *I. glandulifera*-invaded areas. These results are consistent with inferences drawn from studies of population structuring in common bumble bee species and suggest that regular gene flow over several kilometers due to queen dispersal is likely to be sufficient to maintain genetic cohesion of common species over large spatial scales (Lepais et al. 2010). In the same way, except for the observed heterozygosity estimated for 2014, the populations of *B. pascuorum* collected at invaded sites did not have significantly different genetic diversity (allelic richness, gene diversity) than the populations from uninvaded sites.

Parasite prevalence and impact of *Impatiens glandulifera*

Regardless of the occurrence of the invasive plant and the sampling year, *Apicystis bombi* prevalence was significantly higher than the prevalence of *Crithidia bombi* and *Nosema* species for foragers of *Bombus pascuorum* at all sites (in the region of Mons, West of Belgium). Given that the bell-shape morphology of the flower of

Impatiens glandulifera is likely to maximize the contact between the visitor's body and flowers, parasite transmission via flowers, and hence high parasite prevalence, were expected to be higher at invaded sites (Graystock et al. 2015). In spite of an expectation that parasite prevalence would be similar in populations with similar genetic diversity (Whitehorn et al. 2010), there was a detectable difference in parasite prevalence between invaded and uninvaded sites.

This unexpected negative effect of *I. glandulifera* on parasite prevalence for *B. pascuorum* could be explained by three alternative scenarios based on the characteristics of the plant: (1) its impact on pollinator network (e.g., lower abundance of parasites-sharing bees; Thijs et al. 2012), (2) its resource availability and suitability (i.e., host nutrition status directly impacts population of the parasite; Logan et al. 2005), and/or (3) the presence of secondary metabolites in its floral resources (i.e., medicinal effects on bumble bee health; Richardson et al. 2015).

The presence of *Impatiens glandulifera* can have a strong impact on plant–pollinator networks by increasing or decreasing the relative abundance of pollinator species (Thijs et al. 2012). Different studies showed that bumble bee abundance (including *Bombus pascuorum*) is positively correlated with the invasion of *I. glandulifera* while many bee species are negatively impacted (Lopezaraiza-Mikel et al. 2007, Nienhuis et al. 2009). The lower prevalence of bees infected with parasites observed in our study could therefore be explained by a lower abundance of foraging vectors at the invaded sites. Although the occurrence of managed pollinators did not differ between the site types (i.e., *Apis mellifera* and *Bombus terrestris*; Appendix S5: Table S2), unmanaged bumble bee species could have also played an important part in disease prevalence. Actually, cross-species transmission experiments have shown that *B. lapidarius* is likely to act as an important vector of *Crithidia bombi*, a true multi-host parasite across *Bombus* spp. (Ruiz-González et al. 2012). The higher density of *B. lapidarius* in the uninvaded sites compared to the invaded ones could then play a role on parasite prevalence. However, as we detected no significant difference in the prevalence of *C. bombi* between sites uninvaded or invaded by *I. glandulifera*, it is unlikely that the lower occurrence of *B. lapidarius*

fully explains the lower parasite prevalence in the invaded sites. Nevertheless, caution has to be paid since our data did not allow for plainly ruling out this hypothesis.

Although *I. glandulifera* was the only major food source at invaded sites, it is a highly rewarding plant owing to its massive flower display (Showler 1989, Bjerknes et al. 2007). Moreover, *I. glandulifera* could be an even more important foraging source for *Bombus pascuorum* as food competition is reduced by the lower occurrence of honey bees on this plant species (Lopezaraiza-Mikel et al. 2007, Nienhuis et al. 2009). Based on one of our previous studies, *I. glandulifera* pollen shows a relatively low concentration of total amino acids (~25% vs. 37–44%) and a different amino acid profile (i.e., a lower relative abundance of proline, glycine, and threonine) compared to the dominant host plants recorded in uninvaded sites like *E. vulgare*, *L. corniculatus*, *T. repens*, or *T. pratense* (Roger et al. 2017). A previous research indicates that the food environment can influence the parasite loads in the bumble bee–*Crithidia* system with the pollen-starved bees displaying lower *Crithidia* counts (i.e., lack of nutrition disrupting the parasite development; Logan et al. 2005). In the same way, Sadd (2011) found that *Crithidia* counts were low in bees fed with a low-quality diet (i.e., sugar concentration in nectar) but that counts were higher in bees fed with a medium-quality diet compared to those fed with a high-quality diet. Thus, for *Crithidia* and perhaps other parasites as well, we might expect that resources of lower but not terrible quality such as *I. glandulifera* might be associated with a greater incidence of parasite infections compared to higher quality diet offered by native plants. However, such pattern was not observed herein. Another possibility is that a poorer diet for the bee host is also a poorer diet for the parasite, in which case parasite prevalence might be lower where *I. glandulifera* is dominant. However, the fact that only particular parasite species are impacted by the presence of the plant is still puzzling, and it is unlikely that suitability of *I. glandulifera* resources affected the local bumble bee population fitness in such a way that it reduced parasite prevalence. Nevertheless, once again, caution has to be paid since our data did not allow for unambiguously ruling out this hypothesis. Our

understanding of how diet and nutrients interact with bee disease is still lacking, and patterns may differ depending on the parasite and its biology (e.g., intracellular versus gut parasite).

Although we cannot provide conclusive evidence for the third hypothesis, the specific medicative effect of ampelopsin remains a very strong hypothesis for explaining the lower prevalence of *Apicystis bombi* in bumble bee foragers from invaded sites. Ampelopsin, also known as dihydromyricetin, is a dihydroflavonol that occurs in the leaves of some plant species, including *Hovenia dulcis* that has been used in traditional Japanese, Chinese, and Korean medicines to treat parasitic infection (Hyun et al. 2010). It has been shown that occurrence of such secondary metabolites in floral resources (i.e., nectar or pollen) can reduce pathogen activity in bees (Cory and Hoover 2006, Richardson et al. 2015). Although generalist bee species have only poor acuity for the detection of nectar toxins (Tiedeken et al. 2014), a series of toxicological, microbiological, and behavioral experiments have shown that bumble bees infected with *C. bombi* preferred sugar syrup with nicotine to sugar solutions without this substance (Baracchi et al. 2015). Despite relatively weak effect of this compound on the parasite (i.e., infection delayed but not cleared), such behavior could provide subtle benefits for the host fitness and raises the question about self-medication in bumble bees (Baracchi et al. 2015). In this study, the multidirectional biological activity of *I. glandulifera* (especially antimicrobial properties due to flavonoids occurrence in pollen) coupled with the active foraging of bumble bee workers on the invasive plant could explain the lower *Apicystis bombi* prevalence in invaded sites (Appendix S5: Table S4). The growth-inhibiting effect of flavonoids has already been demonstrated for *Plasmodium falciparum*, belonging to the same phylum as *A. bombi* (i.e., Apicomplexa; Slavic et al. 2009). Although the presence of secondary metabolites is a very strong hypothesis for explaining the lower prevalence of a subset of parasite species detected in *Bombus pascuorum* population from invaded sites, additional experimental assays (e.g., test on the biological activities of the secondary metabolites) are needed to fully validate this hypothesis and to understand the associated mechanisms.

Bumble bee conservation

We confirmed in this study that parasite prevalence is context-dependent for bumble bees (Brown et al. 2003). We provided the first evidence that an alien invasive plant could benefit some bee species by decreasing their pathogen loads. Even if our study is limited in time, space, and diversity, we show that the composition of the plant community may significantly influence the pathogen community of their pollinators. This is in line with previous research showing that variation among plant species, through their influence on pathogen transmission, may shape bee disease dynamics (Adler et al. 2018). In addition, among floral traits, the chemical composition of floral resources and especially secondary compounds has been shown to impact interactions between pollinators and their parasites by reducing parasite transmission (Richardson et al. 2015) and parasite load (Manson et al. 2010, Spear et al. 2016, Giacomini et al. 2018, LoCascio et al. 2019). Such potential for floral resources to provide natural resistance to pathogens has been partly studied in bumble bees (Manson et al. 2010, Giacomini et al. 2018, LoCascio et al. 2019) and honey bees (Giacomini et al. 2018) but also in some solitary bee species (Spear et al. 2016). Understanding how plant species affect parasite prevalence is important for the selection of plant species for mitigating strategy (e.g., composition of floral strips to support pollinators and optimize pollinator health) (Vaudo et al. 2015, Adler et al. 2018). As we also underlined that the presence of *Impatiens glandulifera* has no impact on the population of a common and polylectic native bumble bee, it seems that some alien exotic species could be considered a positive alternative resource in poor habitat where natural native resources are missing before plant invasion. Additional quantitative and qualitative empirical data, including plant traits (e.g., pollen proteins, secondary metabolites) and pollination networks, are still needed (e.g., IPBES 2016, Carvell et al. 2017), as well as new experimental studies to evaluate the potential efficiency of the selected plant for bee conservation.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank E. Curtis, M. Dehon, and B. Contino for helping in fieldwork, BOMB Lab and Agrozoology

Lab for technical help with genetic analyses, D. Evrard for technical support, and T.J. Wood for proofreading and English improvement. This work was partly supported by the FRFC project 2.4.613.12 (F.R.S.-FNRS—Fonds National de la Recherche Scientifique) and the Belspo project Belbees (BR/132/A1). NR and LT are PhD students of the FRIA. MV is FNRS grant fellowship “Chargé de recherches.” DM and MV conceived the ideas and designed methodology; NR, GG, RM, DP, SG, NP, and LT collected the data; MV, NR, GG, MG, RM, SG, GS, IM, and DF analyzed the data; and MV, DM, NR, and RM led the writing of the manuscript. All authors contributed critically to the drafts and gave final approval for publication.

LITERATURE CITED

- Adler, L. S., K. M. Michaud, S. P. Ellner, S. H. McArt, P. C. Stevenson, and R. E. Irwin. 2018. Disease where you dine: plant species and floral traits associated with pathogen transmission in bumble bees. *Ecology* 99:2535–2545.
- Arnold, S. E. J., M. E. P. Idrovo, L. J. L. Arias, S. R. Belmain, and P. C. Stevenson. 2014. Herbivore defence compounds occur in pollen and reduce bumblebee colony fitness. *Journal of Chemical Ecology* 40:878–881.
- Baracchi, D., M. J. F. Brown, and L. Chittka. 2015. Behavioural evidence for self-medication in bumblebees? *F1000Research* 4:73.
- Bates, D., M. Maechler, B. Bolker, and S. Walker. 2015. Fitting linear mixed-effects models using lme4. *Journal of Statistical Software* 67:1–48.
- Bennet, R. N., and R. M. Wallsgrove. 1994. Secondary metabolites in plant defence mechanisms. *New Phytologist* 127:617–633.
- Bjerknes, A.-L., O. Totland, S. J. Hegland, and A. Nielsen. 2007. Do alien plant invasions really affect pollination success in native plant species? *Biological Conservation* 138:1–12.
- Bolker, B. M., M. E. Brooks, C. J. Clark, S. W. Geange, J. R. Poulsen, M. H. H. Stevens, and J.-S. White. 2009. Generalized linear mixed models: a practical guide for ecology and evolution. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution* 24:127–135.
- Brown, M. 2017. Microsporidia: An emerging threat to bumblebees? *Trends in parasitology* 33:754–762.
- Brown, M. J. F., R. Schmid-Hempel, and P. Schmid-Hempel. 2003. Strong context-dependent virulence in a host-parasite system: reconciling genetic evidence with theory. *Journal of Animal Ecology* 72:994–1002.
- Brunner, F. S., P. Schmid-Hempel, and S. M. Barribeau. 2014. Protein-poor diet reduces host-specific immune gene expression in *Bombus terrestris*.

- Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences 281:1786.
- Carvell, C., A. F. G. Bourke, S. Dreier, S. N. Freeman, S. Hulmes, W. C. Jordan, J. W. Redhead, S. Sumner, J. Wang, and M. S. Heard. 2017. Bumblebee family lineage survival is enhanced in high-quality landscapes. *Nature* 543:547–549.
- Chauzat, M.-P., L. Cauquil, L. Roy, S. Franco, P. Hendrikx, and M. Ribière-Chabert. 2013. Demographics of the European apicultural industry. *PLoS ONE* 8:e79018.
- Chittka, L., and S. Schurkens. 2001. Successful invasion of a floral market. *Nature* 411:653.
- Chown, S. L., and K. J. Gaston. 2010. Body size variation in insects: a macroecological perspective. *Biological Reviews* 85:139–169.
- Cnaani, J., and A. Hefetz. 1994. The effect of workers size frequency-distribution on colony development in *Bombus terrestris*. *Insectes Sociaux* 41:301–307.
- Cory, J. S., and K. Hoover. 2006. Plant-mediated effects in insect-pathogen interactions. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution* 21:278–286.
- Couvillon, M. J., and A. Dornhaus. 2010. Small worker bumble bees (*Bombus impatiens*) are hardier against starvation than their larger sisters. *Insectes Sociaux* 57:193–197.
- Darvill, B., E. Mairi, and D. Goulson. 2004. Use of genetic markers to quantify bumblebee foraging range and nest density. *Oikos* 107:471–478.
- De Luca, P. A., L. F. Bussière, D. Souto-Vilaros, D. Goulson, A. C. Mason, and M. Vallejo-Marin. 2013. Variability in bumblebee pollination buzzes affects the quantity of pollen released from flowers. *Oecologia* 172:805–816.
- Detzel, A., and M. Wink. 1993. Attraction, deterrence or intoxication of bees (*Apis mellifera*) by plant allelochemicals. *Chemoecology* 4:8–18.
- Dreier, S., J. W. Redhead, I. A. Warren, A. F. G. Bourke, M. S. Heard, W. C. Jordan, S. Sumner, J. Wang, and C. Carvell. 2014. Fine-scale spatial genetic structure of common and declining bumblebees across an agricultural landscape. *Molecular Ecology* 23:3384–3395.
- Durrer, S., and P. Schmid-Hempel. 1994. Shared use of flowers leads to horizontal pathogen transmission. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* 258:299–302.
- Estoup, A., A. Scholl, A. Pouvreau, and M. Solignac. 1995. Monoandry and polyandry in bumblebees (Hymenoptera: Bombinae) as evidence by highly variable microsatellite. *Molecular Ecology* 4:89–93.
- Estoup, A., M. Solignac, J.-M. Cornuet, J. Goudet, and A. Scholl. 1996. Genetic differentiation of continental and island populations of *Bombus terrestris* (Hymenoptera: Apidae) in Europe. *Molecular Ecology* 5:19–31.
- Folly, A. J., H. Koch, P. C. Stevenson, and M. J. F. Brown. 2017. Larvae act as a transient transmission hub for the prevalent bumblebee parasite *Crithidia bombi*. *Journal of Invertebrate Pathology* 148:81–85.
- Fontaine, C., C. L. Collin, and I. Dajoz. 2008. Generalist foraging of pollinators: diet expansion at high density. *Journal of Ecology* 96:1002–1010.
- Fox, J., and S. Weisberg. 2011. An R companion to applied regression. Second edition. Sage, Thousand Oaks, California, USA.
- Gérard, M., D. Michez, V. Debat, L. Fullgrabe, I. Meeus, N. Piot, O. Sculfort, M. Vastrade, G. Smaghe, and M. Vanderplanck. 2018. Stressful conditions reveal decrease in size, modification of shape but relatively stable asymmetry in bumblebee wings. *Scientific Reports* 8:15169.
- Ghazoul, J. 2002. Flowers at the front line of invasion? *Ecological Entomology* 27:638–640.
- Gherman, B. I., A. Denner, O. Bobiş, D. S. Dezmirean, L. A. Mărghițaș, H. Schlüns, R. F. A. Moritz, and S. Erler. 2014. Pathogen-associated self-medication behavior in the honeybee *Apis mellifera*. *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology* 68:1777–1784.
- Giacomini, J. J., J. Leslie, D. R. Tarpay, E. C. Palmer-Young, R. E. Irwin, and L. S. Adler. 2018. Medicinal value of sunflower pollen against bee pathogens. *Scientific Reports* 8:14394.
- Goudet, J. 1995. FSTAT (Version 1.2): a Computer Program to Calculate F-statistics. *Journal of Heredity* 86:485–486.
- Goulson, D., and B. Darvill. 2004. Niche overlap and diet breadth in bumblebees; are rare species more specialized in their choice of flowers? *Apidologie* 35:55–63.
- Goulson, D., G. C. Lye, and B. Darvill. 2008. Decline and conservation of bumblebees. *Annual Review of Entomology* 53:191–208.
- Goulson, D., E. Nicholls, C. Botías, and E. L. Rotheray. 2015. Bee declines driven by combined stress from parasites, pesticides, and lack of flowers. *Science* 347:1255957.
- Goulson, D., J. Peat, J. C. Stout, J. Tucker, B. Darvill, L. C. Derwent, and W. O. H. Hughes. 2002. Can alloethism in workers of the bumblebee, *Bombus terrestris*, be explained in terms of foraging efficiency? *Animal Behaviour* 64:123–130.
- Graystock, P., D. Goulson, and W. O. H. Hughes. 2014. The relationship between managed bees and the prevalence of parasites in bumblebees. *PeerJ* 2:e522.
- Graystock, P., D. Goulson, and W. O. H. Hughes. 2015. Parasites in bloom: Flowers aid dispersal and transmission of pollinator parasites within and

- between bee species. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* 282:1813.
- Graystock, P., K. Yates, B. Darvill, D. Goulson, and W. O. H. Hughes. 2013. Emerging dangers: deadly effects of an emergent parasite in a new pollinator host. *Journal of Invertebrate Pathology* 114:114–119.
- Greenleaf, S. S., N. M. Williams, R. Winfree, and C. Kremen. 2007. Bee foraging ranges and their relationship to body size. *Oecologia* 153:589–596.
- Hadacek, F. 2002. Secondary metabolites as plant traits: current assessment and future perspectives. *Critical Reviews in Plant Sciences* 21:273–322.
- Harrell, F. E. 2015. Hmisc: Harrell Miscellaneous. R package version 3.15-0. <http://CRAN.R-project.org/package=Hmisc>
- Hothorn, T., F. Bretz, and P. Westfall. 2008. Simultaneous inference in general parametric models. *Biometrical Journal* 50:346–363.
- Hyun, T. K., S. H. Eom, C. Y. Yu, and T. Roitsch. 2010. *Hovenia dulcis* – An Asian traditional herb. *Planta Medica* 76:943–949.
- Imhoof, B., and P. Schmid-Hempel. 1999. Colony success of the bumblebee, *Bombus terrestris*, in relation to infections by two protozoan parasites, *Crithidia bombi* and *Nosema bombi*. *Insectes Sociaux* 46:233–238.
- IPBES. 2016. The assessment report of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services on pollinators, pollination and food production. Secretariat of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services, Bonn, Germany.
- Jones, O. R., and J. Wang. 2010. COLONY: a program for parentage and sibship inference from multilocus genotype data. *Molecular Ecology Resources* 10:551–555.
- Kerr, J. T., et al. 2015. Climate change impacts on bumblebees converge across continents. *Science* 349:177–180.
- Kleijn, D., and I. Raemakers. 2008. A retrospective analysis of pollen host plant use by stable and declining bumblebee species. *Ecology* 89:1811–1823.
- Kuznetsova, A., P. B. Brockhoff, and R. H. B. Christensen. 2014. lmerTest: tests for random and fixed effects for linear mixed effect models (lmer objects of lme4 package). R package version 2.0-6. <http://CRAN.R-project.org/package=lmerTest>
- Lenda, M., M. Witek, P. Skórka, D. Moron, and M. Woyciechowski. 2013. Invasive alien plants affect grassland ant communities, colony size and foraging behaviour. *Biological Invasions* 15:2403–2414.
- Lepais, O., B. Darvill, S. O'Connor, J. L. Osborne, R. A. Sanderson, J. Cussans, L. Goeffe, and D. Goulson. 2010. Estimation of bumblebee queen dispersal distances using sibship reconstruction method. *Molecular Ecology* 19:819–831.
- Li, J., W. Chen, J. Wu, W. Peng, J. An, P. Schmid-Hempel, and R. Schmid-Hempel. 2012. Diversity of *Nosema* associated with bumblebees (*Bombus* spp.) from China. *International Journal for Parasitology* 42:49–61.
- LoCascio, G. M., L. Aguirre, R. E. Irwin, and L. S. Adler. 2019. Pollen from multiple sunflower cultivars and species reduces a common bumble bee gut pathogen. *Royal Society Open Science* 6:190279.
- Logan, A., M. X. Ruiz-Gonzalez, and M. J. F. Brown. 2005. The impact of host starvation on parasite development and population dynamics in an intestinal trypanosome parasite of bumblebees. *Parasitology* 130:637–642.
- Lopezariza-Mikel, M. E., R. B. Hayes, M. R. Whalley, and J. Memmott. 2007. The impact of an alien plant on a native plant-pollinator network: an experimental approach. *Ecology Letters* 10:539–550.
- Manson, J. S., M. C. Otterstatter, and J. D. Thomson. 2010. Consumption of a nectar alkaloid reduces pathogen load in bumblebees. *Oecologia* 162:81–89.
- Meeus, I., M. J. F. Brown, D. C. De Graaf, and G. Smagghe. 2011. Effects of invasive parasites on Bumblebee declines. *Conservation Biology* 25:662–671.
- Meeus, I., D. C. de Graaf, K. Jans, and G. Smagghe. 2010. Multiplex PCR detection of slowly-evolving trypanosomatids and neogregarines in bumblebees using broad-range primers. *Journal of Applied Microbiology* 109:107–115.
- Menail, A. H., N. Piot, I. Meeus, G. Smagghe, and W. Loucif-Ayad. 2016. Large pathogen screening reveals first report of *Megaselia scalaris* (Diptera: Phoridae) parasitizing *Apis mellifera intermissa* (Hymenoptera: Apidae). *Journal of Invertebrate Pathology* 137:33–37.
- Moerman, R., M. Vanderplanck, N. Roger, S. Declèves, B. Wathelet, P. Rasmont, D. Fournier, and D. Michez. 2016. Growth rate of bumblebee larvae is related to pollen amino acids. *Journal of Economic Entomology* 109:25–30.
- Müller, A., and M. Kuhlmann. 2008. Pollen hosts of western palaearctic bees of the genus *Colletes* (Hymenoptera: Colletidae): the Asteraceae paradox. *Biological Journal of the Linnean Society* 95:719–733.
- Nienhuis, C. M., A. C. Dietzsch, and J. C. Stout. 2009. The impacts of an invasive alien plant and its removal on native bees. *Apidologie* 40:450–463.
- Nieto, A., et al. 2014. European Red List of bees. Publication Office of the European Union, Luxembourg, Europe.

- Ollerton, J., R. Winfree, and S. Tarrant. 2011. How many flowering plants are pollinated by animals. *Oikos* 120:321–326.
- Peakall, R., and P. E. Smouse. 2012. GenAlEx 6.5: genetic analysis in Excel. Population genetic software for teaching and research—an update. *Bioinformatics* 28:2537–2539.
- Persson, A., and H. G. Smith. 2011. Bumblebee colonies produce larger foragers in complex landscapes. *Basics and Applied Ecology* 12:695–702.
- Plischuk, S., R. Martín-Hernández, L. Prieto, M. Lucía, C. Botías, A. Meana, A. H. Abrahamovich, C. Lange, and M. Higes. 2009. South American native bumblebees (Hymenoptera: Apidae) infected by *Nosema ceranae* (Microsporidia), an emerging pathogen of honeybees (*Apis mellifera*). *Environmental Microbiology Reports* 1:131–135.
- R Development Core Team. 2013. A language and environment for statistical computing, version 3.0.2. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria.
- Ravoet, J., J. Maharramov, I. Meeus, L. De Smet, T. Wenseleers, G. Smagghe, and D. C. de Graaf. 2013. Comprehensive bee pathogen screening in Belgium reveals *Crithidia mellificae* as a new contributory factor to winter mortality. *PLoS ONE* 8:e72443.
- Renauld, M., A. Hutchinson, G. Loeb, K. Poveda, and H. Connelly. 2016. Landscape simplification constrains adult size in a native ground-nesting bee. *PLoS ONE* 11:e0150946.
- Richardson, L. L., L. S. Adler, A. S. Leonard, J. Andicoechea, K. H. Regan, W. E. Anthony, J. S. Manson, and R. E. Irwin. 2015. Secondary metabolites in floral nectar reduce parasite infections in bumblebees. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London B: Biological Sciences* 282:20142471.
- Richardson, L. L., M. D. Bowers, and R. E. Irwin. 2016. Nectar chemistry mediates the behavior of parasitized bees: consequences for plant fitness. *Ecology* 97:325–337.
- Roger, N., et al. 2017. Impact of pollen resources drift on common bumblebees in NW Europe. *Global Change Biology* 23:68–76.
- Roulston, T. H., and J. H. Cane. 2000. Pollen nutritional content and digestibility for animals. *Plant Systematics and Evolution* 222:187–209.
- Ruiz-González, M. X., and M. J. F. Brown. 2006. Honey bee and bumblebee trypanosomatids: specificity and potential for transmission. *Ecological Entomology* 31:616–622.
- Ruiz-González, M. X., J. Bryden, Y. Moret, C. Reber-Funk, P. Schmid-Hempel, and M. J. F. Brown. 2012. Dynamic transmission, host quality, and population structure in a multihost parasite of bumblebees. *Evolution* 66:3053–3066.
- Rutrecht, S. T., and M. J. F. Brown. 2008. Within colony dynamics of *Nosema bombi* infections: disease establishment, epidemiology and potential vertical transmission. *Apidologie* 39:504–514.
- Sadd, B. M. 2011. Food-environment mediates the outcome of specific interactions between a bumblebee and its trypanosome parasite. *Evolution* 65:2995–3001.
- Scheper, J., M. Reemer, R. van Kats, W. A. Ozinga, G. T. J. van der Linden, J. H. J. Schaminée, H. Siepel, and D. Kleijn. 2014. Museum specimens reveal loss of pollen host plants as key factor driving wild bee decline in The Netherlands. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of USA* 111:17552–17557.
- Schmid-Hempel, P. 2001. On the evolutionary ecology of host-parasite interactions: addressing the question with regard to bumblebees and their parasites. *Naturwissenschaften* 88:147–158.
- Schmid-Hempel, R., and P. Schmid-Hempel. 2000. Female mating frequencies in *Bombus* spp. from Central Europe. *Insectes Sociaux* 47:36–41.
- Showler, K. 1989. Plants for Bees: the Himalayan balsam in Britain: an undervalued source of nectar. *Bee World* 70:130–131.
- Slavic, K., E. T. Derbyshire, R. J. Naftalin, S. Krishna, and H. M. Staines. 2009. Comparison of effects of green tea catechins on apicomplexan hexose transporters and mammalian orthologues. *Molecular and Biochemical Parasitology* 168:113–116.
- Spaethe, J., and A. Weidenmüller. 2002. Size variation and foraging rate in bumblebees (*Bombus terrestris*). *Insectes Sociaux* 49:142–146.
- Spear, D. M., S. Silverman, and J. Forrest. 2016. Asteraceae pollen provisions protect *Osmia* mason bees (Hymenoptera: Megachilidae) from brood parasitism. *American Naturalist* 187:797–803.
- Stout, J. C., and E. J. Tiedeken. 2017. Direct interactions between invasive plants and native pollinators: evidence, impacts and approaches. *Functional Ecology* 31:38–46.
- Thijs, K. W., R. Brys, H. A. F. Verboven, and M. Hermy. 2012. The influence of an invasive plant species on the pollination success and reproductive output of three riparian plant species. *Biological Invasions* 14:355–365.
- Tiedeken, E. J., P. A. Egan, P. C. Stevenson, G. A. Wright, M. J. F. Brown, E. F. Power, I. Farrell, S. M. Matthews, and J. C. Stout. 2016. Nectar chemistry modulates the impact of an invasive plant on native pollinators. *Functional Ecology* 30:885–893.
- Tiedeken, E. J., J. C. Stout, P. C. Stevenson, and G. A. Wright. 2014. Bumblebees are not deterred by ecologically relevant concentrations of nectar toxins. *Journal of Experimental Biology* 217:1620–1625.

- Tscharntke, T., and R. Brandl. 2004. Plant-insect interactions in fragmented landscapes. *Annual Review of Entomology* 49:405–430.
- Tylianakis, J. M., R. K. Didham, J. Bascompte, and D. A. Wardle. 2008. Global change and species interactions in terrestrial ecosystems. *Ecology Letters* 11:1351–1363.
- Van Osterhout, C., D. Weetman, and W. F. Hutchinson. 2006. Estimation and adjustment of microsatellite null alleles in nonequilibrium populations. *Molecular Ecology Notes* 6:255–256.
- Vanderplanck, M., R. Moerman, P. Rasmont, G. Lognay, B. Wathelet, R. Wattiez, and D. Michez. 2014. How does pollen chemistry impact development and feeding behaviour of polylectic bees? *PLoS ONE* 9:e86209.
- Vanderplanck, M., et al. 2018. Is non-host pollen suitable for generalist bumblebees? *Insect Science* 25:259–272.
- Vaudo, A. D., J. F. Tooker, C. M. Grozinger, and H. M. Patch. 2015. Bee nutrition and floral resource restoration. *Current Opinion in Insect Science* 10:133–141.
- Vieira, M. N., P. Winterhalter, and G. Jerz. 2016. Flavonoids from the flowers of *Impatiens glandulifera* Royle isolated by high performance countercurrent chromatography. *Phytochemical Analysis* 27:116–125.
- Walsh, P. S., D. A. Metzger, and R. Higuchi. 1991. Chelex 100 as a medium for simple extraction of DNA for PCR-based typing from forensic material. *BioTechniques* 10:506–513.
- Wang, J. 2012. Computationally efficient sibship and parentage assignment from multilocus marker data. *Genetics* 191:183–194.
- Whitehorn, P. R., M. C. Tinsley, M. J. F. Brown, B. Darvill, and D. Goulson. 2010. Genetic diversity, parasite prevalence and immunity in wild bumblebees. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* 278:1195–1202.
- Widmer, A., and P. Schmid-Hempel. 1999. The population genetic structure of a large temperate pollinator species, *Bombus pascuorum* (Scopoli) (Hymenoptera: Apidae). *Molecular Ecology* 8:387–398.
- Williams, P. H., and J. L. Osborne. 2009. Bumblebee vulnerability and conservation world-wide. *Apidologie* 40:367–387.
- Wood, J. T., J. M. Holland, W. O. H. Hughes, and D. Goulson. 2015. Targeted agri-environment schemes significantly improve the population size of common farmland bumblebee species. *Molecular Ecology* 24:1668–1680.
- Woodcock, B. A., N. J. B. Isaac, J. M. Bullock, D. B. Roy, D. G. Garthwaite, A. Crowe, and R. F. Pywell. 2016. Impacts of neonicotinoid use on long-term population changes in wild bees in England. *Nature Communications* 7:12459.
- Wright, S. 1949. The genetical structure of populations. *Annals of Eugenics* 15:323–354.
- Wright, G. A., D. D. Baker, M. J. Palmer, D. Stabler, J. A. Mustard, E. F. Power, A. M. Borland, and P. C. Stevenson. 2013. Caffeine in floral nectar enhances a pollinator's memory of reward. *Science* 339:1202–1204.

SUPPORTING INFORMATION

Additional Supporting Information may be found online at: <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/ecs2.2804/full>