Title

Distribution of tick-borne pathogens in human-biting ticks in France collected through a Citizen-science program

Authors

Jonas Durand[1,2,*], Thierno Bah Madiou[3,4,*] (co-first authors), Isabelle Lebert[3,4], Clémence Galon[5], Irene Carravieri[2], Sébastien Masseglia[3,4], Jean-Marc Armand[6], Julien Marchand[2], Cyril Galley[2], Karine Chalvet-Monfray[3,4], Muriel Vayssier-Taussat[7], Gwenaël Vourc'h[3,4], Annick Brun-Jacob[1], Sara Moutailler[5], Xavier Bailly[3,4], Pascale Frey-Klett[1]

* These authors contributed equally to this work.

Affiliations

[1] Université de Lorraine, INRAE, UMR IAM, Laboratoire Tous Chercheurs, Champenoux, France

[2] CPIE Nancy-Champenoux, Champenoux, France

[3] University of Clermont Auvergne, INRAE, VetAgro Sup, UMR EPIA, Saint-Genès Champanelle, France

[4] University of Lyon, INRAE, VetAgro Sup, UMR EPIA, Marcy l'Etoile, France

[5] ANSES, INRAE, Ecole Nationale Vétérinaire d'Alfort, UMR BIPAR, Laboratoire de Santé Animale, Maisons-Alfort, France

[6] UMR SAVE, INRAE Bordeaux Science Agro, ISVV, Bordeaux, France

[7] INRAE Val de Loire, Nouzilly, France

Corresponding authors

Pascale Frey-Klett pascale.frey-klett@inrae.fr

Jonas Durand jonas.durand@inrae.fr

Keywords

Citizen science, biting tick, tick-borne pathogen, France, CiTIQUE

Abstract (250 mots)

Ticks occupy diverse habitats, including urban and suburban areas, increasing the risk of human exposure. Assessing the public health threat posed by ticks requires rigorous

monitoring of their distribution and of the prevalence of tick-borne pathogens. In France since 2017, the citizen science program CiTIQUE monitors human tick bites through multiple complementary approaches. Citizens can report bites and submit biting ticks to a national tick bank for research and surveillance. This study aimed to investigate human exposure to tick-borne pathogens across France using ticks submitted through the CiTIQUE program. In total, 2,009 ticks were selected from the CiTIQUE tick bank, identified, and screened for pathogens using a real-time microfluidic PCR method. Most bites involved *Ixodes ricinus* nymphs except in Mediterranean regions where *Dermacentor* and *Rhipicephalus* ticks were more common. Twenty-two pathogens were detected, nineteen of which are potentially pathogenic to humans. These pathogens were widely distributed across the country. *Borrelia spp.* were the most frequently detected pathogens with spatial variation among regions. *Anaplasma phagocytophilum* infection rates varied from region to region. *Neoehrlichia mikurensis* was found at low prevalence in all French regions. *Rickettsia* species diversity was highest in the southeast, associated with a greater diversity of vectors. Five percent of ticks were infected with more than one pathogen. Although spatial heterogeneity was observed, no region was free of infected ticks. This study demonstrates the power of citizen science for nationwide surveillance of tick-borne pathogens, providing a large scale overview of pathogen diversity and distribution across France from crowdsourced tick data.

Introduction

Ticks of the family *Ixodidae*, commonly known as hard ticks, are major vectors of infectious diseases worldwide. They pose a substantial public health risk, particularly in temperate regions such as Europe. These ectoparasites can transmit a diverse range of pathogens, including bacteria, viruses, and protozoa (Guglielmone and Robbins, 2018).

In Europe, Lyme borreliosis is the most prevalent tick-borne disease. It is caused by bacteria of the *Borrelia burgdorferi* sensu lato (Bbsl) complex, primarily transmitted by *Ixodes ricinus,* the most widespread tick species in the area (Kilpatrick et al., 2017). These bacteria can infect multiple organs, leading to dermatological, neurological, musculoskeletal, or cardiac manifestations in humans. Of the 21 genospecies existing worlwide, seven - *Borrelia afzelii*, *Borrelia garinii*, *Borrelia burgdorferi* sensu stricto, *Borrelia bavariensis*, *Borrelia spielmanii, Borrelia bissettiae*, and *Borrelia lusitaniae* - are present in Europe and considered pathogenic for human (Rauter and Hartung, 2005; Eisen, 2020; Margos et al., 2022). In metropolitan France, the annual incidence of Lyme borreliosis for 2024 was estimated at 53 cases per 100,000 inhabitants (95% Confidence Interval (95 CI): 43 - 63) (Réseau Sentinelle 2024). Other tick-borne bacterial pathogens of medical relevance in Europe include for instance: i) *Anaplasma phagocytophilum*, which causes human granulocytic anaplasmosis with most cases reported in eastern France (Boulanger et al., 2018), ii) *Neoehrlichia mikurensis*, the agent of neoehrlichiosis (Silaghi et al., 2016), for which four clinical cases were recently documented in France (Boyer et al., 2021) and iii) *Borrelia miyamotoi*, a relapsing fever group spirochete which causes a flu-like illness in humans and has been recently identified in 43 human cases in France (Wagemakers et al., 2020). All these pathogens are supposed to be mainly transmitted by *I. ricinus.*

Furthermore, several *Rickettsia* species also cause rickettsioses, such as *Rickettsia conorii*, responsible for Mediterranean spotted fever (MSF) and transmitted by *Rhipicephalus sanguineus* sensu lato ticks. Other species, including *Rickettsia helvetica*, *Rickettsia massiliae*, and *Rickettsia aeschlimannii*, transmitted by *I. ricinus*, *R. sanguineus* s.l. and *Hyalomma marginatum* respectively, can cause MSF-like syndromes, with fever, rash, and muscle aches being common symptoms, with more severe cases reported in Europe (Oteo and Portillo, 2012). Additionally, *Rickettsia slovaca* and *Rickettsia raoultii*, vectored by *Dermacentor marginatus* and *Dermacentor reticulatus*, are linked to SENLAT syndrome (Scalp Eschar and Neck LymphAdenopathy after Tick bite) which is characterized by scalp eschars and neck lymphadenopathy following tick bites (Oteo and Portillo, 2012).

Among protozoan pathogens, *Babesia* species, also transmitted by *I. ricinus* and *Dermacentor* species, cause babesiosis. While this disease primarily affects domestic and wild animals, human infections do occur. In Europe, *Babesia divergens*, *Babesia venatorum*, and *Babesia microti* are recognized as human pathogens (Hildebrandt et al., 2013). In France, two cases of babesiosis due to *B. divergens* have been reported, mostly in immunocompromised patients (Oteo and Portillo, 2012; Paleau et al., 2020).

Invasive tick species, such as *Hyalomma marginatum* and *Hyalomma lusitanicum* in France, can also be of public health importance. *H. marginatum* ticks indeed transmit Crimean-Congo hemorrhagic fever (CCHF) (Whitehouse, 2004), caused by the CCHF virus, which shows a high fatality rate in case of human infection. Although no human cases have been reported in

France, the virus was recently isolated from *H. marginatum* ticks in the country (Bernard et al., 2024; Kiwan et al., 2024).

Environmental changes and human activities have probably influenced tick distribution and abundance in France. Ticks indeed occupy diverse habitats, including urban and suburban environments, increasing the risk of human exposure (Oechslin et al., 2017; Grochowska et al., 2020; Mathews-Martin et al., 2020). Monitoring the distribution and pathogen carriage of ticks is essential to assess public health risks and guide preventive actions. Traditional approaches, such as flagging or dragging, allow the collection of questing ticks and subsequent pathogen screening. However, these methods are labor-intensive and generally provide partial and piecewise information on the actual distribution of human exposure (Eisen and Eisen, 2016).

In contrast, citizen-science programs offer a practical and large-scale approach to assessing human-tick interactions (Eisen and Eisen, 2021). Such initiatives not only yield valuable data but also enhance public engagement awareness. In the United States, citizen science studies have successfully used human-biting ticks to monitor pathogen prevalence (Nieto et al., 2018; Porter et al., 2019, 2021). Similar initiatives were conducted in European countries such as Finland (Laaksonen et al., 2017) and Belgium (Lernout et al., 2019), with the latter focusing specifically on human-biting ticks as a direct measure of human exposure. In France, the CiTIQUE program has been established since 2017 to improve knowledge on tick ecology and tick-borne disease risks and to improve prevention strategies (Frey-Klett et al., 2018) This program allow citizens to report tick bites and send collected ticks to a national tick bank for research and surveillance purposes (Moutailler et al., 2023).

In this article, we aimed to characterize the tick species biting humans in France and to investigate the diversity and distribution of bacterial and protozoan pathogens carried by these ticks. During the initial development of the program, we characterized a sub-sample of 2,009 human biting ticks submitted to CiTIQUE to explore human exposure to tick species and tick-borne pathogens across France. The results are largely consistent with current knowledge, strengthening the relevance of such a program. They are discussed in the perspective of potential future improvement of the such citizen science programs.

Materials and methods

Tick surveillance, sample collection and identification

Ticks were submitted by citizen volunteers who chose to send tick specimens, in addition to reporting a tick bite to the CiTIQUE project via the Signalement TIQUE app, the website or a paper form (https://www.citique.fr/signalement-tique/). When reporting, citizens complete a questionnaire, which includes the following information: age, sex, location of the bite on the body, number of ticks attached, date of the bite (with an indication on the precision of the date), geographical location of the tick bite (with an indication on the precision of the GPS data), type of environment of the bite (e.g. forest, private yard…), type of activity that was performed at the time of the bite (e.g. sports, hiking…). Tick bite reporting and tick specimen collection began from the start of the program (July 2017) and is still ongoing.

Out of 17,010 human tick-bite reports received from July 2017 to 2019, 4,776 were associated with one or more tick specimens. Tick sampling and analysis were initially carried out on a

first-come, first-served basis, by selecting randomly only one tick per report. In 2017, only 191 reports with ticks were received, and 10 out of 13 administrative French regions (NUTS 1) having fewer than 20 reports (Table 1). We aimed at getting at least 150 ticks per region in order to get a spatial representation. As this number was only obtained for two regions (NAQ and GES) in 2018, some of the ticks received in 2019 were used to complete the sampling. It was not possible to obtain the required number of ticks for the PAC and 20R regions. A total of 2,009 ticks was finally sampled between 2017 to 2019.

The CiTIQUE program grew in term of people and associated skills during this study, resulting in different treatments of ticks regarding their identification. At first, no one was competent in tick morphological identification and we relied only on molecular identification with the high-throughput microfluidic real-time PCR method which could only identify three species including *Ixodes ricinus*, *Dermacentor marginatus* and *Dermacentor reticulatus*. After implementing morphological tick identification, we started to collect additional data on tick engorgement, as an indicator of tick feeding time. Out of 264 ticks that were not identified for developmental stage, 13 were not identified by molecular method either, because they belong to species other than *Ixodes ricinus* or *Dermacentor reticulatus* or *Dermacentor marginatus*; 27 ticks were also identified for developmental stage but not for the species by molecular method. Morphological identification of ticks was performed using two identification keys (Pérez-Eid, 2007; Estrada-Peña et al., 2018). Out of 1724 ticks identified morphologically and molecularly, 668 had their engorgement status recorded.

Table 1
Sample distribution of human biting ticks by year and region with cumulative number over the years. Regions: 20R: Corse; ARA: Auvergne-Rhône-Alpes; BFC: Bourgogne-Franche-Comté; BRE: Bretagne; CVL: Centre-Val de Loire; GES: Grand-Est; HDF; Hauts-De-France; IDF: Île-de-France; NOR: Normandie; NAQ: Nouvelle-Aquitaine; OCC: Occitanie; PAC: Provence-Alpes-Côte d'Azur; PDL: Pays-de-la-Loire.

Region	In 2017	In 2017+2018	In 2017+2018+2019
France	**191**	**1,422**	**2,009**
GES	49	208	298
BRE	12	122	224
NAQ	15	153	174
ARA	31	138	166
PDL	6	71	166
HDF	5	96	159
BFC	14	145	157
IDF	19	142	156
NOR	7	74	150
CVL	5	114	149
OCC	28	126	148

PAC	0	31	59
20R	0	2	3

Detection of pathogens

- **DNA extraction**

DNA from single specimens was extracted using NucleoSpin® Tissue kit (Macherey-Nagel, Germany), following manufacturer's instructions.

- **DNA pre-amplification and high-throughput microfluidic real-time PCR**

Pathogens, targeted genes and primers sets are listed in Table S1 (supplementary material).

A pre-amplification step by PCR with the Preamp Master Mix (Standard BioTools, USA) was performed on the samples according to Melis et al (2024) in order to enhance the sensitivity of microfluidic PCR for pathogen detection. All the primers used for pathogen detection (Table S1) were pooled, at a final concentration of 0.2 µM each. The reaction was carried out as described in Melis et al (2024). Pre-amplified samples were diluted 1:10 and then stored at - 20 °C until further analysis.

High-throughput microfluidic real-time PCR was performed using a BioMark™ real-time PCR system (Standard BioTools, USA), and the 48.48 Dynamic Array™ (Standard BioTools, USA). The chip includes two sets of 48 inlets, allowing the simultaneous loading of 48 samples and 48 assays reaction mix (with specific primers and probe). All 2,304 (48*48) sample-assay combinations were processed simultaneously by the automated microfluidic system (see Michelet et al., 2014; Melis et al., 2024 for details). Amplifications were performed as in Melis et al (2024).

- **Validation of the results by PCR and DNA sequencing**

In order to evaluate, refine and validate the results obtained with the BioMark™ system, conventional PCRs were performed on a subset of representative positive samples following Melis et al (2024). This representative subset included tick in which *Borrelia* spp*., Rickettsia* spp. and *A. phagocytophilum* were detected.

For *Borrelia* spp., on the positive ticks with chip method, 105 were tested for confirmation using flaB gene amplification (Michelet et al., 2014; Melis et al., 2024), and 61 sequences were obtained. In total, 309 samples were validated for *Borrelia* detection.

For *Rickettsia* spp., on the positive ticks with chip method, 71 were tested for confirmation using gltA or ompB genes amplification (Melis et al., 2024), and 35 sequences were obtained. In total, 172 samples were validated for *Rickettsia* detection.

For *A. phagocytophilum*, among 142 positive ticks with the chip method, 106 were tested for confirmation. The samples were analyzed by qPCR using the taqman system targeting a 122 bp fragment of the *A. phagocytophilum* msp2 gene (Drazenovich et al., 2006) with Biorad's SoAdvanced™ Universal Probes Supermix qPCR mix. The 14 unconfirmed samples were

also at the detection limit of the microchip method (high CT). In total, the 142 samples were validated for *A. phagocytophilum* infection.

- **Statistical and spatial analysis**

The dataset presents information on the 2,009 ticks analyzed for pathogen detection and identification. The 72 fields are classified into 4 classes: description of the report (8 fields), tick characterization (13 fields), data from analyses with the chip method on the characterization and detection of pathogens (43 fields), additional analytical data with other methods for pathogen characterization and detection (8 fields).

Infection rates were calculated as the proportion of infected ticks among the total number of ticks per species and/or region. The corresponding 95% confidence intervals (95 CI) were estimated using a binomial test (binom.test function in R). The association between engorgement status and infection (presence or absence of pathogens) as well as between engorgement status and life stages (nymphs and females) was measured using a Chi-squared test of independence (chisq.test function in R). When significant associations were found (p value <0.05), odds ratios with 95% confidence interval were computed to quantify effect size.

All statistical analyses and spatial mapping were performed using R version 4.3.2 (R Core Team, 2023).

Results

Tick stages and species distribution

Of 2,009 ticks submitted by citizens, 1,745 were morphologically identified to determine their developmental stage (larva, nymph, adult female or male), and 1,718 were also identified taxonomically to the genus and species level. All ticks were also tested with the microfluidic chip assay, allowing to confirm morphological taxonomic identification for the following species: *I. ricinus*, *D. marginatus* and *D. reticulatus*. Only four ticks were not morphologically confirmed as *I. ricinus*. Among the 1,745 ticks identified for developmental stage, nymphs were the most represented (1346; 77.1%; 95 CI: 75.1 - 79.1 - the numbers correspond to the number of individuals, the percentage of individuals and its 95% confidence interval, respectively), followed by adult females (272; 15.6%; 95 CI: 13.9 - 17.4), larvae (112; 6.4%; 95 CI: 5.3 - 7.7), and adult males (15; 0.9%; 95 CI: 0.5 – 1.4). Among the 2,009 ticks, five genera and seven species were identified (Figure 1). The most frequent species was *I. ricinus* (1,891 ticks). We also identified five *I. hexagonus* leading to 94.4% *Ixodes* ticks in the dataset. In addition, 60 *Dermacentor* ticks were identified (33 *D. marginatus* and 27 *D. reticulatus)*, along with 11 *Rhipicephalus* ticks (10 *R. sanguineus* s.l. and one *R. bursa)*, one *Haemaphysalis punctata* and one *Hyalomma* spp tick.

Figure 1 shows the distribution of ticks collected and selected across France. *I. ricinus*, the predominant tick species, was sampled in almost all regions. It accounted for 88% to 99% of ticks in most areas. Notable exceptions were Corsica (20R), where no *I. ricinus* were found among the three collected ticks, and the Provence-Alpes-Côte d'Azur region (PAC), where it represented only 61% of identified ticks. In the PAC region, *D. marginatus* and *R. sanguineus* s.l. each accounted for 15% of the identified ticks, reflecting a more diverse tick community

in this area. *Dermacentor marginatus* was detected in seven out of twelve regions (ARA, GES, IDF, NAQ, OCC, PAC, and PDL), but was absent from samples of the northern and western regions of the country, including BRE, NOR, HDF, CVL, and BFC. On the other hand, *D. reticulatus* was identified in all regions except for PAC and 20R. Ticks of the genus *Rhipicephalus* were identified in the southern regions of France, with nine *R. sanguineus* s.l. ticks collected in PAC, one in OCC, and one *R. bursa* tick in 20R. The identified *Hyalomma* tick was collected in the PAC region. The *Haemaphysalis punctata* tick was collected in the Pays de la Loire region (PDL), on an Atlantic Island. Five *I. hexagonus* ticks were identified across four regions: two in the north, Hauts-de-France and Normandy (HDF and NOR), and two in the south, Provence-Alpes-Côte d'Azur and Occitanie (PAC and OCC).



Figure 1. Geographic distribution of the 2,009 human biting ticks studied, differentiated by tick species (A. *Ixodes ricinus* distribution; B. Other tick species distribution). Regions: 20R: Corse; ARA: Auvergne-Rhône-Alpes; BFC: Bourgogne-Franche-Comté; BRE: Bretagne; CVL: Centre-Val de Loire; GES: Grand-Est; HDF; Hauts-De-France; IDF: Île-de-France; NOR: Normandie; NAQ: Nouvelle-Aquitaine; OCC: Occitanie; PAC: Provence-Alpes-Côte d'Azur; PDL: Pays-de-la-Loire. Sources: base map GADM.

Of the 668 ticks for which engorgement status was recorded, 292 (44%; 95 CI: 40 - 48) were reported as engorged. Engorgement status varied by developmental stage and sex: 249 of 519 nymphs (48%; 95 CI: 44 - 52), 30 of 109 females (28%; 95 CI: 19 - 37) were engorged, only 1 male of 13, and 12 of 27 larvae (44%; 95 CI 25 - 65). A significative difference in engorgement status was found between females and nymphs (χ^2=14.447, df=1, p-value <0.001). The odds of being fed were 2.42 higher in nymphs than in females (95 CI: 1.55 – 3.9).

Regarding species, engorgement was observed in 6 of 15 (40%; 95 CI: 16 - 68) *D. marginatus*, 4 of 11 (36%; 95 CI: 11 - 69) *D. reticulatus*, 4 of 5 (80%; 95 CI: 28 - 99) *I. hexagonus*, and 278 of 624 (45%; 95 CI: 41- 49) *I. ricinus* individuals. No engorged ticks were recorded for *Ha. punctata*, *Hyalomma* spp., *R. bursa*, or *R. sanguineus*.

Pathogen and microbe identification

The high-throughput PCR method was applied to each of the 2,009 ticks, leading to the detection of 22 different pathogens in 601 ticks (infection rate: 29.9%; 95 CI: 27.9 - 32.0; Table 2), with one to three pathogens identified per positive tick. Among them, 100 ticks (5.0%; 95 CI: 4.1 - 6.0; Table 2) were infected by at least two different pathogens.

No significative difference was observed between infection with at least one pathogen and engorgement status ($\chi^2 = 0.53779$; p-value = 0.4633).

Among the 1,891 *I. ricinus* ticks, 291 (15.4%; 95 CI: 14.7 - 18.1; Table 3) were infected with *B. burgdorferi* s.l. and 25 (1.3%; 95 CI: 0.9 – 1.9; Table 3) with *Borrelia miyamotoi*. In addition, *A. phagocytophilum* was detected in 135 ticks (7.1%; 95 CI: 6.0 - 8.4; Table 3), while 134 (7.1%; 95 CI: 6.0 - 8.3; Table 3) were positive for *Rickettsia* spp., 54 (2.9%; 95 CI: 2.2 – 3.7; Table 3) for *Ehrlichia* spp. and 24 (1.3%; 95 CI: 0.8 – 1.9; Table 3) for *Babesia* spp. None of the five *I. hexagonus* ticks tested positive for any of the screened pathogens.

Among the 60 *Dermacentor* ticks, *A. phagocytophilum* was detected in one *D. marginatus* and two *D. reticulatus* ticks. Fourteen *D. marginatus* ticks (42%; 95 CI: 25.5 – 60.8; Table 3) and 13 *D. reticulatus* ticks (48%; 95 CI: 28.7 – 68.1; Table 3) were infected with *Rickettsia* spp. Four out of 10 *R. sanguineus* s.l. ticks were infected: one with *A. phagocytophilum* and three with *Rickettsia* spp. The single *Hyalomma* spp. tick was positive for *Rickettsia* spp. No pathogens were detected in the identified *R. bursa* tick or in the *H. punctata* tick (Table 3).

Table 2

Number of human biting ticks carrying N pathogens per regions. N=Number of pathogens found in ticks. n: total number of ticks in each region. Regions: 20R: Corse; ARA: Auvergne-Rhône-Alpes; BFC: Bourgogne-Franche-Comté; BRE: Bretagne; CVL: Centre-Val de Loire; GES: Grand-Est; HDF: Hauts-de-France; IDF: Île-de-France; NAQ: Nouvelle-Aquitaine; NOR: Normandie; OCC: Occitanie; PAC: Provence-Alpes-Côte d'Azur; PDL: Pays-de-la-Loire.

	Regions													France
	20R	ARA	BFC	BRE	CVL	GES	HDF	IDF	NAQ	NOR	OCC	PAC	PDL	Total
N	n=3	n=166	n=157	n=224	n=149	n=298	n=159	n=156	n=174	n=150	n=148	n=59	n=166	n=2,009
0	3	105	90	183	108	195	108	104	118	119	103	38	134	1,408
1	0	51	57	38	30	82	44	46	43	27	35	19	29	501
2	0	10	7	3	11	16	7	6	12	4	9	2	3	90
3	0	0	3	0	0	5	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	10

Table 3

Number of human biting ticks carrying pathogenic and non-pathogenic microbes, with infection rate, per tick species. n: total number of ticks analysed for each species. Results: infected tick number; infection rate in percentage (95% confidence interval). Genera of pathogens in bold letters. Non-pathogenic microbes are marked by an asterisk *.

Microbes	Tick species				
	D. marginatus	*D. reticulatus*	*I. ricinus*	*R. sanguineus* s.l.	Unidentified

	n=33	n=27	n=1,891	n=10	n=40
***Borrelia* spp.**	**0; 0% (0-10.6)**	**0; 0% (0-12.8)**	**309; 16.3% (14.7-18.1)**	**0; 0% (0-30.8)**	**0; 0% (0-8.6)**
***Borrelia burgdorferi* s.l.**	**0; 0% (0-10.6)**	**0; 0% (0-12.8)**	**291; 15.4% (13.8-17.1)**	**0; 0% (0-30.8)**	**0; 0% (0-8.6)**
Borrelia afzelii	0; 0% (0-10.6)	0; 0% (0-12.8)	136; 7.2% (6.1-8.5)	0; 0% (0-30.8)	0; 0% (0-8.6)
Borrelia garinii	0; 0% (0-10.6)	0; 0% (0-12.8)	80; 4.2% (3.4-5.2)	0; 0% (0-30.8)	0; 0% (0-8.6)
Borrelia valaisiana	0; 0% (0-10.6)	0; 0% (0-12.8)	37; 2% (1.4-2.7)	0; 0% (0-30.8)	0; 0% (0-8.6)
Borrelia burgdorferi s.s.	0; 0% (0-10.6)	0; 0% (0-12.8)	25; 1.3% (0.9-1.9)	0; 0% (0-30.8)	0; 0% (0-8.6)
Borrelia spielmanii	0; 0% (0-10.6)	0; 0% (0-12.8)	8; 0.4% (0.2-0.8)	0; 0% (0-30.8)	0; 0% (0-8.6)
Borrelia lusitaniae	0; 0% (0-10.6)	0; 0% (0-12.8)	5; 0.3% (0.1-0.6)	0; 0% (0-30.8)	0; 0% (0-8.6)
Borrelia miyamotoi	0; 0% (0-10.6)	0; 0% (0-12.8)	25; 1.3% (0.9-1.9)	0; 0% (0-30.8)	0; 0% (0-8.6)
***Anaplasma* spp.**	**2; 6.1% (0.7-20.2)**	**1; 3.7% (0.1-19)**	**135; 7.1% (6-8.4)**	**1; 10% (0.3-44.5)**	**3; 7.3% (1.5-19.9)**
Anaplasma phagocytophilum	2; 6.1% (0.7-20.2)	1; 3.7% (0.1-19)	135; 7.1% (6-8.4)	1; 10% (0.3-44.5)	3; 7.3% (1.5-19.9)
***Ehrlichia* spp.**	**0; 0% (0-10.6)**	**0; 0% (0-12.8)**	**54; 2.9% (2.2-3.7)**	**0; 0% (0-30.8)**	**3; 7.3% (1.5-19.9)**
Neoehrlichia mikurensis	0; 0% (0-10.6)	0; 0% (0-12.8)	49; 2.6% (1.9-3.4)	0; 0% (0-30.8)	1; 2.4% (0.1-12.9)
***Rickettsia* spp.**	**14; 42.4% (25.5-60.8)**	**13; 48.1% (28.7-68.1)**	**134; 7.1% (6-8.3)**	**3; 30% (6.7-65.2)**	**10; 24.4% (12.4-40.3)**
Rickettsia helvetica	0; 0% (0-10.6)	0; 0% (0-12.8)	120; 6.3% (5.3-7.5)	0; 0% (0-30.8)	0; 0% (0-8.6)
Rickettsia raoultii	4; 12.1% (3.4-28.2)	13; 48.1% (28.7-68.1)	8; 0.4% (0.2-0.8)	0; 0% (0-30.8)	0; 0% (0-8.6)
Rickettsia slovaca	6; 18.2% (7-35.5)	0; 0% (0-12.8)	1; 0.1% (0-0.3)	0; 0% (0-30.8)	1; 2.4% (0.1-12.9)
Rickettsia massiliae	0; 0% (0-10.6)	0; 0% (0-12.8)	0; 0% (0-0.2)	2; 20% (2.5-55.6)	1; 2.4% (0.1-12.9)
Rickettsia aeschlimannii	0; 0% (0-10.6)	0; 0% (0-12.8)	0; 0% (0-0.2)	0; 0% (0-30.8)	2; 4.9% (0.6-16.5)
Rickettsia felis	0; 0% (0-10.6)	0; 0% (0-12.8)	0; 0% (0-0.2)	0; 0% (0-30.8)	1; 2.4% (0.1-12.9)
***Bartonella* spp.**	**0; 0% (0-10.6)**	**0; 0% (0-12.8)**	**1; 0.1% (0-0.3)**	**0; 0% (0-30.8)**	**0; 0% (0-8.6)**
Bartonella henselae	0; 0% (0-10.6)	0; 0% (0-12.8)	1; 0.1% (0-0.3)	0; 0% (0-30.8)	0; 0% (0-8.6)
*Francisella-like endosymbiont**	1; 3% (0.1-15.8)	26; 96.3% (81-99.9)	23; 1.2% (0.8-1.8)	0; 0% (0-30.8)	3; 7.3% (1.5-19.9)
Apicomplexa	**1; 3% (0.1-15.8)**	**1; 3.7% (0.1-19)**	**28; 1.5% (1-2.1)**	**0; 0% (0-30.8)**	**3; 7.3% (1.5-19.9)**
***Babesia* spp.**	**0; 0% (0-10.6)**	**1; 3.7% (0.1-19)**	**24; 1.3% (0.8-1.9)**	**0; 0% (0-30.8)**	**0; 0% (0-8.6)**
Babesia venatorum	0; 0% (0-10.6)	0; 0% (0-12.8)	14; 0.7% (0.4-1.2)	0; 0% (0-30.8)	0; 0% (0-8.6)
Babesia microti	0; 0% (0-10.6)	0; 0% (0-12.8)	5; 0.3% (0.1-0.6)	0; 0% (0-30.8)	0; 0% (0-8.6)
Babesia divergens	0; 0% (0-10.6)	1; 3.7% (0.1-19)	4; 0.2% (0.1-0.5)	0; 0% (0-30.8)	0; 0% (0-8.6)
Babesia canis	0; 0% (0-10.6)	0; 0% (0-12.8)	1; 0.1% (0-0.3)	0; 0% (0-30.8)	0; 0% (0-8.6)
Theileria spp.	0; 0% (0-10.6)	0; 0% (0-12.8)	0; 0% (0-0.2)	0; 0% (0-30.8)	2; 4.9% (0.6-16.5)
***Hepatozoon* spp.**	**1; 3% (0.1-15.8)**	**0; 0% (0-12.8)**	**2; 0.1% (0-0.4)**	**0; 0% (0-30.8)**	**0; 0% (0-8.6)**

- ***Borrelia* species**

Borrelia spp. was detected in 309 *I. ricinus* ticks, corresponding to an infection rate of 16.3% (95 CI: 14.7-18.1; Table 3). These detections fall into two different species complexes, one that includes the agent of human Lyme borreliosis (*B. burgdorferi* s.l.) and the other, the agents of the human relapsing fever (more specifically *B. miyamotoi* here). Nymphs accounted for the majority of *Borrelia* spp.-positive ticks, with infection rates varying by region and *Borrelia* species.

Across all developmental stages, the average *B. burgdorferi* s.l. infection rate in *I. ricinus* ticks in France was 15.4% (291/1891; 95 CI: 13.8 -17.1; Table 3, Figure 2), ranging from 2.9% (1/35; 95 CI: 0.07 – 14.9) in the PAC region to 21.1% (60/284; 95 CI: 16.5 – 26.3) in the GES region. Five regions had infection rates above 15.4%: in descending order GES, CVL, BFC, ARA, NAQ. Infection rates were the highest in adult females (41/218, 18.8%; 95 CI: 13.8 – 24.6), followed by nymphs (200/1324, 15.1%; 95 CI: 13.2 – 17.1), larvae (8/110, 7.3%; 95 CI: 3.2 – 13.8). One out of three adult male ticks was positive.

The following species of the *B. burgdorferi* s.l. complex (Figure 2) were detected, listed in descending order of occurrence, with the corresponding number of *I. ricinus* ticks infected, the infection rate and 95% confidence interval: *B. afzelii* (136; 7.2%; 95 CI: 6.1 – 8.5), *B. garinii* (80; 4.2%; 95 CI: 3.4 – 5.3), *B. valaisiana* (37; 2.0%; 95 CI: 1.4 – 2.7), *B. burgdorferi* s.s. (25; 1.3% ; 95 CI: 0.9 – 1.9), *B. spielmanii* (8; 0.4%; 95 CI 0.18 – 0.83), *B. lusitaniae* (5; 0.3%; 95 CI: 0.09 – 0.6).

Among all *I. ricinus* stages, *B. afzelii* and *B. garinii* were the two most frequently detected *Borrelia* species (Table 3, Figure 2). The infection rate for *B. afzelii* ranged from 2.1% (3/146; 95 CI: 0.4 – 5.9) in NOR to 12.4 % (19/153; 95 CI: 7.6 – 18.7) in BFC, while it varies between 0% in PAC (0/35; 95 CI: 0 – 10) to 7.5% in CVL (11/146; 95 CI: 3.8 – 13.1) for *B. garinii*. Three regions, Brittany (BRE), Normandy (NOR), and Ile-de-France (IDF), had higher infection rates for *B. garinii* than for *B. afzelii*: BRE (6.8% vs. 2.3%), NOR (4.8% vs. 2.1%), and IDF (4.0% vs. 3.3%). In Centre-Val de Loire (CVL), both species had similar infection rates (7.5%). In all other regions, *B. afzelii* infection rates exceeded those of *B. garinii*: the differences were small in the NAQ, PAC and PDL regions, but more pronounced in Grand-Est (GES: 10.9% vs. 5.6% for *B. afzelii* and *B. garinii* respectively), Haut-de-France (HDF: 7.6% vs. 1.9%), Auvergne-Rhône-Alpes (ARA: 10.5% vs. 4.6%), Occitanie (OCC: 10.0% vs. 0.8%), Bourgogne-Franche-Comté (BFC: 12.4% vs. 2.0%). *B. bissettii* species was not detected.



Figure 2. Infection rate of *Borrelia burgdorferi* sensu lato per regions in analysed human biting *Ixodes ricinus* ticks (central map), and histograms of the specific infection rate of the main *Borrelia* species in each region. Central map: n: number of *I. ricinus* ticks analysed in the considered region. Histogram: Confidence interval 95%. Regions: 20R: Corse; ARA: Auvergne-Rhône-Alpes; BFC: Bourgogne-Franche-Comté; BRE: Bretagne; CVL: Centre-Val de Loire; GES: Grand-Est; HDF: Hauts-de-France; IDF: Île-de-France; NAQ: Nouvelle-Aquitaine; NOR: Normandie; OCC: Occitanie; PAC: Provence-Alpes-Côte d'Azur; PDL: Pays-de-la-Loire.

- ***Rickettsia* species**

Out of 2,009 human biting ticks tested, 172 were tested positive for *Rickettsia* spp., with 120 *R. helvetica,* the main species detected, all found in *I. ricinus* ticks. Other detected species included: *R. raoulti* (25 ticks, comprising 13 *D. reticulatus*, eight *I. ricinus* and four *D. marginatus*); uncultured spotted fever group *Rickettsia* spp. (13 ticks: seven *I. ricinus*, five undetermined ticks and one *D. marginatus*); *R. slovaca* (eight ticks: six *D. marginatus*, one *I.*

ricinus and one undetermined tick); *R. massiliae* (three ticks: two *R. sanguineus* s.l. and one undetermined tick); *R. aeschlimannii* (two undetermined ticks) and *R. felis* (one undetermined tick). *R. conorii* was not detected (Table 3).

As the high-throughput results for 171 *Rickettsia* were confirmed at the species level by PCR and sequencing, results allow the analysis of the variation of the number of species observed from one region to another (Figure 3). Five *Rickettsia* species were detected in the south-east in PAC region (i.e. *R. helvetica, R. raoulti, R. aeschlimannii,* and *R. massiliae* as well as the spotted fever related *Rickettsia spp.*) compared with just one in the CVL region (*R. helvetica*) in the north-west. A clear gradient was observed: in the west and north of France, *Rickettsia* species diversity is lower (mainly *R. helvetica* and *R. raoulti*) while diversity is higher in the south and east.

R. helvetica was exclusively detected in *I. ricinus* ticks, with an average infection rate at the country scale of 6.3% (120/1891; 95 CI: 5.3 - 7.5; Table 3, Figure 3). It ranged from 0 in 20R (no *I. ricinus* tick) to 11.3% in GES (32/284; 95 CI: 7.8 – 15.5) (Figure 3). Two north-eastern regions, BFC and GES, had the highest rates of 11.1% (17/153; 95 CI: 6.6 – 17.2) and 11.3% respectively, while BRE and PDL had the lowest, 0.5 (1/220; 95 CI: 0.01 – 2.5) and 0.7% (1/151; 95 CI: 0.02 – 3.6) respectively.

R. raoulti was present in 25 ticks distributed throughout France, with the exception of three regions 20R, CVL and PDL. Infection rates were generally below 2%, except in the PAC region, where they reached 6.8% (4/59; 95 CI: 1.8 – 16.5) (Figure 3).



Figure 3. Infection rate of *Rickettsia* spp. per regions in analysed human biting ticks (central map), and histogram of the specific infection rate of the main *Rickettsia* species in each region. Central map: n: number of ticks analysed in the considered region. Histogram: Confidence interval 95%. Regions: 20R: Corse; ARA: Auvergne-Rhône-Alpes; BFC: Bourgogne-Franche-Comté; BRE: Bretagne; CVL: Centre-Val de Loire; GES: Grand-Est; HDF: Hauts-de-France; IDF: Île-de-France; NAQ: Nouvelle-Aquitaine; NOR: Normandie; OCC: Occitanie; PAC: Provence-Alpes-Côte d'Azur; PDL: Pays-de-la-Loire.

- ***Anaplasma* species**

Of the six *Anaplasma* species targeted by the microfluidic chip, only *A. phagocytophilum* was detected, with 142 positive ticks. This corresponds to an average infection rate among French samples of 7.1% (142/2009; 95 CI: 6.0 - 8.4). Among the 142 positive ticks, the majority were *I. ricinus* (135/142, 95.1%; 95 CI: 90.1 – 98.0). The remaining seven positive ticks included three *Dermacentor* specimens (two *D. marginatus* in the ARA and PAC regions and one *D. reticulatus* in the NAQ region), one *R. sanguineus* s.l. from PAC region, and three undetermined ticks collected in IDF, NAQ and PDL regions. Infection rates in *I. ricinus*

varied across regions, from 3.9% (11/284; 95 CI: 1.95 – 6.8) in GES region to 12.6% (19/151; 95 CI: 7.7 – 19.0) in IDF region (Figure 4). Considering all genera and species of ticks, the infection rate was the highest for adult female ticks (25/272, 9.2%; 95 CI: 6.0 – 13.3) followed by nymphs (105/1346, 7.8%; 95 CI: 6.4 – 9.4) and larvae (5/112, 4.5%; 95 CI: 1.5 – 10.1). No males were infected.



Figure 4. Infection rate of *Anaplasma phagocytophilum* per regions in analysed human biting ticks. n: number of ticks analysed in the considered region. Regions: 20R: Corse; ARA: Auvergne-Rhône-Alpes; BFC: Bourgogne-Franche-Comté; BRE: Bretagne; CVL: Centre-Val de Loire; GES: Grand-Est; HDF: Hauts-de-France; IDF: Île-de-France; NAQ: Nouvelle-Aquitaine; NOR: Normandie; OCC: Occitanie; PAC: Provence-Alpes-Côte d'Azur; PDL: Pays-de-la-Loire.

- **Other microbes detected in ticks**

Fifty-seven ticks were tested positive for *Ehrlichia* spp., including 50 *Neoerlichia mikurensis,* all detected across different regions of France (Table 4), and exclusively in *I. ricinus*. Among all the other pathogens, *Erlichia spp.* was the only one detected in the Hauts-de-France region (HDF), with eight positive ticks, including seven *N. mikurensis* (data not shown in Table 4). No *E. canis* was detected.

Thirty-three *Apicomplexa* protozoans were detected across multiple regions, mainly in *I. ricinus* (28 ticks), as well as one *D. marginatus,* one *D. reticulatus* and three ticks of undetermined species (Table 3, Table 4).

Among the 25 *Babesia* spp. detections, five *B. microti* were found in *I. ricinus* from northeastern France: three in GES and two in BFC regions (Table 4). Fourteen *I. ricinus* were infected with *B. venatorum* across France. *Babesia divergens* was detected in five ticks: four *I. ricinus* and one *D. reticulatus*. A single *B. canis*, a known canine pathogen, was detected in an *I. ricinus* tick from the Normandy region (NOR) (Table 3, Table 4).

Two *Theileria* spp. were detected, but the tick species could not be determined.

Two *I. ricinus* and one *D. marginatus* were infected with *Hepatozoon* spp., which are considered as non-pathogenic parasites to humans (Table 3, Table 4). One *Bartonella henselae* was detected in an *I. ricinu*s tick in CVL region (0.7%; 95 CI: 0 - 3.7).

Babesia ovis, Babesia bovis, Babesia caballi, Mycoplasma spp.*, Coxiella* spp. were not detected. None of the pathogens listed in Table 4 were detected in ticks collected from regions 20R and PAC that is why these regions were not represented in Table 4.

Fifty-three ticks were infected with a non-pathogenic *Francisella-like* endosymbiont. They were detected in almost all regions, with infection rates ranging from 0.6% (95 CI: 0 - 3.5) in IDF to 3.6% (95 CI: 1.3 - 7.7) in ARA (Table 4).

Table 4
Count and Infection rate of less frequent pathogenic and non-pathogenic microbes founds in human biting ticks per regions. Infection rate are in percentage and 95% confidence interval are between brackets. n: total number of analysed ticks in each region. Regions: ARA: Auvergne-Rhône-Alpes; BFC: Bourgogne-Franche-Comté; BRE: Bretagne; CVL: Centre-Val de Loire; GES: Grand-Est; IDF: Île-de-France; NOR: Normandie; NAQ: Nouvelle-Aquitaine; OCC: Occitanie; PDL: Pays-de-la-Loire. Only regions with less frequent pathogens detected are represented in this table. Pathogens' higher taxonomical level are in bold letters. Non-pathogenic microbes are marked by an asterisk *.

Pathogens	Regions									
	ARA n=166	BFC n=157	BRE n=224	CVL n=149	GES n=298	IDF n=156	NOR n=150	NAQ n=174	OCC n=148	PDL n=166
***Ehrlichia* spp.**	**8; 4.8% (2.1-9.3)**	**7; 4.5% (1.8-9)**	**2; 0.9% (0.1-3.2)**	**7; 4.7% (1.9-9.4)**	**8; 2.7% (1.2-5.2)**	**1; 0.6% (0-3.5)**	**1; 0.7% (0-3.7)**	**7; 4% (1.6-8.1)**	**6; 4.1% (1.5-8.6)**	**2; 1.2% (0.1-4.3)**
Neoehrlichia mikurensis	8; 4.8% (2.1-9.3)	7; 4.5% (1.8-9)	0; 0% (0-1.6)	6; 4% (1.5-8.6)	8; 2.7% (1.2-5.2)	1; 0.6% (0-3.5)	0; 0% (0-2.4)	7; 4% (1.6-8.1)	6; 4.1% (1.5-8.6)	0; 0% (0-2.2)
Apicomplexa	**5; 3% (1-6.9)**	**4; 2.5% (0.7-6.4)**	**5; 2.2% (0.7-5.1)**	**2; 1.3% (0.2-4.8)**	**4; 1.3% (0.4-3.4)**	**3; 1.9% (0.4-5.5)**	**3; 2% (0.4-5.7)**	**4; 2.3% (0.6-5.8)**	**0; 0% (0-2.5)**	**3; 1.8% (0.4-5.2)**

***Babesia* spp.**	**3; 1.8% (0.4-5.2)**	**3; 1.9% (0.4-5.5)**	**4; 1.8% (0.5-4.5)**	**0; 0% (0-2.4)**	**5; 1.7% (0.5-3.9)**	**3; 1.9% (0.4-5.5)**	**3; 2% (0.4-5.7)**	**3; 1.7% (0.4-5)**	**0; 0% (0-2.5)**	**1; 0.6% (0-3.3)**
Babesia microti	0; 0% (0-2.2)	2; 1.3% (0.2-4.5)	0; 0% (0-1.6)	0; 0% (0-2.4)	3; 1% (0.2-2.9)	0; 0% (0-2.3)	0; 0% (0-2.4)	0; 0% (0-2.1)	0; 0% (0-2.5)	0; 0% (0-2.2)
Babesia venatorum	2; 1.2% (0.1-4.3)	1; 0.6% (0-3.5)	4; 1.8% (0.5-4.5)	0; 0% (0-2.4)	1; 0.3% (0-1.9)	2; 1.3% (0.2-4.6)	1; 0.7% (0-3.7)	2; 1.1% (0.1-4.1)	0; 0% (0-2.5)	1; 0.6% (0-3.3)
Babesia divergens	1; 0.6% (0-3.3)	0; 0% (0-2.3)	0; 0% (0-1.6)	0; 0% (0-2.4)	1; 0.3% (0-1.9)	1; 0.6% (0-3.5)	1; 0.7% (0-3.7)	1; 0.6% (0-3.2)	0; 0% (0-2.5)	0; 0% (0-2.2)
***Theileria* spp.**	**0; 0% (0-2.2)**	**0; 0% (0-2.3)**	**1; 0.4% (0-2.5)**	**0; 0% (0-2.4)**	**0; 0% (0-1.2)**	**0; 0% (0-2.3)**	**0; 0% (0-2.4)**	**1; 0.6% (0-3.2)**	**0; 0% (0-2.5)**	**0; 0% (0-2.2)**
***Hepatozoon* spp.**	1; 0.6% (0-3.3)	1; 0.6% (0-3.5)	0; 0% (0-1.6)	0; 0% (0-2.4)	0; 0% (0-1.2)	0; 0% (0-2.3)	0; 0% (0-2.4)	0; 0% (0-2.1)	0; 0% (0-2.5)	1; 0.6% (0-3.3)
Francisella-like* endosymbiont	6; 3.6% (1.3-7.7)	4; 2.5% (0.7-6.4)	8; 3.6% (1.6-6.9)	3; 2% (0.4-5.8)	9; 3% (1.4-5.7)	1; 0.6% (0-3.5)	3; 2.0% (0.4-5.7)	5; 2.9% (0.9-6.6)	2; 1.4% (0.2-4.8)	5; 3.0% (1-6.9)

- **Co-infection**

Ninety ticks were co-infected with two pathogens (4.5%) and ten were co-infected with three pathogens (0.5%) (Tables S2 and S3), representing 5.0% of the total tick sample. No significant difference in co-infection rates was observed between tick developmental stages. Co-infections were predominantly observed in *I. ricinus*, with 89 individuals carrying two pathogens and nine carrying three pathogens. Two *Dermacentor* were co-infected: one *D. reticulatus* with *B. divergen*s, *A. phagocytophilum*, and *R. raoulti;* and one *D. marginatus* with *A. phagocytophilum* and *R. slovaca*. Co-infection rates with another pathogen among pathogen positive ticks were as follow: 26.8% (78/291; 95 CI: 21.8 – 32.3) for *B. burgdorferi* s.l. infected ticks, 54% (27/50; 95 CI: 39.3 – 68.2) for *N. mikurensis* infected ticks, 29.6 % (42/142; 95 CI: 22.2 – 37.8) for *A. phagocytophilum* infected ticks, 25% (30/120; 95 CI: 17.5 – 33.7) for *R. helvetica* infected ticks, and 60% (15/25; 95 CI: 38.7 – 78.9) for *Babesia*-infected ticks. The most frequent association involved *B. afzelii* and *N. mikurensis,* detected together 20 ticks. Fifteen ticks were co-infected with *Babesia* spp.: the involved species were *B. venatorum* (5 ticks, including 4 with *B. burgdorferi* s.l.), *B. microti* (5 ticks), *B. divergens* (4 ticks), *B. canis* (1 tick) (Tables S2 and S3).

Discussion

This study highlights the value of citizen science to investigate the distribution of biting ticks and their pathogens on a large spatio-temporal scale. By analyzing human-biting ticks using a broad-spectrum targeting method which tests for a range of 43 potential pathogens, we accessed to the diversity of tick-borne bacterial and protozoan pathogens that humans are exposed to in France through bites of different tick species. Twenty-two different pathogens were detected in our study, with 19 of them being associated with potential risk for human health, underlining the importance of looking for a large diversity of pathogens. Overall, pathogens distribution was widespread across the country, and, while there were some spatial variations, no region has been found free of tick-borne pathogens. Detected tick numbers, and infection rates of pathogens were consistent with ranges found in previous studies on questing ticks in France, where ranges can be sometimes wide (Michelet et al., 2016; Grech-Angelini et al., 2020; Lebert et al., 2020; Perez et al., 2023). In our study, some places were studied for the first time thanks to citizen participation, which represents a huge improvement in the knowledge of the distribution of tick exposure and of infection rates of ticks and tick-borne pathogens in France, in addition to what is known in the literature (Perez et al., 2023). Specifically, it confirms the widespread presence of *I. ricinus* throughout the territory, and some of its less-studied pathogens in France, such as *Neorhlichia mikurensis* or *Rickettsia helvetica* (Perez et al., 2023). Some pathogens known to be present in France were not found in our study, like *Francisella tularensis*, *Coxiella burnetti*, *Ehrlichia canis*, *Babesia bovis*. This might be explained by their usually low prevalence, as previously observed in questing ticks (Perez et al., 2023). Additional sampling effort among the biting-tick collection of CiTIQUE should be made to confirm these results; one possibility would be for example to target specific groups like breeders to search for *C. burnetti* and *B. bovis*.

According to our results, the human-biting ticks were mostly *I. ricinus* nymphs, apart from the Mediterranean regions (PAC and COR) where mostly *Dermacentor* and *Rhipicephalus* ticks were found. This corresponds to the expected distribution of these species, especially *I. ricinus* which is less prevalent in southeastern France, where the hot and dry climate is less favorable for its development and survival while being better for *Rhipicephalus* ticks (Lebert et al., 2022; Wongnak et al., 2022; Perez et al., 2023). Although we could have expected to have higher number of adult ticks, that are easier to detect by citizens (Eisen and Eisen, 2021), we received *I. ricinus* stages respectively, in proportion similar to other studies on human-biting ticks in other European countries (Mietze et al., 2011; Laaksonen et al., 2017; Nieto et al., 2018; Lernout et al., 2019; Audino et al., 2021). This observed distribution of stages is consistent with known biology of *I. ricinus*. Still, if our results do not seem to show a bias toward detecting a biting tick, it shows a bias in the time it takes to detect and remove the ticks, as nymphs were significantly more collected engorged than females.

Across France, the average infection rate of biting ticks was 29.9%, with infected ticks carrying one to three pathogens. This rate is not homogeneous in France and depends on both the regions and the pathogens concerned. Spatial heterogeneity is observed in the north of France along an east-west gradient: the regions of the northeast (GES and BFC) have the highest rates while the regions of the northwest (NOR, BRE and PDL) are characterized by a lower infection rate. This heterogeneity seems to be linked to a variation in the distribution of the pathogens *B. afzelii* and *R. helvetica*, and to a lesser extent to *B. garinii*. This infection rate of 29.9% must be interpreted with caution because it does not mean that all people bitten

by infected ticks have been infected and developed a disease. Several reasons explain this caution: The method used for pathogen detection is based on DNA amplification and does not distinguish between living and dead microorganisms. Furthermore, as no genotyping analysis was performed, the strains or genotype detected may not have been infectious to humans (Radolf et al., 2021). The method was applied to pathogenic bacteria and protozoa, which are usually transmitted to the host within several hours after starting the blood meal. Pathogen transmission is generally limited if the tick is removed quickly (CDC, 2025). The risk of developing a disease can also be related to human vulnerability (De Keukeleire et al., 2015), for example *B. miyamotoi* is mainly detected in immunocompromised patients (Rubio et al., 2023).We did not find any effect of engorgement on tick infection rate, suggesting absence of reverse transmission from humans to ticks sampled here. Nonetheless, the percentage of infected biting ticks revealed by this study calls for a reminder of the proper preventive measures against the risk of tick bites and for continuing to raise awareness of this risk among all citizens in France, regardless of where they live.

Borrelia was the most frequently detected pathogen. It is not surprising given the incidence of Lyme disease in France and the dominance of *I. ricinus* among collected ticks. There were spatial discrepancies in the distribution of the different genospecies. The northwestern regions (NOR and BRE) had lower level of *B. afzelii* in comparison to others regions but higher levels of *B. garinii*. These spatial discrepancies could reflect a difference in reservoir host distribution and availability (*B. afzelii* is associated with micro-mammals; *B. garinii* with birds), or some variation within-species *I. ricinus* genetic (Gray et al., 2021). *Borrelia* was almost absent from samples from the PAC region, due to the fact that the sampling effort was lower and also because the ticks reported belonged to species other than *I. ricinus*. However, an infected*I. ricinus* tick by *Borrelia* was found, confirming the presence of this pathogen in the French Mediterranean region (Sevestre et al., 2021). This spatial heterogeneity merits further investigation and is presently explored in a subsequent study (Bah et al., 2025). Interestingly we found that 7.2 % of the *I. ricinus* larvae were infected by a *B. burgdorferi* s.l. genospecies. While transovarial transmission of *B. burgdorferi* s.l. was thought to be very unlikely, recent studies have shown that it is possible to find infected questing larvae, and that these infected larvae are even able to infect a new host (van Duijvendijk et al., 2016; Grigoryeva et al., 2024). Larval infection can result from transovarial infection or interrupted feeding, depending on the *Borrelia* genospecies or strain involved. Although unlikely and undocumented, reverse transmission from humans to larvae cannot be entirely excluded, even if there was no effect of engorgement on tick infection. The different results suggest that larval tick may contribute to Lyme disease transmission risk, which probably require further investigation and evaluation. Prevention messages usually consider larvae as not at risk for Lyme disease transmission, and should be corrected.

Not surprisingly, *Rickettsia* species diversity was highest in the PAC region, where we found a higher diversity of tick vector species. This reinforces results from previous studies (Parola et al., 2013; Jumpertz et al., 2023). *R. helvetica* was the most frequently detected species, consistent with its known association with *I. ricinus*. It has been reported in some clinical cases but its pathogen's potential is still debated (De Vito et al., 2020). *Rickettsia raoultii* was also detected across all regions of France, albeit at lower rates. This suggests that SENLAT cases can occur nationwide, aligning with the increasing incidence of such cases in recent years. Altogether, *Rickettsia*-infected ticks were less frequently detected in the Northwestern regions of France, which likely reflects differences in reservoir host distribution and

availability, even if the reservoir hosts of *R. helvetica* are not clearly established (Hornok et al., 2014).

The infection rate of *A. phagocytophilum* was unexpectedly low in the northeastern region (GES), despite it being the region where most diagnoses occur in France (Rigaud et al., 2016).This could be due to under-reporting of human cases in other regions and/or limited awareness of the disease. Another possible explanation lies in the host specificity of the *A. phagocytophilum* ecotypes, as not all strains are associated with human infection but rather primarily infect ruminants (Jaarsma et al., 2019). Conversely, the unexpectedly higher infection rate observed in IDF, may reflect natural fluctuations in prevalence across different years. Some high percentage of *A. phagocytophilum*-infected ticks were indeed found in previous studies in forests of IDF region (Halos et al., 2006; Paul et al., 2016).

Concerning other detected pathogens, *N. mikurensis* was found at low infection rate in almost all regions of France, but nearly none in the northwestern regions. Infection rate is similar to what has been found in questing ticks in a previous study in GES and BRE region (Boyer et al., 2021). As a relatively newly recognized pathogen, it warrants further attention, especially given its non-negligible presence. Its main reservoir hosts are supposed to be small mammals (Burri et al., 2014), which could again explain why it is less present in the north-western regions of France. Indeed, our results on pathogens associated to small mammals, would suggest a lower presence of small mammals in north-western regions. This could be due to different small mammal's communities in this area, with fewer competent host, and/or a higher presence of non-competent host which could be responsible for a dilution effect. Alternatively, it could reflect a difference in the seasonality of *I. ricinus* larval activity and peak activity of small mammals, resulting in larvae feeding preferentially on other type of hosts.

5% of ticks were infected by more than one pathogen. This result might be underestimated if we consider co-infections between *Borrelia* genospecies that are quite common (Herrmann et al., 2013), and that our method using PCR and sequencing confirmation steps could not determine. However, it actually gives a result that could be representative of co-infection by different potential pathogen species. Indeed, our results are quite similar to co-infection percentages found in humans (Boyer et al., 2022) but lower than percentages found in some questing ticks that have taken into account co-infections by different *Borrelia* (Lommano et al., 2012; Moutailler et al., 2016). The most common co-infections involved *B. burgdorferi* s.l. and *A. phagocytophilum* or *N. mikurensis*, which were expected given their high prevalence. Among co-infected ticks, *N. mikurensis*-infected ticks were more frequently co-infected with other pathogens (54%) than ticks infected with other pathogens, suggesting co-infections might be a facilitating factor for *N. mikurensis* to infect ticks. Such a facilitation process has already been suggested for *Babesia* infections (Boyer et al., 2022) which were also mainly found in our study in co-infection with other pathogens (60%). Consequently, when faced with a *N. mikurensis* infection, general practitioners should think of searching for possible co-infections.

From a methodological standpoint, the present approach proved particularly suitable to describe human exposure to *Borrelia* spp. causing Lyme borreliosis, as well as several neglected bacterial and protozoan pathogens transmitted by *I. ricinus* and other tick species. Citizen participation is essential to collect data at a large scale, and their continuing

contribution should lead to spatially finer results in coming years that could be useful for other purposes. Indeed, such large-scale dataset represent a valuable resource to support future modeling efforts aiming to better understand the spatiotemporal dynamics of human exposure to tick-borne pathogens. Furthemore, improving sampling representativeness among the CiTIQUE biting tick collection through a more stratified and regionally balanced strategy, would further improve the depth and the robustness of such analyses. This could also be strengthened by improving citizen enrollment in underrepresented regions. Combining citizen-collected human-biting ticks with questing tick surveys, such as with coordinated flagging campaigns, could also provide complementary insights into tick and pathogen distributions. At a very local scale, it might even allow a rigorous comparison between human-biting and questing ticks. This comparison could (i) quantify biases in tick pathogen exposure derived from each sampling method, (ii) compare pathogen diversity between biting and free-living ticks, and (iii) test whether carriage of particular pathogens confers ecological or behavioral advantages to the tick.

Conclusions

This study highlights the power of citizen science in mapping the diversity and distribution of tick-borne pathogens across France. Our nationwide survey of human-biting ticks revealed 22 bacterial and protozoan tick-borne pathogens, 19 of which have potential human health implications. While spatial heterogeneity was observed—especially for *Borrelia*, *Rickettsia*, and *Anaplasma* species—no region was free of infected ticks. Specifically, it would be interesting to investigate environmental factors that could explain this spatial heterogeneity. Humans were mostly bitten by *I. ricinus* nymphs, apart from the Mediterranean region. Co-infections, mainly involving *Borrelia* and *Anaplasma* or *Neoehrlichia*, were found in about 5% of ticks, indicating complex pathogen interactions.

Overall, this study confirms that ticks and their pathogens are widespread in France and underscores the value of citizen participation for spatio-temporal large-scale surveillance of tick risk. Two emerging public health concerns related to ticks are currently under increased scrutiny in France. The progressive expansion of *Hyalomma* spp., vectors of Crimean-Congo Hemorrhagic Fever virus (CCHFV), highlights the need for targeted surveillance efforts focusing on these species, particularly in regions where they are established or near the current invasion front. Similarly, the ongoing circulation of Tick-Borne Encephalitis virus (TBEV) transmitted by *I. ricinus* raises questions about how the spatial distribution of other tick-borne pathogens may reflect ecological conditions conducive to TBEV transmission. While viral detection remains challenging within the current CiTIQUE framework, due to constraints related to viral genome stability in collected samples, such ecological proxies could help guide future targeted surveillance strategies. These aspects underline the importance of adapting citizen science tools to evolving epidemiological contexts. But it also highlights that future efforts should consider high-risk populations and viral pathogens to refine risk assessments and improve public health responses. In addition, the establishment of a permanent and upkeeping collection of human biting tick is a distinctive feature of CiTIQUE. By maintaining this resource and making it available to the national and international scientific community, we aim to encourage further research to address new and emerging question in tick-borne disease and public health.

Supplementary information

Additional files:

Table S1: Lists of pathogens, tick species, targeted gene and primers

Table S2: Co-infection by two pathogens. The pathogens in asterisk were found in *Dermacentor reticulatus*.

Table S3: Co-infection by three pathogens. The pathogens in asterisk are found in *Dermacentor reticulatus*.

Data availability

Data will be available from the Recherche Data Gouv Repository here: To be completed when accepted.

Ethics approval and consent to participate

Approval of the ethics committee was not required since participation in sending ticks was voluntary and the short questionnaire online was anonymous (no identification possible). The participants are given information about the study on the website of the project.

Funding

This project was made possible through significant funding from different sources, including from the Ministry of Health and Access to Care, the Laboratory of Excellence ARBRE (ANR-11-LABX-0002-01), the Grand Est Region, the European Regional Development Fund, the "Des Hommes et Des Arbres" investment program (Territoire d'Innovation), the Groupama Foundation, and the Fondation de France. This project was also carried out with own funding from ANSES and INRAE.

Competing interests

The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

Declaration of generative AI in scientific writing

During the preparation of this work the authors used ChatGPT and deepL in order to improve english writing. After using this tool/service, the authors reviewed and edited the content as needed and take full responsibility for the content of the published article.

Acknowledgments

Our thoughts are with Jean-François Cosson (JFC) and Béatrice Palin, who passed away in 2019 and 2022. JFC co-created the CiTIQUE project in 2016 alongside PFK and MVT, and co-designed, with PFK, the foundational structure of the program, including the Signalement TIQUE mobile application and its associated database, which has since become a crucial source of data for research. He also produced and analyzed the initial data that were utilized in

this publication. Béatrice Palin was the first “tick librarian” of the program and collaborated with PFK in the design and implementation of the initial procedures for archiving ticks sent in by citizens.

We extend our gratitude to all the citizens and CiTIQUE partners who made this project possible by reporting tick bites and sending the collected ticks to the tick library, as well as to Sandrine Capizzi and the volunteers from CPIE who contributed to raising awareness about the program.

We acknowledge the dedicated work of the tick librarians who have archived all the ticks sent in by citizens (Béatrice Palin, Zoé Gelhaye-Henrion, Sofian Chebli, Antonin Frey, Clémentine Lapie, Tom Beyaert, Aloïs Chevalier, Léane Lémery, Clémentine Frey, Sarah Ost, Eulalie Rathgeber, Sarah Guinet, Sandrine Warion).

We thank Mikaël Carlavan for his assistance in the development of the tick library database alongside JM, as well as Jean-Marc Armand for developing the first version of the Signalement TIQUE application.

CRediT authorship contribution statement

Jonas Durand: Writing – original draft, Writing – review and editing, Conceptualization, Methodology, Formal analysis, Investigation, Data Curation. **Thierno Bah Madiou:** Writing – original draft, Writing – review and editing, Formal analysis, Data curation, Visualization. **Isabelle Lebert:** Writing – original draft, Writing – review and editing, Formal analysis, Data curation. **Clémence Galon:** Writing – review and editing, Methodology, Investigation, Validation. **Irene Carravieri:** Writing – review and editing, Resources. **Sébastien Masseglia:** Writing – review and editing, Validation. **Jean-Marc Armand:** Writing – review and editing, Software, Resources. **Julien Marchand:** Writing – review and editing, Software, Resources. **Cyril Galley:** Writing – review and editing, Resources. **Karine Chalvet-Monfray:** Writing – review and editing, Formal analysis, Supervision. **Muriel Vayssier-Taussat:** Writing – review and editing, Conceptualization, Funding acquisition. **Gwenaël Vourc’h:** Writing – review and editing, Conceptualization. **Annick Brun-Jacob:** Writing – review and editing, Resources, Project administration, Funding acquisition. **Sara Moutailler:** Writing – review and editing, Methodology, Resources, Project administration. **Xavier Bailly:** Writing – review and editing, Formal analysis, Resources, Supervision. **Pascale Frey-Klett:** Writing – review and editing, Conceptualization, Formal analysis, Resources, Supervision, Project administration, Funding acquisition.

References

Audino, T., A. Pautasso, V. Bellavia, V. Carta, A. Ferrari, F. Verna, C. Grattarola, B. Iulini, M.D. Pintore, M. Bardelli, G. Cassina, L. Tomassone, S. Peletto, V. Blanda, A. Torina, M. Caramelli, C. Casalone, and R. Desiato, 2021: Ticks infesting humans and associated pathogens: a cross-sectional study in a 3-year period (2017–2019) in northwest Italy. *Parasit. Vectors* **14**, 136, DOI: 10.1186/s13071-021-04603-x.

Banović, P., A. Foucault-Simonin, L. Papić, S. Savić, A. Potkonjak, A. Jurišić, M. Radenković, D. Mijatović, V. Simin, I. Bogdan, Z. Zając, J. Kulisz, A. Woźniak, D.

Hartmann, J. Perner, A. Wu-Chuang, L. Mateos-Hernandez, S. Moutailler, and A. Cabezas-Cruz, 2024: One health approach to study human health risks associated with *Dermanyssus gallinae* mites. *Heliyon* **10**, e30539, DOI: 10.1016/j.heliyon.2024.e30539.

Bernard, C., C.J. Kukla, I. Rakotoarivony, M. Duhayon, F. Stachurski, K. Huber, C. Giupponi, I. Zortman, P. Holzmuller, T. Pollet, M. Jeanneau, A. Mercey, N. Vachiery, T. Lefrançois, C. Garros, V. Michaud, L. Comtet, L. Despois, P. Pourquier, C. Picard, A. Journeaux, D. Thomas, S. Godard, E. Moissonnier, S. Mely, M. Sega, D. Pannetier, S. Baize, and L. Vial, 2024: Detection of Crimean–Congo haemorrhagic fever virus in *Hyalomma marginatum* ticks, southern France, May 2022 and April 2023. *Eurosurveillance* **29**, 2400023, DOI: 10.2807/1560-7917.ES.2024.29.6.2400023.

Boulanger, N., L. Zilliox, V. Goldstein, P. Boyer, D. Napolitano, and B. Jaulhac, 2018: Surveillance du vecteur de la borréliose de Lyme, *Ixodes ricinus*, en Alsace de 2013 à 2016. *Bull. Epidémiologique Hebd.-BEH* **19**, 400–5.

Boyer, P.H., L. Baldinger, B. Degeilh, X. Wirth, C.M. Kamdem, Y. Hansmann, L. Zilliox, N. Boulanger, and B. Jaulhac, 2021: The emerging tick-borne pathogen *Neoehrlichia mikurensis*: first French case series and vector epidemiology. *Emerg. Microbes Infect.* **10**, 1731–1738, DOI: 10.1080/22221751.2021.1973347.

Boyer, P.H., C. Lenormand, B. Jaulhac, and E. Talagrand-Reboul, 2022: Human Co-Infections between *Borrelia burgdorferi* s.l. and Other Ixodes-Borne Microorganisms: A Systematic Review. *Pathogens* **11**, 282, DOI: 10.3390/pathogens11030282.

Burri, C., O. Schumann, C. Schumann, and L. Gern, 2014: Are *Apodemus* spp. mice and *Myodes glareolus* reservoirs for *Borrelia miyamotoi*, *Candidatus* Neoehrlichia mikurensis, *Rickettsia helvetica*, *R. monacensis* and *Anaplasma phagocytophilum*? *Ticks Tick-Borne Dis.* **5**, 245–251, DOI: 10.1016/j.ttbdis.2013.11.007.

CDC, 2025 (23. July): Lyme Disease, How Lyme Disease Spreads [Online] Available at https://www.cdc.gov/lyme/causes/index.html (accessed August 11, 2025).

De Keukeleire, M., S.O. Vanwambeke, E. Somassè, B. Kabamba, V. Luyasu, and A. Robert, 2015: Scouts, forests, and ticks: Impact of landscapes on human-tick contacts. *Ticks Tick-Borne Dis.* **6**, 636–644, DOI: 10.1016/j.ttbdis.2015.05.008.

De Vito, A., N. Geremia, S.M. Mameli, V. Fiore, P.A. Serra, G. Rocchitta, S. Nuvoli, A. Spanu, R. Lobrano, A. Cossu, S. Babudieri, and G. Madeddu, 2020: Epidemiology, Clinical Aspects, Laboratory Diagnosis and Treatment of Rickettsial Diseases in the Mediterranean Area During COVID-19 Pandemic: A Review of the Literature. *Mediterr. J. Hematol. Infect. Dis.* **12**, e2020056, DOI: 10.4084/MJHID.2020.056.

Drazenovich, N., D.J. Foley, and R.N. Brown, 2006 (3. April): https://home.liebertpub.com/vbz, Use of Real-Time Quantitative PCR Targeting the msp2 Protein Gene to Identify Cryptic *Anaplasma phagocytophilum* Infections in Wildlife and Domestic Animals [Online] Available at https://www.liebertpub.com/doi/10.1089/vbz.2006.6.83 (accessed June 24, 2025). research-article, Mary Ann Liebert, Inc. 2 Madison Avenue Larchmont, NY 10538 USA.

Eisen, L., 2020: Vector competence studies with hard ticks and *Borrelia burgdorferi* sensu lato spirochetes: A review. *Ticks Tick-Borne Dis.* **11**, 101359, DOI: 10.1016/j.ttbdis.2019.101359.

Eisen, L., and R.J. Eisen, 2016: Critical Evaluation of the Linkage Between Tick-Based Risk Measures and the Occurrence of Lyme Disease Cases. *J. Med. Entomol.* **53**, 1050–1062, DOI: 10.1093/jme/tjw092.

Eisen, L., and R.J. Eisen, 2021: Benefits and Drawbacks of Citizen Science to Complement Traditional Data Gathering Approaches for Medically Important Hard Ticks (Acari: *Ixodidae*) in the United States. *J. Med. Entomol.* **58**, 1–9, DOI: 10.1093/jme/tjaa165.

Estrada-Peña, A., A.D. Mihalca, and T.N. Petney, 2018: Ticks of Europe and North Africa: A Guide to Species Identification. Springer.

Frey-Klett, P., A. Brun-Jacob, J. Marchand, P. Boniface, C. Ortmans, G. Salvat, J.-M. Armand, and J.-F. Cosson, 2018: La recherche participative CiTIQUE. *Rev. For. Fr.* **70**, 205–208, DOI: 10.4267/2042/69997.

Gondard, M., S. Delannoy, V. Pinarello, R. Aprelon, E. Devillers, C. Galon, J. Pradel, M. Vayssier-Taussat, E. Albina, and S. Moutailler, 2020: Upscaling the Surveillance of Tick-Borne Pathogens in the French Caribbean Islands. *Pathogens* **9**, 176, DOI: 10.3390/pathogens9030176.

Gray, J., O. Kahl, and A. Zintl, 2021: What do we still need to know about Ixodes ricinus? *Ticks Tick-Borne Dis.* **12**, 101682, DOI: 10.1016/j.ttbdis.2021.101682.

Grech-Angelini, S., F. Stachurski, M. Vayssier-Taussat, E. Devillers, F. Casabianca, R. Lancelot, G. Uilenberg, and S. Moutailler, 2020: Tick-borne pathogens in ticks (Acari: Ixodidae) collected from various domestic and wild hosts in Corsica (France), a Mediterranean island environment. *Transbound. Emerg. Dis.* **67**, 745–757, DOI: 10.1111/tbed.13393.

Grigoryeva, L.A., O.A. Miteva, D.V. Kustova, and A.B. Shatrov, 2024: Transovarial and transstadial transmission of *Borrelia valaisiana*, the pathogen of Lyme borreliosis, in the sheep tick, *Ixodes ricinus* L. *Exp. Appl. Acarol.* **94**, 6, DOI: 10.1007/s10493-024-00973-w.

Guglielmone, A.A., and R.G. Robbins, 2018: Hard Ticks (Acari: Ixodida: Ixodidae) Parasitizing Humans: A Global Overview. Cham: Springer International Publishing.

Halos, L., G. Vourc'h, V. Cotte, P. Gasqui, J. Barnouin, H.-J. Boulous, and M. Vayssier‐Taussat, 2006: Prevalence of *Anaplasma phagocytophilum*, *Rickettsia* sp. and *Borrelia burgdorferi* sensu lato DNA in Questing *Ixodes ricinus* Ticks from France. *Ann. N. Y. Acad. Sci.* **1078**, 316–319, DOI: 10.1196/annals.1374.059.

Herrmann, C., L. Gern, and M.J. Voordouw, 2013: Species Co-Occurrence Patterns among Lyme Borreliosis Pathogens in the Tick Vector *Ixodes ricinus*. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* **79**, 7273–7280, DOI: 10.1128/AEM.02158-13.

Hildebrandt, A., J.S. Gray, and K.-P. Hunfeld, 2013: Human Babesiosis in Europe: what clinicians need to know. *Infection* **41**, 1057–1072, DOI: 10.1007/s15010-013-0526-8.

Hornok, S., D. Kováts, T. Csörgő, M.L. Meli, E. Gönczi, Z. Hadnagy, N. Takács, R. Farkas, and R. Hofmann-Lehmann, 2014: Birds as potential reservoirs of tick-borne pathogens: first evidence of bacteraemia with *Rickettsia helvetica*. *Parasit. Vectors* **7**, 128, DOI: 10.1186/1756-3305-7-128.

Jaarsma, R.I., H. Sprong, K. Takumi, M. Kazimirova, C. Silaghi, A. Mysterud, I. Rudolf, R. Beck, G. Földvári, L. Tomassone, M. Groenevelt, R.R. Everts, J.M. Rijks, F. Ecke, B. Hörnfeldt, D. Modrý, K. Majerová, J. Votýpka, and A. Estrada-Peña, 2019: *Anaplasma phagocytophilum* evolves in geographical and biotic niches of vertebrates and ticks. *Parasit. Vectors* **12**, 328, DOI: 10.1186/s13071-019-3583-8.

Jumpertz, M., J. Sevestre, L. Luciani, L. Houhamdi, P.-E. Fournier, and P. Parola, 2023: Bacterial Agents Detected in 418 Ticks Removed from Humans during 2014–2021, France. *Emerg. Infect. Dis.* **29**, 701–710, DOI: 10.3201/eid2904.221572.

Kilpatrick, A.M., A.D.M. Dobson, T. Levi, D.J. Salkeld, A. Swei, H.S. Ginsberg, A. Kjemtrup, K.A. Padgett, P.M. Jensen, D. Fish, N.H. Ogden, and M.A. Diuk-Wasser, 2017: Lyme disease ecology in a changing world: consensus, uncertainty and critical gaps for improving control. *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci.* **372**, 20160117, DOI: 10.1098/rstb.2016.0117.

Kiwan, P., S. Masse, G. Piorkowski, N. Ayhan, M. Gasparine, L. Vial, R.N. Charrel, X. de Lamballerie, and A. Falchi, 2024: Crimean-Congo Hemorrhagic Fever Virus in Ticks Collected from Cattle, Corsica, France, 2023. *Emerg. Infect. Dis.* **30**, 1036–1039, DOI: 10.3201/eid3005.231742.

Laaksonen, M., E. Sajanti, J.J. Sormunen, R. Penttinen, J. Hänninen, K. Ruohomäki, I. Sääksjärvi, E.J. Vesterinen, I. Vuorinen, J. Hytönen, and T. Klemola, 2017: Crowdsourcing-based nationwide tick collection reveals the distribution of *Ixodes ricinus* and *I. persulcatus* and associated pathogens in Finland. *Emerg. Microbes Infect.* **6**, 1–7, DOI: 10.1038/emi.2017.17.

Lebert, I., A. Agoulon, S. Bastian, A. Butet, B. Cargnelutti, N. Cèbe, A. Chastagner, E. Léger, B. Lourtet, S. Masseglia, K.D. McCoy, J. Merlet, V. Noël, G. Perez, D. Picot, A. Pion, V. Poux, J.-L. Rames, Y. Rantier, H. Verheyden, G. Vourc'h, and O. Plantard, 2020: Distribution of ticks, tick-borne pathogens and the associated local environmental factors including small mammals and livestock, in two French agricultural sites: the OSCAR database. *Biodivers. Data J.* **8**, e50123, DOI: 10.3897/BDJ.8.e50123.

Lebert, I., S. Bord, C. Saint-Andrieux, E. Cassar, P. Gasqui, F. Beugnet, K. Chalvet-Monfray, S.O. Vanwambeke, G. Vourc'h, and M. René-Martellet, 2022: Habitat suitability map of *Ixodes ricinus* tick in France using multi-criteria analysis. *Geospatial Health* **17**, DOI: 10.4081/gh.2022.1058.

Lernout, T., N. De Regge, K. Tersago, M. Fonville, V. Suin, and H. Sprong, 2019: Prevalence of pathogens in ticks collected from humans through citizen science in Belgium. *Parasit. Vectors* **12**, 550, DOI: 10.1186/s13071-019-3806-z.

Lommano, E., L. Bertaiola, C. Dupasquier, and L. Gern, 2012: Infections and Coinfections of Questing *Ixodes ricinus* Ticks by Emerging Zoonotic Pathogens in Western Switzerland. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* **78**, 4606–4612, DOI: 10.1128/AEM.07961-11.

Margos, G., S. Hepner, and V. Fingerle, 2022: Characteristics of *Borrelia burgdorferi sensu lato*, pp. 1–29. In: Hunfeld, Klaus-Peter, and Jeremy Gray (eds), Lyme Borreliosis. Cham: Springer International Publishing.

Melis, S., G. Batisti Biffignandi, E. Olivieri, C. Galon, N. Vicari, P. Prati, S. Moutailler, D. Sassera, and M. Castelli, 2024: High-throughput screening of pathogens in *Ixodes ricinus* removed from hosts in Lombardy, northern Italy. *Ticks Tick-Borne Dis.* **15**, 102285, DOI: 10.1016/j.ttbdis.2023.102285.

Michelet, L., S. Delannoy, E. Devillers, G. Umhang, A. Aspan, M. Juremalm, J. Chirico, F.J. van der Wal, H. Sprong, T.P. Boye Pihl, K. Klitgaard, R. Bødker, P. Fach, and S. Moutailler, 2014: High-throughput screening of tick-borne pathogens in Europe. *Front. Cell. Infect. Microbiol.* **4**, DOI: 10.3389/fcimb.2014.00103.

Michelet, L., G. Joncour, E. Devillers, A. Torina, M. Vayssier-Taussat, S.I. Bonnet, and S. Moutailler, 2016: Tick species, tick-borne pathogens and symbionts in an insular environment off the coast of Western France. *Ticks Tick-Borne Dis.* **7**, 1109–1115, DOI: 10.1016/j.ttbdis.2016.08.014.

Mietze, A., C. Strube, M. Beyerbach, T. Schnieder, and R. Goethe, 2011: Occurrence of *Bartonella henselae* and *Borrelia burgdorferi* sensu lato co-infections in ticks collected from humans in Germany. *Clin. Microbiol. Infect.* **17**, 918–920, DOI: 10.1111/j.1469-0691.2010.03363.x.

Moutailler, S., L. Bournez, and J. Durand, 2023: Expansion des maladies à tiques, implication de la société civile dans la surveillance (sciences participatives) et développement d'outils innovants pour leur détection. *Epidémiologie Santé Anim.*

Moutailler, S., C. Valiente Moro, E. Vaumourin, L. Michelet, F.H. Tran, E. Devillers, J.-F. Cosson, P. Gasqui, V.T. Van, P. Mavingui, G. Vourc'h, and M. Vayssier-Taussat, 2016: Co-infection of Ticks: The Rule Rather Than the Exception. *PLoS Negl. Trop. Dis.* **10**, e0004539, DOI: 10.1371/journal.pntd.0004539.

Nieto, N.C., W.T. Porter, J.C. Wachara, T.J. Lowrey, L. Martin, P.J. Motyka, and D.J. Salkeld, 2018: Using citizen science to describe the prevalence and distribution of tick bite and exposure to tick-borne diseases in the United States. *PLOS ONE* **13**, e0199644, DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0199644.

Oteo, J.A., and A. Portillo, 2012: Tick-borne rickettsioses in Europe. *Ticks Tick-Borne Dis.* **3**, 271–278, DOI: 10.1016/j.ttbdis.2012.10.035.

Paleau, A., E. Candolfi, L. Souply, D. De Briel, J.M. Delarbre, D. Lipsker, M. Jouglin, L. Malandrin, Y. Hansmann, and M. Martinot, 2020: Human babesiosis in Alsace. *Médecine Mal. Infect.* **50**, 486–491, DOI: 10.1016/j.medmal.2019.08.007.

Parola, P., C.D. Paddock, C. Socolovschi, M.B. Labruna, O. Mediannikov, T. Kernif, M.Y. Abdad, J. Stenos, I. Bitam, P.-E. Fournier, and D. Raoult, 2013: Update on tick-borne rickettsioses around the world: a geographic approach. *Clin. Microbiol. Rev.* **26**, 657–702, DOI: 10.1128/CMR.00032-13.

Paul, R.E.L., M. Cote, E. Le Naour, and S.I. Bonnet, 2016: Environmental factors influencing tick densities over seven years in a French suburban forest. *Parasit. Vectors* **9**, 309, DOI: 10.1186/s13071-016-1591-5.

Perez, G., L. Bournez, N. Boulanger, J. Fite, B. Livoreil, K.D. McCoy, E. Quillery, M. René-Martellet, and S.I. Bonnet, 2023: The distribution, phenology, host range and pathogen prevalence of *Ixodes ricinus* in France: a systematic map and narrative review. *Peer Community J.* **3**, DOI: 10.24072/pcjournal.291.

Pérez-Eid, C., 2007: Les tiques : identification, biologie, importance médicale et vétérinaire. Lavoisier.

Porter, W.T., P.J. Motyka, J. Wachara, Z.A. Barrand, Z. Hmood, M. McLaughlin, K. Pemberton, and N.C. Nieto, 2019: Citizen science informs human-tick exposure in the Northeastern United States. *Int. J. Health Geogr.* **18**, 9, DOI: 10.1186/s12942-019-0173-0.

Porter, W.T., J. Wachara, Z.A. Barrand, N.C. Nieto, and D.J. Salkeld, 2021: Citizen Science Provides an Efficient Method for Broad-Scale Tick-Borne Pathogen Surveillance of *Ixodes pacificus* and *Ixodes scapularis* across the United States. *mSphere* **6**, 10.1128/msphere.00682-21, DOI: 10.1128/msphere.00682-21.

R Core Team, 2023: R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing. Vienna, Austria: R Foundation for Statistical Computing.

Radolf, J.D., K. Strle, J.E. Lemieux, and F. Strle, 2021: Lyme Disease in Humans. *Curr. Issues Mol. Biol.* **42**, 333–384, DOI: 10.21775/cimb.042.333.

Rauter, C., and T. Hartung, 2005: Prevalence of *Borrelia burgdorferi* Sensu Lato Genospecies in *Ixodes ricinus* Ticks in Europe: a Metaanalysis. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* **71**, 7203–7216, DOI: 10.1128/AEM.71.11.7203-7216.2005.

Réseau sentinel, réseau S., INSERM/Sorbonne n.d.: Réseau Sentinelles > France > Surveillance continue [Online] Available at https://www.sentiweb.fr/france/fr/?page=maladies&mal=18 (accessed January 23, 2025).

Rigaud, E., B. Jaulhac, N. Garcia-Bonnet, K.-P. Hunfeld, F. Féménia, D. Huet, C. Goulvestre, V. Vaillant, G. Deffontaines, and G. Abadia-Benoist, 2016: Seroprevalence of seven pathogens transmitted by the *Ixodes ricinus* tick in forestry workers in France. *Clin. Microbiol. Infect.* **22**, 735.e1-735.e9, DOI: 10.1016/j.cmi.2016.05.014.

Rubio, L.A., A.M. Kjemtrup, G.E. Marx, S. Cronan, C. Kilonzo, M.E.M. Saunders, J.L. Choat, E.A. Dietrich, K.A. Liebman, and S.Y. Park, 2023: *Borrelia miyamotoi* Infection in Immunocompromised Man, California, USA, 2021. *Emerg. Infect. Dis.* **29**, 1011–1014, DOI: 10.3201/eid2905.221638.

Sevestre, J., A.Z. Diarra, H.A. Oumarou, J. Durant, P. Delaunay, and P. Parola, 2021: Detection of emerging tick-borne disease agents in the Alpes-Maritimes region, southeastern France. *Ticks Tick-Borne Dis.* **12**, 101800, DOI: 10.1016/j.ttbdis.2021.101800.

Silaghi, C., R. Beck, J.A. Oteo, M. Pfeffer, and H. Sprong, 2016: Neoehrlichiosis: an emerging tick-borne zoonosis caused by *Candidatus Neoehrlichia mikurensis*. *Exp. Appl. Acarol.* **68**, 279–297, DOI: 10.1007/s10493-015-9935-y.

Sprong, H., T. Azagi, D. Hoornstra, A.M. Nijhof, S. Knorr, M.E. Baarsma, and J.W. Hovius, 2018: Control of Lyme borreliosis and other *Ixodes ricinus*-borne diseases. *Parasit. Vectors* **11**, 145, DOI: 10.1186/s13071-018-2744-5.

van Duijvendijk, G., C. Coipan, A. Wagemakers, M. Fonville, J. Ersöz, A. Oei, G. Földvári, J. Hovius, W. Takken, and H. Sprong, 2016: Larvae of *Ixodes ricinus* transmit *Borrelia afzelii* and *B. miyamotoi* to vertebrate hosts. *Parasit. Vectors* **9**, 97, DOI: 10.1186/s13071-016-1389-5.

Wagemakers, A., H. Sprong, A. Platonov, and J.W. Hovius, 2020: Commentary: *Borrelia miyamotoi*: 43 Cases Diagnosed in France by Real-Time PCR in Patients With Persistent Polymorphic Signs and Symptoms. *Front. Med.* **7**, DOI: 10.3389/fmed.2020.00474.

Whitehouse, C.A., 2004: Crimean–Congo hemorrhagic fever. *Antiviral Res.* **64**, 145–160, DOI: 10.1016/j.antiviral.2004.08.001.

Wongnak, P., S. Bord, M. Jacquot, A. Agoulon, F. Beugnet, L. Bournez, N. Cèbe, A. Chevalier, J.-F. Cosson, N. Dambrine, T. Hoch, F. Huard, N. Korboulewsky, I. Lebert, A. Madouasse, A. Mårell, S. Moutailler, O. Plantard, T. Pollet, V. Poux, M. René-Martellet, M. Vayssier-Taussat, H. Verheyden, G. Vourc'h, and K. Chalvet-Monfray, 2022: Meteorological and climatic variables predict the phenology of *Ixodes ricinus* nymph activity in France, accounting for habitat heterogeneity. *Sci. Rep.* **12**, 7833, DOI: 10.1038/s41598-022-11479-z.

Table S1. Lists of pathogens, tick species, targeted gene and primers

Organism	Targeted gene	Primers (F and R - 5'-3') and Probes (P)	Product length (bp)	Reference
Borrelia burgdorferi sensu stricto	*rpoB*	F-GCTTACTCACAAAAGGCGTCTT	83	Michelet et al., 2014
		R-GCACATCTCTTACTTCAAATCCT		
		P-AATGCTCTTGGACCAGGAGGACTTTCA		
Borrelia garinii	*rpoB*	F-TGGCCGAACTTACCCACAAAA	88	Michelet et al., 2014
		R-ACATCTCTTACTTCAAATCCTGC		
		P-TCTATCTCTTGAAAGTCCCCCTGGTCC		
Borrelia afzelii	*fla*	F-GGAGCAAATCAAGATGAAGCAAT	116	Michelet et al., 2014
		R-TGAGCACCCTCTTGAACAGG		
		P-TGCAGCCTGAGCAGCTTGAGCTCC		
Borrelia valaisiana	*ospA*	F-ACTCACAAATGACAGATGCTGAA	135	Michelet et al., 2014
		R-GCTTGCTTAAAGTAACAGTACCT		
		P-TCCGCCTACAAGATTTCCTGGAAGCTT		
Borrelia lusitaniae	*rpoB*	F-CGAACTTACTCATAAAAGGCGTC	87	Michelet et al., 2014
		R-TGGACGTCTCTTACTTCAAATCC		
		P-TTAATGCTCTCGGGCCTGGGGGACT		
Borrelia spielmanii	*fla*	F-ATCTATTTTCTGGTGAGGGAGC	71	Michelet et al., 2014
		R-TCCTTCTTGTTGAGCACCTTC		
		P-TTGAACAGGCGCAGTCTGAGCAGCTT		
Borrelia bissetti	*rpoB*	F-GCAACCAGTCAGCTTTCACAG	118	Michelet et al., 2014
		R-CAAATCCTGCCCTATCCCTTG		
		P-AAAGTCCTCCCGGCCCAAGAGCATTAA		
Borrelia myamotoi	*glpQ*	F-CACGACCCAGAAATTGACACA	94	Michelet et al., 2014
		R-GTGTGAAGTCAGTGGCGTAAT		
		P-TCGTCCGTTTTCTCTAGCTCGATTGGG		
Borrelia spp.	*23S rRNA*	F-GAGTCTTAAAAGGGCGATTTAGT	73	Michelet et al., 2014
		R-CTTCAGCCTGGCCATAAATAG		
		P-AGATGTGGTAGACCCGAAGCCGAGT		
Anaplasma marginale	*msp1*	F-CAGGCTTCAAGCGTACAGTG	85	Michelet et al., 2014
		R-GATATCTGTGCCTGGCCTTC		
		P-ATGAAAGCCTGGAGATGTTAGACCGAG		

Anaplasma platys	*groEL*	F-TTCTGCCGATCCTTGAAAACG	75	Michelet et al., 2014
		R-CTTCTCCTTCTACATCCTCAG		
		P-TTGCTAGATCCGGCAGGCCTCTGC		
Anaplasma phagocytophilum	*msp2*	F-GCTATGGAAGGCAGTGTTGG	77	Michelet et al., 2014
		R-GTCTTGAAGCGCTCGTAACC		
		P-AATCTCAAGCTCAACCCTGGCACCAC		
Anaplasma ovis	*msp4*	F-TCATTCGACATGCGTGAGTCA	92	Michelet et al., 2014
		R-TTTGCTGGCGCACTCACATC		
		P-AGCAGAGAGACCTCGTATGTTAGAGGC		
Anaplasma centrale	*groEL*	F-AGCTGCCCTGCTATACACG	79	Michelet et al., 2014
		R-GATGTTGATGCCCAATTGCTC		
		P-CTTGCATCTCTAGACGAGGTAAAGGGG		
Anaplasma bovis	*groEL*	F-GGGAGATAGTACACATCCTTG	73	Sprong et al. 2019
		R-CTGATAGCTACAGTTAAGCCC		
		P-AGGTGCTGTTGGATGTACTGCTGGACC		
Anaplasma spp.	*16S rRNA*	F-CTTAGGGTTGTAAAACTCTTTCAG	160	Gondard et al., 2020
		R-CTTTAACTTACCAAACCGCCTAC		
		P-ATGCCCTTTACGCCCAATAATTCCGAACA		
Ehrlichia canis	*gltA*	F-GACCAAGCAGTTGATAAAGATGG	136	Gondard et al., 2020
		R-CACTATAAGACAATCCATGATTAGG		
		P-ATTAAAACATCCTAAGATAGCAGTGGCTAAGG		
Ehrlichia spp.	*16S rRNA*	F-GCAACGCGAAAAACCTTACCA	98	Gondard et al., 2020
		R-AGCCATGCAGCACCTGTGT		
		P-AAGGTCCAGCCAAACTGACTCTTCCG		
Neoehrlichia mikurensis	*groEL*	F-AGAGACATCATTCGCATTTTGGA	96	Michelet et al., 2014
		R-TTCCGGTGTACCATAAGGCTT		
		P-AGATGCTGTTGGATGTACTGCTGGACC		
Rickettsia conorii	*23S-5S ITS*	F-CTCACAAAGTTATCAGGTTAAATAG	118	Michelet et al., 2014
		R-CGATACTCAGCAAAATAATTCTCG		
		P-CTGGATATCGTGGCAGGGCTACAGTAT		
Rickettsia slovaca	*23S-5S ITS*	F-GTATCTACTCACAAAGTTATCAGG	138	Michelet et al., 2014
		R-CTTAACTTTTACTACAATACTCAGC		
		P-TAATTTTCGCTGGATATCGTGGCAGGG		

Rickettsia massiliae	*23S-5S ITS*	F-GTTATTGCATCACTAATGTTATACTG	128	Michelet et al., 2014
		R-GTTAATGTTGTTGCACGACTCAA		
		P-TAGCCCCGCCACGATATCTAGCAAAAA		
Rickettsia helvetica	*23S-5S ITS*	F-AGAACCGTAGCGTACACTTAG	79	Michelet et al., 2014
		R-GAAAACCCTACTTCTAGGGGT		
		P-TACGTGAGGATTTGAGTACCGGATCGA		
Rickettsia aeshlimannii	*23S-5S ITS*	F-CTCACAAAGTTATCAGGTTAAATAG	134	Sprong et al., 2018
		R-CTTAACTTTTACTACGATACTTAGCA		
		P-TAATTTTTGCTGGATATCGTGGCGGGG		
Rickettsia felis	*orfB*	F-ACCCTTTTCGTAACGCTTTGC	163	Gondard et al., 2020
		R-TATACTTAATGCTGGGCTAAACC		
		P-AGGGAAACCTGGACTCCATATTCAAAAGAG		
Rickettsia spp.	*gltA*	F-GTCGCAAATGTTCACGGTACTT	145	Michelet et al., 2014
		R-TCTTCGTGCATTTCTTTCCATTG		
		P-TGCAATAGCAAGAACCGTAGGCTGGATG		
Bartonella henselae	*pap31*	F-CCGCTGATCGCATTATGCCT	107	Michelet et al., 2014
		R-AGCGATTTCTGCATCATCTGCT		
		P-ATGTTGCTGGTGGTGTTTCCTATGCAC		
Bartonella spp.	*ssrA*	F-CGTTATCGGGCTAAATGAGTAG	118	Gondard et al., 2020
		R-ACCCCGCTTAAACCTGCGA		
		P-TTGCAAATGACAACTATGCGGAAGCACGTC		
Francisella tularensis	*tul4*	F-ACCCACAAGGAAGTGTAAGATTA	76	Michelet et al., 2014
		R-GTAATTGGGAAGCTTGTATCATG		
		P-AATGGCAGGCTCCAGAAGGTTCTAAGT		
Francisella-like endosymbiont	*fop4*	F-GGCAAATCTAGCAGGTCAAGC	91	Michelet et al., 2014
		R-CAACACTTGCTTGAACATTTCTAG		
		P-AACAGGTGCTTGGGATGTGGGTGGTG		
Coxiella burnetii	*IS1111*	F-TGGAGGAGCGAACCATTGGT	86	Michelet et al., 2014
		R-CATACGGTTTGACGTGCTGC		
		P-ATCGGACGTTTATGGGGATGGGTATCC		
Coxiella-like endosymbiont	*idc*	F-AGGCCCGTCCGTTATTTTACG	74	Michelet et al., 2014
		R-CGGAAAATCACCATATTCACCTT		
		P-TTCAGGCGTTTTGACCGGGCTTGGC		

Apicomplexa	*18S*	F-TGAACGAGGAATGCCTAGTATG	104	Gondard et al., 2020
		R-CACCGGATCACTCGATCGG		
		P-TAGGAGCGACGGGCGGTGTGTAC		
Babesia microti	*CCTeta*	F-ACAATGGATTTTCCCCAGCAAAA	145	Michelet et al., 2014
		R-GCGACATTTCGGCAACTTATATA		
		P-TACTCTGGTGCAATGAGCGTATGGGTA		
Babesia canis (3 subspecies)	*18 rRNA*	F-TGGCCGTTCTTAGTTGGTGG	104	Michelet et al., 2014
		R-AGAAGCAACCGGAAACTCAAATA		
		P-ACCGGCACTAGTTAGCAGGTTAAGGTC		
Babesia ovis	*18S rRNA*	F-TCTGTGATGCCCTTAGATGTC	92	Michelet et al., 2014
		R-GCTGGTTACCCGCGCCTT		
		P-TCGGAGCGGGGTCAACTCGATGCAT		
Babesia bovis	*CCTeta*	F-GCCAAGTAGTGGTAGACTGTA	100	Michelet et al., 2014
		R-GCTCCGTCATTGGTTATGGTA		
		P-TAAAGACAACACTGGGTCCGCGTGG		
Babesia caballi	*Rap1*	F-GTTGTTCGGCTGGGGCATC	94	Michelet et al., 2014
		R-CAGGCGACTGACGCTGTGT		
		P-TCTGTCCCGATGTCAAGGGGCAGGT		
Babesia venatorum (sp. EU1)	*18S rRNA*	F-GCGCGCTACACTGATGCATT	91	Michelet et al., 2014
		R-CAAAAATCAATCCCCGTCACG		
		P-CATCGAGTTTAATCCTGTCCCGAAAGG		
Babesia divergens	*hsp70*	CTCATTGGTGACGCCGCTA	83	Michelet et al., 2014
		R-CTCCTCCCGATAAGCCTCTT		
		P-AGAACCAGGAGGCCCGTAACCCAGA		
Theileria spp.	*18S rRNA*	F-GTCAGTTTTTACGACTCCTTCAG	213	Melis et al., 2024
		R-CCAAAGAATCAAGAAAGAGCTATC		
		P-AATCTGTCAATCCTTCCTTTGTCTGGACC		
Hepatozoon spp.	*18S rRNA*	F-ATTGGCTTACCGTGGCAGTG	175	Gondard et al., 2020
		R-AAAGCATTTTAACTGCCTTGTATTG		
		P-ACGGTTAACGGGGGATTAGGGTTCGAT		
Mycoplasma spp	16S	F-GTGACGGCTAACTATGTGCC	77	Banović et al., 2024
		R-GCTTTACGCCCAATAATTCCG		
		P-AGCAGCTGCGGTAATACATAGGTCGC		

Ixodes ricinus	*ITS2*	F-CGAAACTCGATGGAGACCTG	77	Michelet et al., 2014
		R-ATCTCCAACGCACCGACGT		
		P-TTGTGGAAATCCCGTCGCACGTTGAAC		
Dermacentor reticulatus	*ITS2*	F-AACCCTTTTCCGCTCCGTG	83	Michelet et al., 2014
		R-TTTTGCTAGAGCTCGACGTAC		
		P-TACGAAGGCAAACAACGCAAACTGCGA		
Dermacentor marginatus	*ITS2*	F-GCACGTTGCGTTGTTTGCC	139	Michelet et al., 2014
		R-CCGCTCCGCGCAAGAATCT		
		P-TTCGGAGTACGTCGAGCTCTAGCAGA		
Tick species	*16S rRNA*	F-AAATACTCTAGGGATAACAGCGT	99	Gondard et al., 2020
		R-TCTTCATCAAACAAGTATCCTAATC		
		P-CAACATCGAGGTCGCAAACCATTTTGTCTA		
Escherichia coli	*eae*	F-CATTGATCAGGATTTTTCTGGTGATA	102	Michelet et al., 2014
		R-CTCATGCGGAAATAGCCGTTA		
		P-ATAGTCTCGCCAGTATTCGCCACCAATACC		

Table S2: Co-infection of human biting ticks by two pathogens. The pathogens with an asterisk were found in *Dermacentor marginatus*.

Pathogen_1	Pathogen_2	Co_Occurrences
Borrelia burgdorferi sensu lato	*Anaplasma phagocytophilum*	21
Borrelia burgdorferi sensu lato	*Neoehrlichia mikurensis*	18
Borrelia burgdorferi sensu lato	*Rickettsia helvetica*	14
Borrelia burgdorferi sensu lato	*Borrelia miyamotoi*	6
Borrelia burgdorferi sensu lato	*Babesia venatorum*	4
Borrelia burgdorferi sensu lato	*Babesia microti*	3
Borrelia burgdorferi sensu lato	*Bartonella henselae*	1
Borrelia burgdorferi sensu lato	*Rickettsia spotted fever*	1
Borrelia miyamotoi	*Anaplasma phagocytophilum*	2
Borrelia miyamotoi	*Neoehrlichia mikurensis*	1
Anaplasma phagocytophilum	*Rickettsia helvetica*	4
Anaplasma phagocytophilum	*Neoehrlichia mikurensis*	3
Anaplasma phagocytophilum	*Babesia divergens*	2
Anaplasma phagocytophilum	*Rickettsia raoultii*	2
Anaplasma phagocytophilum	*Babesia canis*	1
Anaplasma phagocytophilum	*Rickettsia fever*	1
*Anaplasma phagocytophilum**	*Rickettsia slovaca**	1*
Neoehrlichia mikurensis	*Rickettsia helvetica*	3
Rickettsia helvetica	*Babesia venatorum*	1

Table S3: Co-infection of human biting ticks by three pathogens. The pathogens with an asterisk are found in *Dermacentor reticulatus*.

Pathogen_1	Pathogen_2	Pathogen_3	Co_Occurrences
Borrelia burgdorferi sensu lato	*Anaplasma phagocytophilum*	*Rickettsia helvetica*	3
Borrelia burgdorferi sensu lato	*Babesia microti*	*Rickettsia helvetica*	2
Borrelia burgdorferi sensu lato	*Neoehrlichia mikurensis*	*Rickettsia helvetica*	2
Borrelia burgdorferi sensu lato	*Anaplasma phagocytophilum*	*Borrelia miyamotoi*	1
Borrelia burgdorferi sensu lato	*Babesia divergens*	*Rickettsia helvetica*	1
*Anaplasma phagocytophilum**	*Babesia divergens**	*Rickettsia raoultii**	1