**Table S3** - Binary logistic regression analysis of susceptibility to *Gamasodes* mites for 10 UAS-GAL4 lines and respective controls (for each analysis in the table, the RNAi target line is provided first and the control is provided second; the name of the RNAi target is provided in parentheses). Infested flies were coded as 0, and uninfested flies as 1. Line and sex were treated as categorical terms. The regression coefficient (B), a Wald chi-square statistic and associated *p* value are provided for each analysis, along with the odds ratio and associated 95% confidence interval.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Predictor** | **B** | **S.E.** | **Wald** | **df** | **P** | **OR****(odds ratio)** | **95% C.I. for OR** |
| **Lower** | **Upper** |
| **1. P{TRiP.GLV21081}attP2 vs. P{CaryP}attP2 (CG11539)** |
| Treatment | -1.774 | 0. 357 | 24.681 | 1 | <0.001 | 0.170 | 0.084 | 0.342 |
| Sex | -0.091 | 0.318 | 0.082 | 1 | 0.775 | 0.913 | 0.490 | 1.703  |
| **2. P{TRiP.JF01946}attP2 vs. P{CaryP}attP2 (bmm)** |
| Treatment | -1.573 | 0.326 | 23.236 | 1 | <0.001 | 0.207 | 0.109 | 0.393 |
| Sex | 0.232 | 0.305 | 0.578 | 1 | 0.447 | 0.793 | 0.436 | 1.442 |
| **3. P{TRiP.HMC04066}attP2 vs. P{CaryP}attP2 (TotA)** |
| Treatment | 0.700 | 0.314 | 4.956 | 1 | 0.026 | 2.013 | 1.087 | 3.727 |
| Sex | 0.531 | 0.312 | 2.908 | 1 | 0.088 | 1.701 | 0.924 | 3.133 |
| **4. P{TRiP.HMC06168}attP40 vs. P{CaryP}attP40 (TotZ)** |
| Treatment | 0.504 | 0.287 | 3.092 | 1 | 0.079 | 1.656 | 0.944 | 2.905 |
| Sex | 0.311 | 0.285 | 1.190 | 1 | 0.275 | 1.365 | 0.780 | 2.388 |
| **5. P{TRiP.HMC03362}attP40 vs. P{CaryP}attP40 (PGI)** |
| Treatment | 0.839 | 0.272 | 9.482 | 1 | 0.002 | 2.313 | 1.356 | 3.944 |
| Sex | -0.970 | 0.272 | 12.682 | 1 | <0.001 | 0.379 | 0.222 | 0.647 |
| **6. P{TRiP.HMC05755}attP40 vs. P{CaryP}attP40 (CG30287)** |
| Treatment | -0.345 | 0.264 | 1.712 | 1 | 0.191 | 0.708 | 0.423 | 1.187 |
| Sex | 0.617 | 0.264 | 5.474 | 1 | 0.019 | 1.853 | 1.105 | 3.108 |
| **7. P{TRiP.HMS00629}attP2 vs. P{CaryP}attP40 (Lsd2)** |
| Treatment | -0.508 | 0.262 | 3.765 | 1 | 0.052 | 0.602 | 0.360 | 1.005 |
| Sex | -0.541 | 0.262 | 4.280 | 1 | 0.039 | 0.582 | 0.348 | 0.972 |
| **8. P{TRiP.HMS05387}attP40 vs. P{CaryP}attP40 (mrj)** |
| Treatment | -0.613 | 0.263 | 5.424 | 1 | 0.020 | 0.542 | 0.324 | 0.908 |
| Sex | -0.207 | 0.263 | 0.620 | 1 | 0.431 | 0.813 | 0.486 | 1.361 |
| 9. **P{TRiP.HMS05794}attP40u7 vs. P{CaryP}attP40 (CG18815)** |
| Treatment | -0.880 | 0.264 | 11.098 | 1 | 0.001 | 0.415 | 0.247 | 0.696 |
| Sex | -0.207 | 0.263 | 0.620 | 1 | 0.431 | 0.813 | 0.486 | 1.361 |
| 10. **P{TRiP.HMS00549}attP2 vs. P{CaryP}attP2 (ILP6)** |
| Treatment | -0.461 | 0.266 | 3.014 | 1 | 0.083 | 0.631 | 0.375 | 1.061 |
| Sex | 1.002 | 0.266 | 14.202 | 1 | <0.001 | 2.723 | 1.617 | 4.584 |

*Note:* Infected files coded as ‘0’ and uninfected coded as ‘1’ . *P* values in between 1.0 to 0.05 considered as trend.