

#### Large carnivore impacts are context-dependent

Haswell, P.M.; Kusak, Josip; Hayward, M.W.

#### **Food Webs**

DOI: 10.1016/j.fooweb.2016.02.005

Published: 01/09/2017

Peer reviewed version

Cyswllt i'r cyhoeddiad / Link to publication

Dyfyniad o'r fersiwn a gyhoeddwyd / Citation for published version (APA): Haswell, P. M., Kusak, J., & Hayward, M. W. (2017). Large carnivore impacts are context-dependent. *Food Webs*, *12*, 3-13. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fooweb.2016.02.005

Hawliau Cyffredinol / General rights Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

· Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.

- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
   You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal ?

#### Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

- Haswell PM, Kusak J, Hayward MW (2017) Large carnivore impacts are context-dependent. Food
   Webs 12:3-13. doi: 10.1016/j.fooweb.2016.02.005
- 34 Article history:
- 5 Received 24 September 2015
- 6 Received in revised form 7 January 2016
- 7 Accepted 9 February 2016
- 8 Available online 6 March 2016
- 9 10

#### Large Carnivore impacts are context-dependent

- 11 Peter M. Haswell<sup>ab</sup>, Josip Kusak<sup>c</sup>, Matt W. Hayward<sup>adef</sup>
- <sup>12</sup> <sup>a</sup>School of Biological Sciences, Bangor University, Bangor, Gwynedd, LL57 2UW, UK.
- <sup>13</sup> <sup>b</sup>UK Wolf Conservation Trust, Butlers Farm, Beenham, Berkshire, RG7 5NT
- <sup>14</sup> <sup>c</sup>Department of Biology, Veterinary Faculty, University of Zagreb, Heinzelova 55, 10000,
- 15 Zagreb, Croatia

<sup>16</sup> <sup>d</sup>School of Environment Natural Resources and Geography, Bangor University, Bangor,

- 17 Gwynedd, LL57 2UW, UK.
- <sup>e</sup>Centre for African Conservation Ecology, Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University, Port
   Elizabeth, South Africa
- 20 <sup>f</sup>Centre for Wildlife Management, University of Pretoria, South Africa.
- 21 Corresponding author: Peter M. Haswell, p.m.haswell@bangor.ac.uk
- 22 Keywords
- Landscape of fear; interspecific competition; apex predator; large carnivore; mesopredator
   release hypothesis; predation risk.
- 25 Abstract
- 26 Interactions between large carnivores and other species may be responsible for impacts that
- are disproportionately large relative to their density. Context-dependent interactions between
- species are common but often poorly described. Caution must be expressed in seeing apex
- 29 predators as ecological saviours because ecosystem services may not universally apply,
- 30 particularly if inhibited by anthropogenic activity. This review examines how the impacts of
- 31 large carnivores are affected by four major contexts (species assemblage, environmental
- 32 productivity, landscape, predation risk) and the potential for human interference to affect
- these contexts. Humans are the most dominant landscape and resource user on the planet and
- 34 our management intervention affects species composition, resource availability, demography,
- 35 behaviour and interspecific trophic dynamics. Humans can impact large carnivores in much
- the same way these apex predators impact mesopredators and prey species through density-
- 37 mediated (consumptive) and trait/behaviourally-mediated (non-consumptive) pathways.
- 38 Mesopredator and large herbivore suppression or release, intraguild competition and
- 39 predation pressure may all be affected by human context. The aim of restoring 'natural'
- 40 systems is somewhat problematic and not always pragmatic. Interspecific interactions are

- 41 influenced by context, and humans are often the dominant driver in forming context. If
- 42 management and conservation goals are to be achieved then it is pivotal to understand how
- 43 humans influence trophic interactions and how trophic interactions are affected by context.
- 44 Trade-offs and management interventions can only be implemented successfully if the
- 45 intricacies of food webs are properly understood.

#### 46 **1. Introduction**

- 47 When understanding and managing trophic dynamics, what is deemed a natural or unnatural
- 48 interaction must first be considered (Rolston 2001). The aim of restoring 'natural' systems in
- 49 the modern era becomes somewhat problematic. Wildlife conservation is still possible in
- 50 human dominated landscapes but maintaining top-down ecological processes in such
- <sup>51</sup> landscapes is challenging (Chapron et al. 2014; Linnell et al. 2015; López-Bao et al. 2015).
- 52 The impacts of world-wide predator decline and the relative importance of direct and indirect
- 53 species interactions have been highlighted as fundamental ecological questions (Sutherland et
- al. 2013). Yet caution has been expressed in seeing apex predators like the grey wolf
- 55 *Carnivora Canidae Canis lupus* as ecological saviours because ecosystem services may not
- universally apply, particularly if inhibited by anthropogenic activity (Mech 2012).
- 57 Furthermore, there is only one intact terrestrial predator guild in the world (Africa), so all
- 58 other guilds may reflect the impacts of the Pleistocene megafauna extinctions and shifting
- 59 baselines to mesopredator-dominated systems (Fleming et al. 2012; Valkenburgh et al. 2015).
- 60 The question arises as to what the conservation benchmark or baseline is, was or should be
- 61 given a particular ecological context (Berger 2008; Hayward 2009; Hayward 2012).
- 52 Species at higher trophic levels are often lost more rapidly than those at lower trophic levels 53 (Dobson et al. 2006). Apex predator decline and trophic simplification is something of great 54 concern worldwide (Estes et al. 2011; Johnson 2010; Ripple et al. 2014). It is imperative to 55 understand the interactions and potential impacts of apex predators because their absence or
- 66 decline can have undesired effects (Berger et al. 2008; Jackson et al. 2001; Terborgh et al.
- 67 2001). The consequences of upper trophic level decline and the loss of ecosystem services
- 68 provided by large carnivores could lead to environmental degradation through the release of
- top-down control upon herbivores (Beschta and Ripple 2012; Hebblewhite et al. 2005; Ripple
- and Larsen 2000) and mesopredators (Newsome and Ripple 2014; Prugh et al. 2009; Ritchie
- and Johnson 2009). If healthy populations of top predators can be maintained within
- ecosystems, they should also contain healthy communities and populations of the many
- recies that perform a diversity of ecosystem services at lower trophic levels (Dobson et al.
- 74 2006).
- As the most dominant landscape user and primary resource consumer on the planet (Paquet
- and Darimont 2010), humans greatly modify the landscapes and communities that apex
- predators interact with through a myriad of disturbance types (Blanc et al. 2006; Frid and Dill
- 78 2002; Sibbald et al. 2011). The positive (Kilgo et al. 1998; Kloppers et al. 2005; Leighton et
- al. 2010) or negative (Hebblewhite et al. 2005; Jayakody et al. 2008; Pelletier 2006) nature of
- this disturbance however depends entirely on management perspective (Reimoser 2003).
- 81 Humans can impact apex predators in much the same way as they impact smaller predators

- 82 and prey species, through density-mediated (consumptive) and trait/behaviourally-mediated
- 83 (non-consumptive) pathways (Ordiz et al. 2013). Impacts can be direct (Packer et al. 2009;
- 84 Virgos and Travaini 2005) or indirect through effects on other species or habitat (Rogala et
- 85 al. 2011; Sidorovich et al. 2003).
- 86 Context-dependent interactions between species are common but often poorly described
- 87 (Chamberlain et al. 2014). This review examines the contextual impacts of large carnivores
- 88 and the potential for human interference through effects on species assemblage,
- 89 environmental productivity, landscape and predation risk (Fig.1 and Table 1). If we are to
- 90 predict the consequences of predator management, it is critical to understand the dynamics of
- 91 interspecific relationships between organisms (Elmhagen et al. 2010; Prugh et al. 2009;
- 82 Ripple et al. 2014) and to determine if this context can be manipulated to achieve
- 93 management and ecosystem service goals (Kareiva et al. 2007).
- 94 A search of literature was conducted using Web of Science and Google Scholar with "OR"
- and "AND" search operators and a mixture of key words (apex predator\*, large carnivore\*,
- 96 carnivore\*, mesopredator release, mesopredator\*, mesocarnivore\*, large herbivore\*,
- 97 herbivore suppression, grazing, browsing, predation pressure\*, interspecific, interspecific
- 98 interaction\*, interspecific killing, predation, intraguild predation, competition, competitor\*,
- trophic cascade\*, predation risk\*, ecosystem service\*). Reference trails, recommended
- 100 papers or appropriate material already in the possession of the authors were also used to
- 101 inform this review.
- 102 1.1 Predation risk

103 Predators consume prey but they also provide risk (Brown and Kotler 2007; Fortin et al.

- 104 2005). Harassment and the associated energetic losses of responding to predation risk can
- 105 carry costs to overall fitness (Creel 2011). Predation risk is a powerful motivator that can
- affect behaviour and how an animal uses time and space as well as investment in other
- 107 antipredator strategies (Brown et al. 1999; Ripple and Beschta 2004; Willems and Hill 2009).
- 108 Predation risk and disturbance create trade-offs between avoiding risk or perceived risk and
- other fitness enhancing activities (e.g. feeding and breeding), such that risk avoidance carries
   energetic costs in the form of missed opportunities (Brown 1992; Brown et al. 1999; Eccard
- and Liesenjohann 2014). Human disturbance may incur similar responses to risk in wildlife
- 112 (Erb et al. 2012; Frid and Dill 2002; Leighton et al. 2010).
- 113 Risk-induced interactions between predators and other organisms can have cascading effects
- (Miller et al. 2012; Ripple et al. 2014; Ritchie and Johnson 2009). A forager's response to its
- landscape of fear (Laundré et al. 2014; Laundré et al. 2010) may alter the species
- 116 composition, behaviour, adaptive evolution or population dynamics of its prey and perhaps its
- 117 predators or competitors (Brown and Kotler 2007). Non-consumptive behavioural
- 118 interactions can be significant ecological drivers and should not be overlooked (Heithaus et
- al. 2009; Peckarsky et al. 2008; Ritchie and Johnson 2009).

#### 120 **2. Interactions with mesopredators**

- 121 Larger predators can sometimes limit the impacts, range and densities of smaller predators
- 122 (Henke and Bryant 1999; Levi and Wilmers 2012; Prugh et al. 2009). Soulé et al., (1988)
- 123 observed that, in the absence of larger more dominant predators, smaller predators and
- 124 omnivore populations explode: increasing abundance by up to ten times that before release.
- 125 The mesopredator release hypothesis predicts that a decrease in abundance of top-order
- 126 predators results in an increase in the abundance of mesopredators due to a reduction in intra-
- guild predation and competitive suppression (Letnic and Dworjanyn 2011; Ritchie and
- 128Johnson 2009). Suppression of mesopredators can result in density reductions or even
- 129 complete exclusion of these smaller predators from habitats or regions in both time and space
- 130 (Berger and Gese 2007; Linnell and Strand 2000; Newsome and Ripple 2014).
- 131 Interspecific competitive killing, intraguild predation and interspecific interference
- 132 competition are common in a whole range of mammalian carnivores (Lourenco et al. 2014),
- 133 particularly between species with elements of niche overlap and species of the same family
- having not too dissimilar body mass (Linnell and Strand 2000; Palomares and Caro 1999;
- 135 Ritchie and Johnson 2009). Two main mechanisms offer explanation for mesopredator
- suppression by apex predators, direct lethal encounters, and behavioural responses to risk
- 137 (Ritchie and Johnson 2009).
- 138 There is great debate about the strength of impacts large carnivores have upon mesopredators
- (Allen et al. 2013; Letnic et al. 2011; Letnic et al. 2009b). There is some evidence that
- 140 predation threat and impacts of mesocarnivores upon native rodents, such as *Notomys fuscus*,
- are lower in the presence of dingoes (Letnic et al. 2009a; Letnic and Dworjanyn 2011).
- 142 However, some express caution in assigning causality to short-term observations of
- 143 correlated, but unvalidated population indices which may falsely suggest mesopredator
- release (Allen et al. 2013; Fleming et al. 2012; Hayward and Marlow 2014). While there is
- 145 little doubt in the value of stable ecosystems complete with top predators (Estes et al. 2011;
- 146Ripple et al. 2014), untangling the web of ecological interactions and clearly identifying
- 147 ecosystem services from apex predators will require careful experimental design.
- 148 In an extensive review, Ritchie & Johnson (2009) discuss a number of trophic assemblages
- 149 where mesopredators are suppressed by larger predators and found only 2 studies identifying
- 150 scenarios where scent or vocal predator cues had little impact upon mesopredators (Gehrt and
- 151 Prange 2007; Prange and Gehrt 2007). Interactions between species may vary depending
- upon context. Larger predators may competitively suppress smaller predators but also provide
- scavenging opportunities (Khalil et al. 2014). Habitat complexity, resource availability and
- the density or complexity of predator communities may affect the outcomes of interactions
- between predators (Khalil et al. 2014; Ritchie and Johnson 2009). Mesopredator prey species
- 156 comprise a vast array of herbivores, detritivores, seed dispersers and seed predators (Catling
- 157 1988; Panzacchi et al. 2008; Russell and Storch 2004). Such species have variable
- interactions with vegetation communities (Wang and Yang 2015; Yi and Wang 2015; Zamora
- and Matias 2014). Any consequential cascades resulting from mesopredator release are also
- 160 likely to be context-dependent.

#### 161 **2.1 Contexts affecting mesopredator interactions**

#### 162 2.1.1 Species assemblage

- 163 Vulnerability and interactions between predators may be influenced by niche overlap and
- relatedness (Berger and Gese 2007; Gehrt and Prange 2007; Ritchie and Johnson 2009), but
- also by species specific factors such as defence or grouping behaviour (Cooper 1991;
- 166 Palomares and Caro 1999; Prange and Gehrt 2007). Mesopredators, such as the bobcat
- 167 *Carnivora Felidae Lynx rufus* (5-15kg), can coexist with larger predators of similar size but
- different families, like the coyote *Carnivora Canidae Canis latrans* (8-20kg), even when a
- smaller mesopredator the grey fox *Carnivora Canidae Urocyon cinereoargenteus* (3-5kg) did
- 170 not (Fedriani et al. 2000).
- 171 In many North American trophic systems lacking larger carnivores, coyotes can interact
- 172 competitively and suppress mesocarnivores (Henke and Bryant 1999; Kamler et al. 2003;
- 173 Linnell and Strand 2000). The extent of this suppression may be somewhat dependent on the
- 174 presence of other predators. Red fox *Carnivora Canidae Vulpes vulpes* for example pose
- 175 more of a threat to kit fox *Carnivora Canidae Vulpes macrotis* populations because they can
- access dens (Cypher et al. 2001; Ralls and White 1995). Coyotes could have an additive
- 177 negative impact (through predation) or benefit kit foxes through interference competition and
- 178 suppression of red foxes (Cypher et al. 2001).
- 179 In the presence of a larger canid, coyotes were supressed by wolves and red foxes became
- 180 more abundant (Levi and Wilmers 2012). North American wolves impact coyote distribution,
- abundance (33% lower in wolf abundant sites) and dispersal survival rates (Berger and Gese
- 182 2007; Newsome and Ripple 2014). In the presence of a feline apex predator however, coyotes
- 183 were only killed by mountain lions *Carnivora Felidae Puma concolor* defending or usurping
- 184 food caches during winter when diets overlapped significantly more (Koehler and Hornocker
- 185 1991). The overall impacts of predator communities and the outcomes of mesopredator
- suppression might depend directly on the number, density and composition of predator
- 187 dominance levels (Chakarov and Krueger 2010).
- 188 At its most extreme scale, human influence can result in mesopredator range expansion and
- population growth, through the removal of apex predators (Kamler et al. 2003; Ripple et al.
- 190 2013; Selås and Vik 2006) or competing mesopredators (Courchamp et al. 1999; Rayner et al.
- 191 2007; Trewby et al. 2008). In some circumstances, release can result in the increase of a prey
- source shared by apex and mesopredators (Henke and Bryant 1999). Decline in prey species
- of mesopredators is however more common (Elmhagen et al. 2010; Sargeant et al. 1984;
- 194 Sovada et al. 1995). Caution must be expressed when interfering with ecological interactions
- as mesopredator release can carry economic and social costs (Prugh et al. 2009).
- 196 The introduction of alien predators may also alter trophic dynamics, complicating intraguild
- 197 competition and affecting food webs (Crooks and Soulé 1999; Krauze-Gryz et al. 2012;
- 198 Rayner et al. 2007). Wolf-dog interactions in particular stand out as an anthropogenic
- 199 introduction to species assemblage with variable context-dependent outcomes (Lescureux and
- Linnell 2014). Levels of co-existence between native and alien species may be dependent on
- niche flexibility, landscape and resource abundance (Bonesi et al. 2004; Bonesi and

- 202 Macdonald 2004; Brzezinski et al. 2008). The maintenance and recovery of native or
- 203 naturalised predators may in some contexts help to mitigate the impacts of invasive
- 204 mesopredators (Glen et al. 2007; McDonald et al. 2007; Ritchie et al. 2012). Introduced
- 205 predators, although posing their own threat to native prey species may also suppress the
- 206 impacts of smaller alien predators in certain contexts (Hanna and Cardillo 2014). Predator
- 207 eradication can have unforeseen consequences even with conservation in mind. Invasive
- species removal may have undesired effects through mesopredator release, rather than
- alleviating predation pressure upon native species as intended (Rayner et al. 2007).
- 210 2.1.2 Environmental productivity
- 211 Apex predators can affect food availability to smaller predators through the provision of
- carrion (Wilmers and Getz 2005), exploitative competition (Selås and Vik 2006),
- 213 kleptoparasitism (Gorman et al. 1998), landscapes of fear (Kuijper et al. 2013; Laundré et al.
- 214 2010), and possibly through indirect impacts on habitat structure and provisioning of refuge
- for mesopredator prey (Letnic and Dworjanyn 2011). Bottom-up factors however influence
- 216 population densities of herbivores and consequently their predators (East 1984; Hayward et
- 217 al. 2007).
- 218 The strength of top-down mesopredator control and consequently the strength of cascades
- from large carnivores can be determined by ecosystem productivity (Elmhagen et al. 2010;
- Elmhagen and Rushton 2007; Hollings et al. 2014). In contexts where bottom up effects are
- strongly influential the mesopredator release response to apex predator control may be
- limited. Coyote predation upon kit foxes can account for 75-90% of mortality (Eliason and
- Berry 1994; Linnell and Strand 2000; Ralls and White 1995). Such predation may be most
- significant when food availability is low or when kit fox populations are small (Cypher et al.
- 225 2001). During a coyote control programme where kit fox release did not occur as expected,
- food availability (lagomorph abundance) was observed to be the primary factor driving
- 227 population dynamics of both species (Cypher and Scrivner 1992).
- Humans can influence the type and severity of interspecific competition amongst carnivores
- by artificially boosting food availability, and consequently mesopredator populations
- 230 (Bateman and Fleming 2012; Crooks and Soulé 1999; Linnell and Strand 2000). Maintaining
- mesopredators far above their carrying capacity with nutritional subsidies may particularly
- unbalance natural regulation if accompanied by habitat fragmentation (Crooks and Soulé
- 1999; Dickman 2008). Large carnivores can also adapt to capitalize on anthropogenic food
- sources (Ciucci et al. 1997; Kusak et al. 2005; Newsome et al. 2014). However, humans often
- inhibit large carnivore use of space and time (Whittington et al. 2005). Both direct and
- 236 indirect human influence on prey numbers, accessibility and hunting opportunities may cause
- 237 prey switching and impact activity patterns with consequences for competitive interactions
- and the resultant impacts of large carnivores (Allen and Leung 2012; Theuerkauf et al. 2003).
- 239 2.1.3 Landscape
- The interplay between predation risk and habitat features can shape foraging decisions and
  habitat use (Camacho 2014). Predation risk is not homogenous across landscapes or species;

- 242 habitat features can interact with escape tactics to shape interspecific interactions (Wirsing et
- al. 2010). Predation risk is not always driven by predator density alone and mesopredator
- landscape use can sometimes be more dominantly driven by habitat features (Heithaus et al.
- 245 2009).
- 246 In many cases humans have drastically reduced available habitat for native fauna (Paquet and
- 247 Darimont 2010). The impacts large carnivores have on other species and ecosystems may be
- relative to their interactions with anthropogenic landscapes. Human landscape modification
- 249 may alter species interactions and occupancy by benefitting those species more adaptable to
- anthropogenic disturbance (Cove et al. 2012; Erb et al. 2012; Ruiz-Capillas et al. 2013).
- 251 Urban predators can provide ecosystem services as well as conflicts but human conflict often
- dominates management decisions (Dodge and Kashian 2013).
- 253 Human presence does not always necessitate extreme avoidance by large carnivores
- 254 (Theuerkauf et al. 2007) and not all human landscapes will inhibit ecological interactions
- between predators (Berry et al. 1992; Standley et al. 1992). Landscape modification and the
- 256 management of larger predators in fenced reserves for example can also have conservation
- 257 benefits for mesopredators (Van Dyk and Slotow 2003). In other contexts, human landscape
- use may have negligible impact on mesopredator occupancy (Schuette et al. 2013) or
- negative effects through elevated populations of domestic competitors (Krauze-Gryz et al.2012).
- 261 2.1.4 Predation risk
- As well as direct killing, large carnivores impact habitat use and foraging effort of smaller
- 263 mesopredators (Palomares and Caro 1999; Ritchie and Johnson 2009; Thurber et al. 1992).
- Interference competition between carnivores through harassment (Berger and Gese 2007;
- Linnell and Strand 2000; Mukherjee et al. 2009), prey competition (Cypher et al. 2001) and
- 266 kleptoparasitism (Cooper 1991; Gorman et al. 1998) can generate avoidance of larger
- carnivores through spatio-temporal partitioning (Crooks and Soulé 1999; Durant 2000;
- Hayward and Slotow 2009).
- 269 Rarity and inconsistency of agonistic interactions and/or behavioural avoidance of encounters
- 270 may permit co-existence between some predators (Durant 2000; Fedriani et al. 2000).
- 271 Distribution of predators over large spatial scales can however be driven by competitive
- interactions (Elmhagen et al. 2010; Newsome and Ripple 2014). Mesopredators sometimes
- use peripheries of larger predator territories (Berger and Gese 2007; Miller et al. 2012;
- Thurber et al. 1992), presumably reducing encounter rates and increasing fitness. Fearful
- 275 interactions between predators may permit the co-existence of multiple prey species, with
- certain species existing where dominant predators limit the spatio-temporal presence of
- subordinate predators (Berger et al. 2008; Miller et al. 2012).
- As a consequence of interspecific aggression between carnivores (Berger and Gese 2007;
- 279 Palomares and Caro 1999; Thurber et al. 1992), foraging decisions by mesopredators are also
- influenced by risk from their own predators (Mukherjee et al. 2009; Ritchie and Johnson
- 281 2009; Roemer et al. 2009). The extent to which mesopredators are impacted by larger

- predators and the degree to which they have to adjust their foraging efforts, activity patterns,
- vigilance and risk taking is likely to vary depending on predator assemblage, habitat and food
  availability (Ritchie and Johnson 2009).
- Humans can also influence interspecific interactions (Crooks and Soulé 1999). Additional
- anthropogenic landscapes of fear (Frid and Dill 2002) could further limit foraging
- 287 opportunities for mesopredators. Alternatively anthropogenic interference with larger
- predators (Erb et al. 2012; George and Crooks 2006; Theuerkauf et al. 2003) could
- 289 potentially reduce suppression.

#### 290 **3. Interactions with large herbivores**

- 291 Large carnivores can be important mortality drivers of ungulate populations (Jędrzejewski et
- al. 2002; Melis et al. 2009), maintaining herd health through the removal of unhealthy
- individuals (Kusak et al. 2012). Although not universal, density-driven terrestrial cascades
- are common (Schmitz et al. 2000). On Isle Royale, USA for example, wolves have been
- found to regulate moose *Cetartiodactyla Cervidae Alces alces* population dynamics and in
- 296 doing so dampen the effects of climactic change upon herbivore and scavenger communities
- 297 (Wilmers et al. 2006).
- Both herbivore density and behaviour can be altered by the presence and actions of predators
- 299 (Beckerman et al. 1997; Montgomery et al. 2013). In many circumstances the role of
- 300 "landscapes of fear" (Laundré et al. 2010), predation risk and the avoidance of predators are
- also believed to be closely linked to how ungulates use time and space (Brown et al. 1999;
- Harmsen et al. 2011; Kronfeld-Schor and Dayan 2003) as well as how they forage (Altendorf
- et al. 2001; Kotler et al. 1994; Laundré et al. 2001). There is an increasing amount of
- 304 literature investigating the impacts that ungulate foraging patterns may have upon ecosystems
- and vegetation community structure (Gill 2000; Reimoser et al. 1999; Tschöpe et al. 2011).
- 306 Large carnivores may hold influence over patterns of ungulate grazing pressure and its
- 307 consequent impacts (Creel et al. 2005; Estes et al. 2011; Ripple and Beschta 2004).
- 308 There is a great deal of flexibility in how large carnivores such as wolves use time and space
- 309 (Kusak and Haswell 2013). The causal factors behind activity patterns are highly variable
- 310 (Ballard et al. 1997; Kolenosky and Johnston 1967; Theuerkauf 2009). Anthropogenic
- influences are often strong drivers (Ciucci et al. 1997; Kusak et al. 2005; Theuerkauf et al.
- 2003). How large carnivores interact with herbivores is likely to be dependent on this context.
- Foraging and space-time use patterns of herbivores and the role of behaviourally-mediated carnivore impacts may ultimately dictate potential ecosystem services that could benefit local
- communities (Hebblewhite et al. 2005; Ripple et al. 2014). However trophic cascades from
- 316 large carnivores are not guaranteed in every ecological context (Ford et al. 2015).

## 317 **3.1** Context's affecting interactions with large herbivores

- 318 3.1.1 Species assemblage
- In Europe, the limiting effects of lynx *Carnivora Felidae Lynx lynx* and wolf upon roe deer
   *Cetartiodactyla Cervidae Capreolus capreolus* density were stronger when both species were

- 321 present than by one species alone (Melis et al. 2009). Where one species was present alone
- (most commonly the wolf) mean roe deer density was 917 per 100 km<sup>2</sup> but only 167 in the
- presence of both predators (Melis et al. 2009). This suggests that predators can have additive
- effects on shared prey and that generally lynx are a more dominant predator of roe deer in
- Europe. The composition of large carnivores in a given scenario is clearly consequential to
- the effects upon herbivore communities.

In south-eastern Norway, roe deer fawns were consumed by red foxes (8.6% spring-summer diet, (Panzacchi et al. 2008). Red foxes had a highly varied diet so fawns were not considered important to the population dynamics of red foxes, implying that there was unlikely to be any stabilising feedback mechanism between the species (Panzacchi et al. 2008). Where mesopredators are released from apex predator suppression, mesopredators could have more pronounced impacts on herbivore recruitment (Berger et al. 2008). This may offer some compensation for a lack of adult ungulate predation by large carnivores. However, even if

density-driven effects could be compensated by mesopredators, smaller carnivores areunlikely to replace the behavioural dynamics between larger carnivores and adult ungulates.

Harvesting of larger trophy individuals or the removal of larger predators in general due to 336 337 human conflicts could have catastrophic effects (Packer et al. 2009). Larger wolves >39kg (usually older and/or male animals) have been observed to have higher attack and kill rates in 338 Yellowstone National Park where improvements in handling success are not counteracted by 339 a reduction in pursuit ability (MacNulty et al. 2009). The association between increased body 340 weight and prey size in carnivores could be driven by size-related energetic costs (Carbone et 341 al. 1999; Carbone et al. 2007) and size-related predator performance (MacNulty et al. 2009). 342 343 Local conditions may affect composition and characteristics (gender, size or age) of predator social groups (Van Orsdol et al. 1985). Food loss rates from kleptoparasites like ravens are 344 relative to wolf pack size and can consequently further affect kill rates (Hayes et al. 2000; 345 Kaczensky et al. 2005). Temporal success, preferences and social structure can influence 346 predation rates and consumption of different prey species (Jedrzejewski et al. 2002). Social 347 dynamics and population demography could also influence the direction or strength of 348 cascades due to predation patterns. 349

Interspecific relationships may also have a variable temporal context that is not constant
(Koehler and Hornocker 1991). Herbivores can have seasonal habitat preferences and dietary
requirements (Degmečić et al. 2011). Large carnivores can also exhibit seasonal or context
driven dietary shifts (Garrott et al. 2007; Latham et al. 2013; Odden et al. 2006) and habitat
use (Alexander et al. 2006). Population structure, body condition, parasite load, climate,
predator density and predation risk may all interact to drive herbivore landscape use
(Montgomery et al. 2013).

- 357 Herbivore response to risk may in itself be subject to competitive partitioning between
- herbivores, particularly around key habitat sites such as water sources (Hayward and
- Hayward 2012). Resource competition between herbivores may alter landscape use patterns
- 360 (Dolman and Waber 2008; Hibert et al. 2010). While displacement is context specific and

likely to be dependent on levels of niche overlap (Iranzo et al. 2013), the potential fordomestic herbivores to outcompete wild herbivores is probably high (Latham 1999).

Wild and domestic herbivores forage and interact with vegetation communities in different 363 ways, with domestic stock often causing greater degradation (Fuller 2001; Hester and Baillie 364 1998; Hill et al. 1991). Domestic livestock often aggregate more, and their limited ranging 365 behaviour is exacerbated through herding and human directed foraging at convenient 366 367 locations (Albon et al. 2007). This type of herbivory will likely result in limited impacts from large carnivores upon domestic grazing/browsing pressure, with consequences being 368 predominantly human driven. When livestock are free-ranging their response to predation 369 risk is still different to that of wild herbivores, as well as being somewhat attenuated (Muhly 370

- et al. 2010).
- 372 The introduction of competitive alien herbivores (e.g. domestic stock) can also lead to

apparent competition and increased predation of native species by predators (Dolman and

Waber 2008). Poor husbandry practices and high livestock predation rates could potentially

375 either exacerbate or reduce large carnivore impacts on native species depending on context.

Furthermore, livestock guarding dogs that accompany livestock interact with predators

377 (Lescureux and Linnell 2014). Livestock guarding dogs, along with human presence may add

to landscapes of fear for large carnivores but may also serve to maintain interactions between

379 predators and native prey.

380 The traditional role of humans as part of the predator guild in communities is often

381 overlooked. Aboriginal hunters were important apex predators in Australia following their

arrival and the extinction of the megafauna (Fleming et al. 2012). In the absence of its human

hunting partners, the dingo may not truly fulfil the role of an apex predator and its modern

ecological function may differ given vast anthropogenic habitat modification (Fleming et al.

2012). In a similar fashion, our understanding of how indigenous North American's impacted

- the landscape is still developing (Lightfoot et al. 2013). The sustainability of such impacts are
- debateable, but it is clear that the removal of human regimes from wilderness designations in
  the USA will not replicate the ecological conditions present since its colonisation by
- 389 European settlers (Kay 1994).

390 The role of humans in the modern food web and the very different nature of our interactions

and impacts is something worth considering. Modern hunting practices and regulations vary

dramatically across the globe and the impacts will no doubt vary too. The attractive re-

393 wilding concept of re-establishing self-sustaining ecosystems with minimal human disruption

- may help to maintain large carnivore-herbivore interactions, but requires careful
- consideration of desired outcomes (Brown et al. 2011). Such management intervention may
- not always be pragmatic or necessarily a true reflection of the historic *status quo*. An
- 397 understanding of how humans influence trophic dynamics could help to better predict and
- 398 steer landscape management to desired outcomes.

399 3.1.2 Ecosystem productivity

- 400 Resource driven landscape use (Owen-Smith 2014) and bottom-up effects of environmental
- 401 productivity are often a major driving force influencing large herbivore distribution and
- 402 abundance (Coe et al. 1976; East 1984; Karanth et al. 2004). For example, roe deer
- 403 abundance in Europe was positively correlated with environmental productivity (Melis et al.
- 404 2009). The impacts of large predators were however weak in productive environments and
- regions with mild climate but noticeably greater in regions with harsher winters and lower
   productivity (Melis et al. 2009). Climatic features such as temperature or snow depth can also
- interact with local complexities, impacting the strength of predation pressure and trophic
- 408 cascades (Post et al. 1999; Sanford 1999). The strength of impacts from large carnivores may
- 409 be dependent on productivity and climatic context.
- 410 A forager in a low energy state has less to lose from predation and a higher marginal value of
- 411 energy to be gained so is more likely to forage in riskier habitats, change their forage
- selection decisions and reduce food patches to a greater extent (Brown and Kotler 2007;
- Brown et al. 1992; Hayward et al. 2015). Competition for game animals between humans and
- 414 large carnivores (Virgos and Travaini 2005) may affect predator energy states and
- 415 consequently predation patterns. Conversely, anthropogenic food provisioning, such as at
- refuse (Ciucci et al. 1997), urban (Rodewald et al. 2011) or hunting sites (Selva et al. 2014)
- 417 may alter predation risk trade-offs and interactions between species, potentially decoupling
- 418 interspecific relationships (Rodewald et al. 2011). Where anthropogenic foods dominate
- 419 predator diet, impacts of large carnivores upon wild herbivores could become minimal or
- 420 alternatively could increase due to inflated predator numbers, energy or time resources.

### 421 3.1.3 Landscape

- 422 Landscape-scale or micro-habitat predation patterns of large carnivores can impact upon local
  423 vegetation communities. Wolf predation of deer can impact habitat heterogeneity through the
- 424 creation of nutrient pulses at kill sites (Bump et al. 2009). Wolf predation success and prey
  425 vulnerability may be dependent on the amount of open grassland adjacent to streams
- 425 vulnerability may be dependent on the amount of open grassiand adjacent to streams 426 (Kauffman et al. 2007). If large herbivores are predated more successfully and forage less in
- high risk areas (Crosmary et al. 2012; Fortin et al. 2005; Ripple and Beschta 2004), one
- 428 might expect woody plant regeneration and vegetation succession (Berger 1999; Berger et al.
- 429 2001a; Hebblewhite et al. 2005).
- 430 In Yellowstone National Park's northern winter range, elk *Cetartiodactyla Cervidae Cervus*
- 431 *canadensis* movement preference for vegetative cover types was influenced by the spatial
- distribution of wolves (Fortin et al. 2005). Risk driven habitat preferences may be responsible
- 433 for observed reductions in aspen *Malpighiales Salicaceae Populus tremuloides* browsing
- 434 pressure by elk in the presence of wolves (Fortin et al. 2005; Ripple and Larsen 2000; Ripple
- 435 et al. 2001). The extent of the impacts behaviourally-mediated trophic cascades have on
- 436 aspen recruitment in Yellowstone has however been debated (Beschta et al. 2014; Kauffman
  437 et al. 2010; Winnie 2014; Winnie 2012). Trophic cascades may be more complicated than the
- 437 et al. 2010, withine 2014, withine 2012). Trophic cascades may be more complicated than the438 three tiered systems proposed; in complicated food webs interactions can go up, across and
- 456 unce there systems proposed; in complicated food webs interactions can go up, across and 420 down the trophic web (Dolig et al. 2000; Strong 1002). In Vallewater a interactional between
- down the trophic web (Polis et al. 2000; Strong 1992). In Yellowstone, interactions between
  environmental productivity, habitat features, human activities outside the park, predators and

- 441 herbivores, as well as contributing impacts of engineers, such as beavers *Rodentia Castoridae*
- 442 *Castor canadensis*, are likely to contribute and interact to affect vegetation communities
- through both behaviourally- and density-mediated mechanisms (Marshall et al. 2013; Painter
- 444 et al. 2015).

445 Anthropogenic landscape alterations such as higher road densities, fire regimes and housing

446 developments can have negative impacts on the presence and activity of large carnivores

(Haskell et al. 2013; Hebblewhite et al. 2009; Theuerkauf et al. 2003). Anthropogenic

- disturbance may span further than expected, with activities outside protected areas having
- strong effects on species within reserves (Parks and Harcourt 2002). Even human landscape
- modification intended to conserve (e.g. fenced reserves) may alter natural predator-prey
   dynamics through consequent changes in prey vulnerability and predator behaviour (Davies-
- 452 Mostert et al. 2013). Human landscape alteration can also create new landscapes of fear for
- 453 large herbivores (Semeniuk et al. 2014). Such interferences could inhibit desirable ecological
- 454 interactions.

455 3.1.4 Predation risk

456 Through behavioural mechanisms predators can influence prey species landscape use

457 (Laundré et al. 2001; Laundré et al. 2014; Willems and Hill 2009) and consequently the

458 impacts of herbivores upon habitat structure (Fortin et al. 2005; Kuijper et al. 2013). How

459 populations and individuals respond to predation risk is unlikely to be consistent across

- 460 contexts. Behavioural responses to environmental cues of predation risk may be sensitive to
   461 fluctuations in predation pressure (Berger 1999) but can also remain stable in its absence
- fluctuations in predation pressure (Berger 1999) but can also remain stable in its absence
  (Chamaille-Jammes et al. 2014). The strength of response to risk and the relative influence of
- 463 predation risk to a predator's overall limiting effect is likely to be affected by the
- 464 environment as well as predator and prey characteristics (Creel 2011). It is suggested that
- 465 prey species respond to overall risk rather than predator abundance alone (Heithaus et al.
- 466 2009). In some circumstances, prey species escape probability, habitat use and consequently
- 467 resource exploitation can be higher where predators are more abundant (Heithaus et al. 2009).
- 468 Individual factors such as gender (Laundré et al. 2001) and the presence of offspring (Wolff
- and Horn 2003) can also influence investment in anti-predatory responses like vigilance.

470 Risk of predation can cause prey to be more cautious in how they forage, becoming more

vigilant (Altendorf et al. 2001; Halofsky and Ripple 2008; Wolff and Horn 2003), more

472 mobile, thereby reducing predictability (Fortin et al. 2009), alter habitat use (Creel et al.

473 2005; Fortin et al. 2005; Laundré et al. 2001), respond to risk cues (Berger 1999; Mella et al.

- 474 2014), forage less in risky patches (Andruskiw et al. 2008; Brown 1988; Koivisto and
- 475 Pusenius 2006) or at restricted times (Brown and Kotler 2007), forage in larger groups
- diluting risk (Fortin et al. 2009; Hebblewhite et al. 2002; Isvaran 2007) or in smaller groups
- 477 reducing detection (Fortin et al. 2009; Hebblewhite et al. 2002). In any one circumstance a

478 myriad and combination of these antipredator tactics may be implemented.

Behavioural responses by prey also encourage countermeasures in predators such as stealth,
boldness and space-time use selection (Brown and Kotler 2007; Hopcraft et al. 2005). Fear

- and predation risk create somewhat of a tactical predator-prey foraging game. "Prey face
- different risks from predators with different tactics, and their antipredator responses vary
- accordingly" (Creel 2011). Predator specific strategies in prey may also promote coexistence
- 484 among predator species, if employing vigilance or avoidance strategies against one sort of
- 485 predator causes the forager to be more vulnerable to another (Sih et al. 1998).
- 486 Variation in response to predators may be driven by local selective pressures. Predator
- 487 hunting strategies, foraging behaviour and social organisation of herbivores alongside
- 488 environmental variables will lead to context-dependent herbivore response to predation risk
- 489 (Samelius et al. 2013). Prey species response to predation risk in turn impacts lower trophic
- 490 levels in what is ambiguously known as a trophic cascade (Polis et al. 2000).
- 491 Human activities can also impact patch predation risk, landscapes of fear and habitat use by
- both predators and large herbivores (Hebblewhite et al. 2009; Rogala et al. 2011; Sibbald et
- al. 2011). Non-consumptive (Blanc et al. 2006; Frid and Dill 2002; Leighton et al. 2010) and
- 494 consumptive (Ciuti et al. 2012; Proffitt et al. 2013; Sand et al. 2006) human interactions with
- 495 large herbivores can affect predation risk responses. Whether an elk was harvested by
- 496 humans or not in North America was found to be a consequence of individual response to a
- human mediated landscape of fear (Ciuti et al. 2012). Older female elk generally adopted
  habitat preferences and the use of a running or hiding strategy that lead to their survival (Ciuti
- 499 et al. 2012).
- 500 In the absence of human hunting pressures large herbivores may adjust their behaviour in
- response to large carnivores (Berger et al. 2001b). Human interactions with ungulates may
- sometimes benefit large carnivores (Kilgo et al. 1998). However, anthropogenic selection can
- also impact behavioural evolution and herbivore learning in a different and opposing manner
- to that of large carnivores, potentially negating their impacts (Ciuti et al. 2012; Sand et al.
- 505 2006).
- 506 Individual behaviour, learning and the selective pressures of large carnivores and humans
- 507 over time may be important drivers of large herbivore behaviour and its potential cascading
- effects. It is essential to know whether human interactions yield desired outcomes or interferewith the impacts of large carnivores through intensified or competing selection pressures.

# 510 **4. Conclusions**

- 511 Interactions between species are complicated. Suppression of one species by another can be
- 512 driven by a varying intensity of both density- and behaviourally-mediated mechanisms.
- 513 Impacts from large carnivores will not be homogenous across contexts. Factors intrinsic to
- 514 prey, predators and the given system (species composition, environmental productivity,
- 515 landscape, and predation risk) will culminate to produce the resultant dynamics in a given
- 516 context. The mixture of variables yielding interspecific relationships with large carnivores in
- a given context will in turn interact with additional features at lower trophic levels, dictating
  further interspecific interactions, ecosystem services and the presence of trophic cascades
- 518 further interspecific interactions, ecosystem519 from large carnivores.

- 520 Human-induced changes could have cascading effects for the entire carnivore community, on
- 521 prey communities of both apex and mesopredators and consequently habitat structure and
- 522 biodiversity (Fig.1). The impacts of humans on other species, the types and intensity of
- 523 human activity in a given context could alter the direction or severity of other interspecific
- 524 interactions (Table 1). Humans can remove large carnivores from systems altogether,
- 525 undesirably influence large carnivore activity, disrupt foraging, reduce survival success or
- 526 breeding capability, suppress habitat use and ultimately interfere with trophic interactions.
- 527 An understanding of whole ecosystems and the processes that maintain them is key to
- 528 ensuring sustainability. If we are to understand ecological systems, it is important for basic
- 529 monitoring of common as well as rare species to be undertaken alongside novel experimental
- approaches. Whilst managers, politicians and the public might desire standardised answers,
- 531 blanket assumptions of the role of large carnivores across contexts and inflexible or
- misinformed approaches to their management are damaging. In order to take appropriate
- 533 management and conservation action in any given context, interspecific interactions, the
- outcome of human interference and the trade-off between ecosystem services and
- anthropogenic land uses must be informed by robust experimentation and analysis. It is
- imperative that the consequences of intervention, particularly predator control are understood.

#### 537 Acknowledgements

- 538 We would like to thank Bangor University and the University of Zagreb for their support of
- the authors. Both Haswell and Kusak would also like to thank The UK Wolf Conservation
- 540 Trust, Nacionalni park Sjeverni Velebit and Nacionalni park Plitvička jezera for their
- 541 continued assistance and support of research efforts with the study of large carnivores in
- 542 Croatia. We are grateful to Dr. B. Allen and Dr. S. Creel for their useful comments on the
- 543 manuscript. The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest in the authorship of this
- 544 article.

#### 545 <u>References</u>

- 546 1. Albon, S.D., Brewer, M.J., O'Brien, S., Nolan, A.J., Cope, D., 2007. Quantifying the grazing 547 impacts associated with different herbivores on rangelands. J. Appl. Ecol. 44, 1176-1187.
- 5482. Alexander, S.M., Logan, T.B., Paquet, P.C., 2006. Spatio-temporal co-occurrence of cougars549(*Felis concolor*), wolves (*Canis lupus*) and their prey during winter: a comparison of two550analytical methods. J. Biogeogr. 33, 2001-2012.
- Allen, B.L., Fleming, P.J.S., Allen, L.R., Engeman, R.M., Ballard, G., Leung, L.K.P., 2013. As
   clear as mud: A critical review of evidence for the ecological roles of Australian dingoes. Biol.
   Conserv. 159, 158-174.
- 5544. Allen, B.L., Leung, L.K.P., 2012. Assessing predation risk to threatened fauna from their555prevalence in predator scats: dingoes and rodents in arid Australia. PLOS. ONE. 7, e36426.
- 5565.Altendorf, K.B., Laundré, J.W., López González, C.A., Brown, J.S., 2001. Assessing effects of557predation risk on foraging behavior of mule deer. J. Mammal. 82, 430-439.
- 5586. Andruskiw, M., Fryxell, J.M., Thompson, I.D., Baker, J.A., 2008. Habitat-mediated variation in559predation risk by the American marten. Ecology. 89, 2273-2280.

560	7.	Ballard, W., Ayres, L., Krausman, P., Reed, D., Fancy, S., 1997. Ecology of wolves in relation to
561		a migratory caribou herd in northwest Alaska. Wildlife. Monogr. 135, 3-47.
562	8.	Bateman, P.W., Fleming, P.A., 2012. Big city life: carnivores in urban environments. J. Zool.
563		287, 1-23.
564	9.	Beckerman, A.P., Uriarte, M., Schmitz, O.J., 1997. Experimental evidence for a behavior-
565		mediated trophic cascade in a terrestrial food chain. Proc. Nat.l Acad. Sci. USA. 94, 10735-
566		10738.
567	10.	Berger, J., 1999. Anthropogenic extinction of top carnivores and interspecific animal
568		behaviour: Implications of the rapid decoupling of a web involving Wolves, Bears, Moose
569		and Ravens. Proc. R. Soc. B. 266, 2261-2267.
570	11.	Berger, J., 2008. Undetected species losses, food webs, and ecological baselines: a
571		cautionary tale from the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem, USA. Oryx. 42, 139-142.
572	12.	Berger, J., Stacey, P., Bellis, L., Johnson, M., 2001a. A Mammalian Predator-Prey Imbalance:
573		Grizzly Bear and Wolf Extinction Affect Avian Neotropical Migrants. Ecol. Appl. 11, 947-960.
574	13.	Berger, J., Swenson, J.E., Persson, I.L., 2001b. Recolonizing carnivores and naive prey:
575		Conservation lessons from Pleistocene extinctions. Science. 291, 1036-1039.
576	14.	Berger, K., Gese, E., 2007. Does interference competition with wolves limit the distribution
577		and abundance of coyotes? J. Anim. Ecol. 76, 1075-1085.
578	15.	Berger, K.M., Gese, E.M., Berger, J., 2008. Indirect effects and traditional trophic cascades: A
579		test involving wolves, coyotes, and pronghorn. Ecology. 89, 818-828.
580	16.	Berry, W.H., Standley, W.G., O`Farrell, T.P., Kato, T.T., 1992. Effects of military-authorized
581		activities on the San Joaquin kit fox (Vulpes velox macrotis) at Camp Roberts Army National
582		Guard Training Site, California. EG and G Energy Measurements, Inc., Goleta, CA (United
583		States). Santa Barbara Operations.
584	17.	Beschta, R.L., Eisenberg, C., Laundre, J.W., Ripple, W.J., Rooney, T.P., 2014. Predation risk,
585		elk, and aspen: comment. Ecology. 95, 2669-2671.
586	18.	Beschta, R.L., Ripple, W.J., 2012. The role of large predators in maintaining riparian plant
587		communities and river morphology. Geomorphology. 157, 88-98.
588	19.	Blanc, R., Guillemain, M., Mouronval, JB., Desmonts, D., Fritz, H., 2006. Effects of non-
589		consumptive leisure disturbance to wildlife. Rev. Ecol-Terre. Vie. 61, 117-133.
590	20.	Bonesi, L., Chanin, P., Macdonald, D.W., 2004. Competition between Eurasian otter Lutra
591		lutra and American mink Mustela vison probed by niche shift. Oikos. 106, 19-26.
592	21.	Bonesi, L., Macdonald, D.W., 2004. Differential habitat use promotes sustainable
593		coexistence between the specialist otter and the generalist mink. Oikos. 106, 509-519.
594	22.	Brown, C., McMorran, R., Price, M.F., 2011. Rewilding - A New Paradigm for Nature
595		Conservation in Scotland? Scott. Geogr. J. 127, 288-314.
596	23.	Brown, J.S., 1988. Patch use as an indicator of habitat preference, predation risk, and
597		competition. Behav. Ecol. Sociobiol. 22, 37-47.
598	24.	Brown, J.S., 1992. Patch use under predation risk: I. Models and predictions. Ann. Zool. Fenn.
599		29, 301-309.
600	25.	Brown, J.S., Kotler, B.P., 2007. Foraging and the ecology of fear, In Foraging Behaviour and
601		Ecology. eds D.W. Stephens, J.S. Brown, R.C. Ydenberg, pp. 438-480. University of Chicago
602		Press, Chicago USA.
603	26.	Brown, J.S., Laundré, J.W., Gurung, M., 1999. The ecology of fear: optimal foraging, game
604		theory, and trophic interactions. J. Mammal. 80, 385-399.

605	27.	Brown, J.S., Morgan, R.A., Dow, B.D., 1992. Patch use under predation risk: II. A test with fox
606		squirrels, Sciurus niger. Ann. Zool. Fennici. 29, 311-318.
607	28.	Brzezinski, M., Swiecicka-Mazan, A., Romanowski, J., 2008. Do otters and mink compete for
608		access to foraging sites? A winter case study in the Mazurian Lakeland, Poland. Ann.
609		Zool. Fennici. 45, 317-322.
610	29.	Bump, J.K., Peterson, R.O., Vucetich, J.A., 2009. Wolves modulate soil nutrient heterogeneity
611		and foliar nitrogen by configuring the distribution of ungulate carcasses. Ecology. 90, 3159-
612		3167.
613	30.	Camacho, C., 2014. 'Bodyguard' plants: Predator-escape performance influences
614		microhabitat choice by nightjars. Behav. Process. 103, 145-149.
615	31.	Carbone, C., Mace, G.M., Roberts, S.C., Macdonald, D.W., 1999. Energetic constraints on the
616		diet of terrestrial carnivores. Nature. 402, 286-288.
617	32.	Carbone, C., Teacher, A., Rowcliffe, J.M., 2007. The costs of carnivory. PLOS. Biol. 5, 363-368.
618	33.	Catling, P.C., 1988. Similarities and contrasts in the diets of foxes, Vulpes vulpes, and cats,
619		Felis catus, relative to fluctuating prey populations and drought. Aust. Wildl. Res. 15, 307-
620		317.
621	34.	Chakarov, N., Krueger, O., 2010. Mesopredator Release by an Emergent Superpredator: A
622		Natural Experiment of Predation in a Three Level Guild. PLOS. ONE. 5.
623	35.	Chamaille-Jammes, S., Malcuit, H., Le Saout, S., Martin, J.L., 2014. Innate threat-sensitive
624		foraging: black-tailed deer remain more fearful of wolf than of the less dangerous black bear
625		even after 100 years of wolf absence. Oecologia. 174, 1151-1158.
626	36.	Chamberlain, S.A., Bronstein, J.L., Rudgers, J.A., 2014. How context dependent are species
627		interactions? Ecol. lett. 17, 881-890.
628	37.	Chapron, G., Kaczensky, P., Linnell, J. D., Von Arx, M., Huber, D., Andrén, H., López-Bao, J. B.,
629		Adamec, M., Álvares, F., Anders, O., Balčiauskas, L., Balys, V., Bedő, P., Bego, F., Blanco, J. C.,
630		Breitenmoser, U., Brøseth, H., Bufka, L., Bunikyte, R., Ciucci, P., Dutsov, A., Engleder, T.,
631		Fuxjäger, C., Groff, C., Holmala, K., Hoxha, B., Iliopoulos, Y., Ionescu, O., Jeremić, J., Jerina, K.,
632		Kluth, G., Knauer, F., Kojola, I., Kos, I., Krofel, M., Kubala, J., Kunovac, S., Kusak, J., Kutal, M.,
633		Liberg, O., Majić, A., Männil, P., Manz, R., Marboutin, E., Marucco, F., Melovski, D., Mersini,
634		K., Mertzanis, Y., Mysłajek, R. W., Nowak, S., Odden, J., Ozolins, J., Palomero, G., Paunović,
635		M., Persson, J., Potočnik, H., Quenette, P-Y., Rauer, G., Reinhardt, I., Rigg, R., Ryser, A.,
636		Salvatori, V., Skrbinšek, T., Stojanov, A., Swenson, J. E., Szemethy, L., Trajçe, A., Tsingarska-
637		Sedefcheva, E., Váňa, M., Veeroja, R., Wabakken, P., Wölfl, M., Wölfl, S., Zimmermann, F.,
638		Zlatanova, D., Boitani, L., 2014. Recovery of large carnivores in Europe's modern human-
639		dominated landscapes. Science. 346 1517-1519.
640	38.	Ciucci, P., Boitani, L., Francisci, F., Andreoli, G., 1997. Home range, activity and movements
641		of a wolf pack in central Italy. J. Zool. Lond. 243, 803-819.
642	39.	Ciuti, S., Muhly, T.B., Paton, D.G., McDevitt, A.D., Musiani, M., Boyce, M.S., 2012. Human
643		selection of elk behavioural traits in a landscape of fear. Proc. R. Soc. B. 279, 4407-4416.
644	40.	Coe, M.J., Cumming, D.H., Phillipson, J., 1976. Biomass and production of large African
645		herbivores in relation to rainfall and primary production. Oecologia. 22, 341-354.
646	41.	Cooper, S.M., 1991. Optimal hunting group size: the need for lions to defend their kills
647		against loss to spotted hyaenas. Afr. J. Ecol. 29, 130-136.
648	42.	Courchamp, F., Langlais, M., Sugihara, G., 1999. Cats protecting birds: modelling the
649		mesopredator release effect. J. Anim. Ecol. 68, 282-292.

650	43.	Cove, M.V., Jones, B.M., Bossert, A., Clever, D.R., Dunwoody, R.K., White, B.C., Jackson, V.L.,
651		2012. Use of Camera Traps to Examine the Mesopredator Release Hypothesis in a
652		Fragmented Midwestern Landscape. Am. Midl. Nat. 168, 456-465.
653	44.	Creel, S., 2011. Toward a predictive theory of risk effects: hypotheses for prey attributes and
654		compensatory mortality. Ecology. 92, 2190-2195.
655	45.	Creel, S., Winnie, J.J., Maxwell, B., Hamlin, K., Creel, M., 2005. Elk alter habitat selection as
656		an antipredator response to wolves. Ecology. 86, 3387-3397.
657	46.	Crooks, K.R., Soulé, M.E., 1999. Mesopredator release and avifaunal extinctions in a
658		fragmented system. Nature. 400, 563-566.
659	47.	Crosmary, W.G., Valeix, M., Fritz, H., Madzikanda, H., Côté, S.D., 2012. African ungulates and
660		their drinking problems: hunting and predation risks constrain access to water. Anim. Behav.
661		83, 145–153.
662	48.	Cypher, B.L., Clark Jr, H.O., Kelly, P.A., Job, C.V.H., Warrick, G.D., Williams, D.F., 2001.
663		Interspecific interactions among wild canids: implications for the conservation of
664		endangered San Joaquin kit foxes. Endanger. Species. UPD. 18, 171-174.
665	49.	Cypher, B.L., Scrivner, J.H., 1992. Coyote control to protect endangered San Joaquin kit foxes
666		at the naval petroleum reserves, California, In 15th Vertebrate Pest Conference. eds J.E.
667		Borrecco, R.E. Marsh, pp. 42–47. University of California Davis, Hyatt Newporter, Newport
668		Beach, California.
669	50.	Davies-Mostert, H.T., Mills, M.G.L., Macdonald, D.W., 2013. Hard boundaries influence
670		African wild dogs' diet and prey selection. J. Appl. Ecol. 50, 1358-1366.
671	51.	Degmečić, D., Gros, R., Florijančić, T., Ozimec, S., Bošković, I., 2011. Habitat Use and Activity
672		of Roe Deer (Capreolus capreolus L.) in Eastern Croatia. Agric. Conspec. Sci. 76, 197-200.
673	52.	Dickman, C.R., 2008. Indirect interactions and conservation in human-modified
674		environments. Anim. Conserv. 11, 11-12.
675	53.	Dobson, A., Lodge, D., Alder, J., Cumming, G.S., Keymer, J., McGlade, J., Mooney, H., Rusak,
676		J.A., Sala, O., Wolters, V., Wall, D., Winfree, R., Xenopoulos, M.A., 2006. Habitat loss, trophic
677		collapse, and the decline of ecosystem services. Ecology. 87, 1915-1924.
678	54.	Dodge, W.B., Kashian, D.M., 2013. Recent Distribution of Coyotes Across an Urban
679		Landscape in Southeastern Michigan. J. Fish. Wildl. Manag. 4, 377-385.
680	55.	Dolman, P.M., Waber, K., 2008. Ecosystem and competition impacts of introduced deer.
681		Wildl. Res. 35, 202-214.
682	56.	Durant, S.M., 2000. Living with the enemy: avoidance of hyenas and lions by cheetahs in the
683		Serengeti. Behav. Ecol. 11, 624-632.
684	57.	East, R., 1984. Rainfall, soil nutrient status and biomass of large African savanna mammals.
685		Afr. J. Ecol. 22, 245-270.
686	58.	Eccard, J.A., Liesenjohann, T., 2014. The importance of predation risk and missed
687		opportunity costs for context-dependent foraging patterns. PLOS. ONE. 9, e94107.
688	59.	Eliason, J.J., Berry, W.H., 1994. Effects of militaryauthorized activities on the San Joaquin kit
689		fox at Camp Roberts. Natl. Mil. Fish. Wildlife. T, 4–10.
690	60.	Elmhagen, B., Ludwig, G., Rushton, S.P., Helle, P., Lindén, H., 2010. Top predators,
691		mesopredators and their prey: interference ecosystems along bioclimatic productivity
692		gradients. J. Anim. Ecol. 79, 785-794.
693	61.	Elmhagen, B., Rushton, S.P., 2007. Trophic control of mesopredators in terrestrial
694		ecosystems: top-down or bottom-up? Ecol. Lett. 10, 197-206.

695	62.	Erb, P.L., McShea, W.J., Guralnick, R.P., 2012. Anthropogenic Influences on Macro-Level
696		Mammal Occupancy in the Appalachian Trail Corridor. PLOS. ONE. 7, 10.
697	63.	Estes, J., Terborgh, J., Brashares, J., Power, M., Berger, J., Bond, W., Carpenter, S., Essington,
698		T., Holt, R., Jackson, J., Marquis, R., Oksanen, L., Oksanen, T., Paine, R., Pikitch, E., Ripple, W.,
699		Sandin, S., Scheffer, M., Schoener, T., Shurin, J., Sinclair, A., Soulé, M., Virtanen, R., Wardle,
700		D., 2011. Trophic downgrading of planet earth. Science. 333, 301-306.
701	64.	Fedriani, J.M., Fuller, T.K., Sauvajot, R.M., York, E.C., 2000. Competition and intraguild
702		predation among three sympatric carnivores. Oecologia. 125, 258-270.
703	65.	Fleming, P.J.S., Allen, B.L., Ballard, G.A., 2012. Seven considerations about dingoes as
704		biodiversity engineers: the socioecological niches of dogs in Australia. Aus. Mammal. 34,
705		119-131.
706	66.	Ford, A.T., Goheen, J.R., Augustine, D.J., Kinnaird, M.F., O'Brien, T.G., Palmer, T.M., Pringle,
707		R.M., Woodroffe, R., 2015. Recovery of African wild dogs suppresses prey but does not
708		trigger a trophic cascade. Ecology 96, 2705–2714
709	67.	Fortin, D., Beyer, H.L., Boyce, M.S., Smith, D.W., Duchesne, T., Mao, J.S., 2005. Wolves
710		influence elk movements: Behaviour shapes a trophic cascade in Yellowstone National Park.
711		Ecology. 86, 1320-1330.
712	68.	Fortin, D., Fortin, M.E., Beyer, H.L., Duchesne, T., Courant, S., Dancose, K., 2009. Group-size-
713		mediated habitat selection and group fusion-fission dynamics of bison under predation risk.
714		Ecology. 90, 2480-2490.
715	69.	Frid, A., Dill, L., 2002. Human-caused disturbance stimuli as a form of predation risk.
716		Conserv. Ecol. 6, art 11.
717	70.	Fuller, R.J., 2001. Responses of woodland birds to increasing numbers of deer: a review of
718		evidence and mechanisms. Forestry. 74, 289-298.
719	71.	Garrott, R.A., Bruggeman, J.E., Becker, M.S., Kalinowski, S.T., White, P.J., 2007. Evaluating
720		prey switching in wolf-ungulate systems. Ecol. Appl. 17, 1588-1597.
721	72.	Gehrt, S.D., Prange, S., 2007. Interference competition between coyotes and raccoons: a test
722		of the mesopredator release hypothesis. Behav. Ecol. 18, 204-214.
723	73.	George, S.L., Crooks, K.R., 2006. Recreation and large mammal activity in an urban nature
724		reserve. Biol. Conserv. 133, 107-117.
725	74.	Gill, R., 2000. The Impact of Deer on Woodland Biodiversity, pp. 1-6. Forestry Commission,
726		[Online] Available at: <a href="http://www.forestry.gov.uk">http://www.forestry.gov.uk</a> (Accessed:15/06/2012).
727	75.	Glen, A.S., Dickman, C.R., Soule, M.E., Mackey, B.G., 2007. Evaluating the role of the dingo as
728		a trophic regulator in Australian ecosystems. Austral. Ecol. 32, 492-501.
729	76.	Gorman, M.L., Mills, M.G., Raath, J.P., Speakman, J.R., 1998. High hunting costs make African
730		wild dogs vulnerable to kleptoparasitism by hyaenas. Nature. 391, 479-481.
731	77.	Halofsky, J.S., Ripple, W.J., 2008. Fine-scale predation risk on elk after wolf reintroduction in
732		Yellowstone National Park, USA. Oecologia. 155, 869-877.
733	78.	Hanna, E., Cardillo, M., 2014. Island mammal extinctions are determined by interactive
734		effects of life history, island biogeography and mesopredator suppression. Glob. Ecol.
735		Biogeogr. 23, 395-404.
736	79.	Harmsen, B., Foster, R., Silver, S., Ostro, L., Doncaster, C., 2011. Jaguar and puma activity
737		patterns in relation to their main prey. Mamm. Biol. 76, 320-324.

738	80.	Haskell, D.E., Webster, C.R., Flaspohler, D.J., Meyer, M.W., 2013. Relationship between
739		Carnivore Distribution and Landscape Features in the Northern Highlands Ecological
740		Landscape of Wisconsin. Am. Midl. Nat. 169, 1-16.
741	81.	Hayes, R.D., Baer, A.M., Wotschikowsky, U., Harestad, A.S., 2000. Kill rate by wolves on
742		moose in the Yukon. Can. J. Zool. 78, 49-59.
743	82.	Hayward, M., Slotow, R., 2009. Temporal Partitioning of Activity in Large African Carnivores:
744		Tests of Multiple Hypotheses. S. Afr. J. Wildl. Res. 39, 109-125.
745	83.	Hayward, M.W., 2009. Conservation management for the past, present and future.
746		Biodivers. Conserv. 18, 765-775.
747	84.	Hayward, M.W., 2012. Time to agree on a conservation benchmark for Australia. Pac.
748		Conserv. Biol. 18, 69-76.
749	85.	Hayward, M.W., Hayward, M.D., 2012. Waterhole use by African Fauna. S. Afr. J. Wildl. Res.
750		42, 117-127.
751	86.	Hayward, M.W., Marlow, N., 2014. Will dingoes really conserve wildlife and can our methods
752		tell? J. Appl. Ecol. 51, 835-838.
753	87.	Hayward, M.W., O'Brien, J., Kerley, G.I.H., 2007. Carrying capacity of large African predators:
754		Predictions and tests. Biol. Conserv. 139, 219-229.
755	88.	Hayward, M.W., Ortmann, S., Kowalczyk, R., 2015. Risk perception by endangered European
756		bison Bison bonasus is context (condition) dependent. Landscape. Ecol. 30, 2079-2093.
757	89.	Hebblewhite, M., Munro, R.H., Merrill, E.H., 2009. Trophic consequences of postfire logging
758		in a wolf–ungulate system. Forest. Ecol. Manag. 257, 1053-1062.
759	90.	Hebblewhite, M., Pletscher, D., Paquet, P., 2002. Elk population dynamics in areas with and
760		without predation by recolonizing wolves in Banff National Park, Alberta. Can. J. Zool. 80,
761		789-799.
762	91.	Hebblewhite, M., White, C.A., Nietvelt, C.G., Mckenzie, J.A., Hurd, T.E., Fryxell, J.M., Bayley,
763		S.E., Paquet, P.C., 2005. Human activity mediates a trophic cascade caused by wolves.
764		Ecology. 86, 2135-2144.
765	92.	Heithaus, M.R., Wirsing, A.J., Burkholder, D., Thomson, J., Dill, L.M., 2009. Towards a
766		predictive framework for predator risk effects: the interaction of landscape features and
767		prey escape tactics. J. Anim. Ecol. 78, 556-562.
768	93.	Henke, S.E., Bryant, F.C., 1999. Effects of coyote removal on the faunal community in
769		western Texas. J. Wildlife. Manage. 63, 1066-1081.
770	94.	Hester, A., Baillie, G., 1998. Spatial and temporal patterns of heather use by sheep and red
771		deer within natural heather:grass mosaics. J. Appl. Ecol. 35, 772-784.
772	95.	Hibert, F., Calenge, C., Fritz, H., Maillard, D., Bouche, P., Ipavec, A., Convers, A., Ombredane,
773		D., de Visscher, M.N., 2010. Spatial avoidance of invading pastoral cattle by wild ungulates:
774		insights from using point process statistics. Biodivers. Conserv. 19, 2003-2024.
775	96.	Hill, D.A., Lambton, S., Proctor, I., Bullock, I., 1991. Winter bird communities in woodland in
776		the Forest of Dean, England, and some implications of livestock grazing. Bird. Study. 38, 57-
777		70.
778	97.	Hollings, T., Jones, M., Mooney, N., McCallum, H., 2014. Trophic Cascades Following the
779		Disease-Induced Decline of an Apex Predator, the Tasmanian Devil. Conserv. Biol. 28, 63-75.
780	98.	Hopcraft, J.G.C., Sinclair, A.R.E., Packer, C., 2005. Planning for success: Serengeti lions seek
781		prey accessibility rather than abundance. J. Anim. Ecol. 74, 559-566.

782 99. Iranzo, E.C., Traba, J., Acebes, P., Gonzalez, B.A., Mata, C., Estades, C.F., Malo, J.E., 2013. 783 Niche Segregation between Wild and Domestic Herbivores in Chilean Patagonia. PLOS. ONE. 784 8, 8. 785 100. Isvaran, K., 2007. Intraspecific variation in group size in the blackbuck antelope: the 786 roles of habitat structure and forage at different spatial scales. Oecologia. 154, 435-444. 787 101. Jackson, J.B., Kirby, M.X., Berger, W.H., Bjorndal, K.A., Botsford, L.W., Bourque, B.J., 788 Bradbury, R.H., Cooke, R., Erlandson, J., Estes, J.A., Hughes, T.P., Kidwell, S., Lange, C.B., 789 Lenihan, H.S., Pandolfi, J.M., Peterson, C.H., Steneck, R.S., Tegner, M.J., Warner, R.R., 2001. 790 Historical overfishing and the recent collapse of coastal ecosystems. Science. 293, 629-637. 791 Jayakody, S., Sibbald, A., Gordon, I., Lambin, X., 2008. Red deer Cervus elephus 102. 792 vigilance behaviour differs with habitat and type of human disturbance. Wildlife. Biol. 14, 81-793 91. 103. 794 Johnson, C.N., 2010. Red in tooth and claw: how top predators shape terrestrial 795 ecosystems. J. Anim. Ecol. 79, 723-725. 796 104. Jędrzejewski, W., Schmidt, K., Theuerkauf, J., Jędrzejewska, B., Selva, N., Zub, K., 797 Szymura, L., 2002. Kill rates and predation by wolves on ungulate populations in białowiezå 798 primeval forest (Poland). Ecology. 83, 1341-1356. 799 105. Kaczensky, P., Hayes, R.D., Promberger, C., 2005. Effect of raven Corvus corax 800 scavenging on the kill rates of wolf Canis lupus packs. Wildlife. Biol. 11, 101-108. 106. Kamler, J.F., Ballard, W.B., Gilliland, R.L., Lemons, P.R., Mote, K., 2003. Impacts of 801 802 coyotes on swift foxes in northwestern Texas. J. Wildl. Manage. 67, 317-323. 803 107. Karanth, K.U., Nichols, J.D., Kumar, N.S., Link, W.A., Hines, J.E., 2004. Tigers and their 804 prey: Predicting carnivore densities from prey abundance. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA. 101, 4854-4858. 805 806 108. Kareiva, P., Watts, S., McDonald, R., Boucher, T., 2007. Domesticated nature: 807 Shaping landscapes and ecosystems for human welfare. Science. 316, 1866-1869. Kauffman, M.J., Brodie, J.F., Jules, E.S., 2010. Are wolves saving Yellowstone's 808 109. aspen? A landscape-level test of a behaviorally mediated trophic cascade. Ecology. 91, 2742-809 810 2755. 811 110. Kauffman, M.J., Varley, N., Smith, D.W., Stahler, D.R., MacNulty, D.R., Boyce, M.S., 812 2007. Landscape heterogeneity shapes predation in a newly restored predator-prey system. 813 Ecol. Lett. 10, 690-700. 814 111. Kay, C.E., 1994. Aboriginal overkill - The role of native americans in structuring 815 western ecosystems. Hum. Nature. Int. Bios. 5, 359-398. Khalil, H., Pasanen-Mortensen, M., Elmhagen, B., 2014. The relationship between 816 112. 817 wolverine and larger predators, lynx and wolf, in a historical ecosystem context. Oecologia. 818 175, 625-637. 819 113. Kilgo, J.C., Labisky, R.F., Fritzen, D.E., 1998. Influences of hunting on the behavior of 820 white-tailed deer: Implications for conservation of the Florida panther. Conserv. Biol. 12, 821 1359-1364. Kloppers, E.L., St. Clair, C.C., Hurd, T.E., 2005. Predator-Resembling Aversive 114. 822 823 Conditioning for Managing Habituated Wildlife. Ecol. Soc. 10, art 31. 824 115. Koehler, G.M., Hornocker, M.G., 1991. Seasonal resource use among mountain lions, bobcats, and coyotes. J. Mammal. 72, 391-396. 825

- 826116.Koivisto, E., Pusenius, J., 2006. The effects of weasel proximity on the foraging827activity of voles. Ann. Zool. Fenn. 43, 45-51.
- 828 117. Kolenosky, G.B., Johnston, D.H., 1967. Radio- tracking timber wolves in Ontario. Am.
  829 Zool. 7, 289-303.
- Kotler, B.P., Gross, J.E., Mitchell, W.A., 1994. Applying patch use to assess aspects of
  foraging behavior in Nubian ibex. J. Wildlife. Manage. 58, 299-307.
- Krauze-Gryz, D., Gryz, J.B., Goszczynski, J., Chylarecki, P., Zmihorski, M., 2012. The
  good, the bad, and the ugly: space use and intraguild interactions among three opportunistic
  predators-cat (Felis catus), dog (Canis lupus familiaris), and red fox (Vulpes vulpes)-under
  human pressure. Can. J. Zool. 90, 1402-1413.
- Kronfeld-Schor, N., Dayan, T., 2003. Partitioning of time as an ecological resource.
  Annu. Rev. Ecol. Evol. Syst. 34, 153-181.
- Kuijper, D.P.J., de Kleine, C., Churski, M., van Hooft, P., Bubnicki, J., Jedrzejewska, B.,
  2013. Landscape of fear in Europe: wolves affect spatial patterns of ungulate browsing in
  Bialowieza Primeval Forest, Poland. Ecography. 36, 1263-1275.
- Kusak, J., Haswell, P., 2013. Spatio-temporal distribution of activity and space use
  among wolves, ungulates and humans in Croatia, In 2013 International Wolf Symposium:
  Wolves and Humans at the Crossroads. DECC Duluth Entertainment Convention Center,
  Duluth, Minnesota.
- Kusak, J., Skrbinšek, A., Huber, D., 2005. Home ranges, movements, and activity of
  wolves (*Canis lupus*) in the Dalmatian part of Dinarids, Croatia. Eur. J. Wildl. Res. 51, 254262.
- Kusak, J., Špičić, S., Slijepčević, V., Bosnić, S.J., RR., Duvnjak, S., Sindičić, M., Majnarić,
  D.C., Ž., Huber, Đ., 2012. Health status of red deer and roe deer in Gorski kotar, Croatia. Vet.
  Arhiv. 82, 59-73.
- Latham, A.D.M., Latham, M.C., Knopff, K.H., Hebblewhite, M., Boutin, S., 2013.
  Wolves, white-tailed deer, and beaver: implications of seasonal prey switching for woodland
  caribou declines. Ecography. 36, 1276-1290.
- 854126.Latham, J., 1999. Interspecific interactions of ungulates in European forests: an855overview. For. Ecol. Manage. 120, 13-21.
- Laundré, J.W., Hernández, L., Altendorf, K.B., 2001. Wolves, elk, and bison:
  reestablishing the" landscape of fear" in Yellowstone National Park, USA. Can. J. Zool. 79,
  1401-1409.
- Laundré, J.W., Hernández, L., López Medina, P., Campanella, A., López-Portillo, J.,
  González-Romero, A., Grajales-Tam, K.M., Burke, A.M., Gronemeyer, P., Browing, D.M.,
  2014. The landscape of fear: the missing link to understand top-down and bottom-up
  controls of prey abundance? Ecology. 95, 1141-1152.
- 863129.Laundré, J.W., Hernández, L., Ripple, W.J., 2010. The landscape of fear: ecological864implications of being afraid. Open. Ecol. J. 3, 1-7.
- Leighton, P., Horrocks, J., Kramer, D., 2010. Conservation and the scarecrow effect:
  Can human activity benefit threatened species by displacing predators? Biol. Conserv. 143,
  2156-2163.

# Lescureux, N., Linnell, J.D., 2014. Warring brothers: The complex interactions between wolves (Canis lupus) and dogs (Canis familiaris) in a conservation context. Biol. Conserv. 171, 232-245.

871 132. Letnic, M., Crowther, M.S., Koch, F., 2009a. Does a top-predator provide an 872 endangered rodent with refuge from an invasive mesopredator? Anim. Conserv. 12, 302-873 312. 874 133. Letnic, M., Dworjanyn, S.A., 2011. Does a top predator reduce the predatory impact 875 of an invasive mesopredator on an endangered rodent? Ecography. 34, 827-835. 876 134. Letnic, M., Greenville, A., Denny, E., Dickman, C.R., Tischler, M., Gordon, C., Koch, F., 877 2011. Does a top predator suppress the abundance of an invasive mesopredator at a 878 continental scale? Global. Ecol. Biogeogr. 20, 343-353. 879 135. Letnic, M., Koch, F., Gordon, C., Crowther, M.S., Dickman, C.R., 2009b. Keystone 880 effects of an alien top-predator stem extinctions of native mammals. P. Roy. Soc. B. 276, 881 3249-3256. 882 Levi, T., Wilmers, C.C., 2012. Wolves-coyotes-foxes: a cascade among carnivores. 136. 883 Ecology. 93, 921-929. 884 137. Lightfoot, K.G., Cuthrell, R.Q., Striplen, C.J., Hylkema, M.G., 2013. Rethinking the study of landscape management practices among hunter-gatherers in North America. Am. 885 886 Antiq. 78, 285-301 887 138. Linnell, J.D., Kaczensky, P., Wotschikowsky, U., Lescureux, N., Boitani, L., 2015. 888 Framing the relationship between people and nature in the context of European 889 conservation. Conserv. Biol. 29, 978-985. 890 Linnell, J.D., Strand, O., 2000. Interference interactions, co-existence and 139. 891 conservation of mammalian carnivores. Divers. Distrib. 6, 169-176. 892 140. Lourenco, R., Penteriani, V., Rabaca, J.E., Korpimaki, E., 2014. Lethal interactions 893 among vertebrate top predators: a review of concepts, assumptions and terminology. Biol. 894 Rev. 89, 270-283. 895 141. López-Bao, J.V., Kaczensky, P., Linnell, J. D., Boitani, L., Chapron, G., 2015. Carnivore 896 coexistence: wilderness not required. Science. 348, 871. 897 MacNulty, D.R., Smith, D.W., Mech, L.D., Eberly, L.E., 2009. Body size and predatory 142. 898 performance in wolves: is bigger better? J. Anim. Ecol. 78, 532-539. 899 143. Marshall, K.N., Hobbs, N.T., Cooper, D.J., 2013. Stream hydrology limits recovery of 900 riparian ecosystems after wolf reintroduction. Proc. R. Soc. B. 280. McDonald, R.A., O'Hara, K., Morrish, D.J., 2007. Decline of invasive alien mink 901 144. 902 (Mustela vison) is concurrent with recovery of native otters (Lutra lutra). Divers. Distrib. 13, 903 92-98. 904 145. Mech, L., 2012. Is science in danger of sanctifying the wolf? Biol. Conserv. 150, 143-149. 905 906 146. Melis, C., Jedrzejewska, B., Apollonio, M., Barton, K.A., Jedrzejewski, W., Linnell, 907 J.D.C., Kojola, I., Kusak, J., Adamic, M., Ciuti, S., Delehan, I., Dykyy, I., Krapinec, K., Mattioli, L., Sagaydak, A., Samchuk, N., Schmidt, K., Shkvyrya, M., Sidorovich, V.E., Zawadzka, B., 908 909 Zhyla, S., 2009. Predation has a greater impact in less productive environments: variation in 910 roe deer, Capreolus capreolus, population density across Europe. Global. Ecol. Biogeogr. 18, 724-734. 911 912 147. Mella, V.S.A., Banks, P.B., McArthur, C., 2014. Negotiating multiple cues of predation 913 risk in a landscape of fear: what scares free-ranging brushtail possums? J. Zool. 294, 22-30.

914 148. Miller, B.J., Harlow, H.J., Harlow, T.S., Biggins, D., Ripple, W.J., 2012. Trophic 915 cascades linking wolves (Canis lupus), coyotes (Canis latrans), and small mammals. Can. J. 916 Zool. 90, 70-78. 917 149. Montgomery, R.A., Vucetich, J.A., Peterson, R.O., Roloff, G.J., Millenbah, K.F., 2013. 918 The influence of winter severity, predation and senescence on moose habitat use. J. Anim. Ecol. 82, 301-309. 919 920 150. Muhly, T.B., Alexander, M., Boyce, M.S., Creasey, R., Hebblewhite, M., Paton, D., 921 Pitt, J.A., Musiani, M., 2010. Differential risk effects of wolves on wild versus domestic prey 922 have consequences for conservation. Oikos. 119, 1243-1254. 923 Mukherjee, S., Zelcer, M., Kotler, B.P., 2009. Patch use in time and space for a meso-151. 924 predator in a risky world. Oecologia. 159, 661-668. 925 Newsome, T.M., Ballard, G.A., Fleming, P.J.S., van de Ven, R., Story, G.L., Dickman, 152. 926 C.R., 2014. Human-resource subsidies alter the dietary preferences of a mammalian top 927 predator. Oecologia. 175, 139-150. 928 Newsome, T.M., Ripple, W.J., 2014. A continental scale trophic cascade from wolves 153. 929 through coyotes to foxes. J. Anim. Ecol. 84, 49-59. 930 154. Odden, J., Linnell, J.D.C., Andersen, R., 2006. Diet of Eurasian lynx, Lynx lynx, in the 931 boreal forest of southeastern Norway: the relative importance of livestock and hares at low 932 roe deer density. Eur. J. Wildlife. Res. 52, 237-244. 933 155. Ordiz, A., Bischof, R., Swenson, J.E., 2013. Saving large carnivores, but losing the 934 apex predator? Biol. Conserv. 168, 128–133. 935 156. Owen-Smith, N., 2014. Spatial ecology of large herbivore populations. Ecography. 936 37, 416-430. 937 157. Packer, C., Kosmala, M., Cooley, H.S., Brink, H., Pintea, L., Garshelis, D., Purchase, G., 938 Strauss, M., Swanson, A., Balme, G., Hunter, L., Nowell, K., 2009. Sport Hunting, Predator 939 Control and Conservation of Large Carnivores. PLOS. ONE. 34, 1160-1164. 940 158. Painter, L.E., Beschta, R.L., Larsen, E.J., Ripple, W.J., 2015. Recovering aspen follow 941 changing elk dynamics in Yellowstone: evidence of a trophic cascade? Ecology. 96, 252-263. 942 159. Palomares, F., Caro, T., 1999. Interspecific killing among mammalian carnivores. 943 Amer. Nat. 153, 492-508. Panzacchi, M., Linnell, J.D.C., Serrao, G., Eie, S., Odden, M., Odden, J., Andersen, R., 944 160. 945 2008. Evaluation of the importance of roe deer fawns in the spring-summer diet of red foxes 946 in southeastern Norway. Ecol. Res. 23, 889-896. 947 Paquet, P.C., Darimont, C.T., 2010. Wildlife conservation and animal welfare: two 161. 948 sides of the same coin? Anim. Welf. 19, 177-190. 949 162. Parks, S.A., Harcourt, A.H., 2002. Reserve size, local human density, and mammalian 950 extinctions in US protected areas. Conserv. Biol. 16, 800-808. 951 163. Peckarsky, B.L., Abrams, P.A., Bolnick, D.I., Dill, L.M., Grabowski, J.H., Luttbeg, B., 952 Orrock, J.L., Peacor, S.D., Preisser, E.L., Schmitz, O.J., Trussell, G.C., 2008. Revisiting the 953 classics: Considering nonconsumptive effects in textbook examples of predator-prey 954 interactions. Ecology. 89, 2416-2425. 955 164. Pelletier, F., 2006. Effects of tourist activities on ungulate behaviour in a mountain 956 protected area. J. Mt. Ecol. 8, 15-19. 957 165. Polis, G.A., Sears, A.L.W., Huxel, G.R., Strong, D.R., Maron, J., 2000. When is a trophic 958 cascade a trophic cascade? Trends. Ecol. Evol. 15, 473-475.

959 166. Post, E., Peterson, R.O., Stenseth, N.C., McLaren, B.E., 1999. Ecosystem 960 consequences of wolf behavioural response to climate. Nature. 401, 905-907. 961 167. Prange, S., Gehrt, S.D., 2007. Response of skunks to a simulated increase in coyote 962 activity. J. Mammal. 88, 1040-1049. 963 168. Proffitt, K.M., Gude, J.A., Hamlin, K.L., Messer, M.A., 2013. Effects of hunter access 964 and habitat security on elk habitat selection in landscapes with a public and private land 965 matrix. J. Wildlife. Manage. 77, 514-524. 966 169. Prugh, L.R., Stoner, C.J., Epps, C.W., Bean, W.T., Ripple, W.J., Laliberte, A.S., 967 Brashares, J.S., 2009. The rise of the mesopredator. Bioscience. 59, 779-791. Ralls, K., White, P.J., 1995. Predation on San Joaquin kit foxes by larger canids. J. 968 170. Mammal. 76, 723-729. 969 970 171. Rayner, M.J., Hauber, M.E., Imber, M.J., Stamp, R.K., Clout, M.N., 2007. Spatial 971 heterogeneity of mesopredator release within an oceanic island system. P. Natl. Acad. Sci. 972 USA. 104, 20862-20865. 973 Reimoser, F., 2003. Steering the impacts of ungulates on temperate forests. J. Nat. 172. 974 Conser. 10, 243-252. 975 173. Reimoser, F., Armstrongb, H., Suchantc, R., 1999. Measuring forest damage of 976 ungulates: what should be considered. Forest. Ecol. Manag. 120, 47-58. 977 174. Ripple, W., Beschta, R., 2004. Wolves and the ecology of fear: Can predation risk 978 structure ecosystems? Bioscience. 54, 755-766. 979 Ripple, W.J., Estes, J.A., Beschta, R.L., Wilmers, C.C., Ritchie, E.G., Hebblewhite, M., 175. 980 Berger, J., Elmhagen, B., Letnic, M., Nelson, M.P., Schmitz, O.J., Smith, D.W., Wallach, A.D., 981 Wirsing, A.J., 2014. Status and Ecological Effects of the World's Largest Carnivores. Science. 982 343, 1241484. Ripple, W.J., Larsen, E.J., 2000. Historic aspen recruitment, elk, and wolves in 983 176. 984 northern Yellowstone National Park, USA. Biol. Conserv. 95, 361-370. 985 177. Ripple, W.J., Larsen, E.J., Renkin, R.A., Smith, D.W., 2001. Trophic cascades among wolves, elk and aspen on Yellowstone National Park's northern range. Biol. Conserv. 102, 986 987 227-234. 988 178. Ripple, W.J., Wirsing, A.J., Wilmers, C.C., Letnic, M., 2013. Widespread mesopredator effects after wolf extirpation. Biol. Conserv. 160, 70-79. 989 990 179. Ritchie, E.G., Elmhagen, B., Glen, A.S., Letnic, M., Ludwig, G., McDonald, R.A., 2012. 991 Ecosystem restoration with teeth: what role for predators? Trends. Ecol. Evol. 27, 265-271. 992 180. Ritchie, E.G., Johnson, C., N., 2009. Predator interactions, mesopredator release and 993 biodiversity conservation. Ecol. Lett. 12, 982-998. 994 181. Rodewald, A.D., Kearns, L.J., Shustack, D.P., 2011. Anthropogenic resource subsidies 995 decouple predator-prey relationships. Ecol. Appl. 21, 936-943. Roemer, G.W., Gompper, M.E., Valkengurgh, B.V., 2009. The ecological role of the 996 182. 997 mammalian mesocarnivore. Bioscience. 59, 165-173. 998 183. Rogala, J.K., Hebblewhite, M., Whittington, J., White, C.A., Coleshill, J., Musiani, M., 999 2011. Human Activity Differentially Redistributes Large Mammals in the Canadian Rockies 1000 National Parks. Ecol. Soc. 16, 24. 1001 184. Rolston, H., 2001. Natural and unnatural; Wild and cultural. West. N. Am. Nat. 61, 267-276. 1002

- 1003 185. Ruiz-Capillas, P., Mata, C., Malo, J.E., 2013. Community Response of Mammalian
   1004 Predators and Their Prey to Motorways: Implications for Predator-Prey Dynamics.
   1005 Ecosystems. 16, 617-626.
- 1006186.Russell, A.J.M., Storch, I., 2004. Summer food of sympatric red fox and pine marten1007in the German Alps. Eur. J. Wildl. Res. 50, 53-58.
- 1008 187. Samelius, G., Andren, H., Kjellander, P., Liberg, O., 2013. Habitat Selection and Risk
  1009 of Predation: Re-colonization by Lynx had Limited Impact on Habitat Selection by Roe Deer.
  1010 PLOS. ONE. 8, 1-8.
- 1011 188. Sand, H., Wikenros, C., Wabakken, P., Liberg, O., 2006. Cross-continental differences
  1012 in patterns of predation: will naive moose in Scandinavia ever learn? Proc. R. Soc. B. 273,
  1013 1421-1427.
- 1014189.Sanford, E., 1999. Regulation of keystone predation by small changes in ocean1015temperature. Science. 283, 2095-2097.
- 1016190.Sargeant, A.B., Allen, S.H., Eberhardt, R.T., 1984. Red fox predation on breeding1017ducks in midcontinent North America. Wildlife. Monogr. 89, 3-41.
- 1018191.Schmitz, O.J., Hamback, P.A., Beckerman, A.P., 2000. Trophic cascades in terrestrial1019systems: A review of the effects of carnivore removals on plants. Am. Nat. 155, 141-153.
- 1020 192. Schuette, P., Wagner, A.P., Wagner, M.E., Creel, S., 2013. Occupancy patterns and
   1021 niche partitioning within a diverse carnivore community exposed to anthropogenic
   1022 pressures. Biol. Conserv. 158, 301-312.
- 1023 193. Selva, N., Berezowska-Cnota, T., Elguero-Claramunt, I., 2014. Unforeseen Effects of
   1024 Supplementary Feeding: Ungulate Baiting Sites as Hotspots for Ground-Nest Predation.
   1025 PLOS. ONE. 9, e90740.
- 1026194.Selås, V., Vik, J.O., 2006. Possible impact of snow depth and ungulate carcasses on1027red fox (Vulpes vulpes) populations in Norway, 1897–1976. J. Zool. 269, 299-308.
- 1028195.Semeniuk, C.A.D., Musiani, M., Birkigt, D.A., Hebblewhite, M., Grindal, S., Marceau,1029D.J., 2014. Identifying non-independent anthropogenic risks using a behavioral individual-1030based model. Ecol. Complexity. 17, 67-78.
- 1031196.Sibbald, A., Hooper, R., McLeod, J., Gordon, I., 2011. Responses of red deer (Cervus1032elaphus) to regular disturbance by hill walkers. Eur. J. Wildlife. Res. 57, 817-825.
- 1033197.Sidorovich, V.E., Tikhomirova, L.L., Jedrzejewska, B., 2003. Wolf Canis lupus1034numbers, diet and damage to livestock in relation to hunting and ungulate abundance in1035northeastern Belarus during 1990-2000. Wildlife. Biol. 9, 103-111.
- 1036198.Sih, A., Englund, G., Wooster, D., 1998. Emergent impacts of multiple predators on1037prey. Trends. Ecol. Evol. 13, 350-355.
- 1038 199. Soulé, M.E., Bolger, D.T., Alberts, A.C., Wrights, J., Sorice, M., Hill, S., 1988.
   1039 Reconstructed dynamics of rapid extinctions of chaparral-requiring birds in urban habitat
   1040 islands. Conserv. Biol. 2, 75-92.
- 1041200.Sovada, M.A., Sargeant, A.B., Grier, J.W., 1995. Differential effects of coyotes and1042red foxes on duck nest success. J. Wildlife. Manage. 59, 1-9.
- Standley, W.G., Berry, W.H., O'Farrell, T.P., Kato, T.T., 1992. Mortality of San Joaquin
   kit fox (Vulpes velox macrotis) at Camp Roberts Army National Guard Training Site,
   California. EG and G Energy Measurements, Inc., Goleta, CA (United States). Santa Barbara
- 1046 Operations.

1048 speciose ecosystems. Ecology. 73, 747-754. 1049 203. Sutherland, W.J., Freckleton, R.P., Godfray, H.C.J., Beissinger, S.R., Benton, T., 1050 Cameron, D.D., Carmel, Y., Coomes, D.A., Coulson, T., Emmerson, M.C., Hails, R.S., Hays, 1051 G.C., Hodgson, D.J., Hutchings, M.J., Johnson, D., Jones, J.P.G., Keeling, M.J., Kokko, H., 1052 Kunin, W.E., Lambin, X., Lewis, O.T., Malhi, Y., Mieszkowska, N., Milner-Gulland, E.J., Norris, 1053 K., Phillimore, A.B., Purves, D.W., Reid, J.M., Reuman, D.C., Thompson, K., Travis, J.M.J., 1054 Turnbull, L.A., Wardle, D.A., Wiegand, T., 2013. Identification of 100 fundamental ecological 1055 questions. J. Ecol. 101, 58-67. 1056 204. Terborgh, J., Lopez, L., Nunez, P., Rao, M., Shahabuddin, G., Orihuela, G., Riveros, M., 1057 Ascanio, R., Adler, G.H., Lambert, T.D., Balbas, L., 2001. Ecological meltdown in predator-free 1058 forest fragments. Science. 294, 1923-1926. 1059 205. Theuerkauf, J., 2009. What drives wolves: Fear or hunger? Humans, diet, climate and 1060 wolf activity patterns. Ethology. 115, 649-657. 1061 Theuerkauf, J., Gula, R., Pirga, B., Tsunoda, H., Eggermann, J., Brzezowska, B., Rouys, 206. 1062 S., Radler, S., 2007. Human impact on wolf activity in the Bieszczady Mountains, SE Poland. 1063 Ann. Zool. Fennici. 44, 225-231. 1064 207. Theuerkauf, J., Jędrzejewski, W., Schmidt, K., Okarma, H., Ruczyński, I., Śnieżko, S., 1065 Gula, R., 2003. Daily patterns and duration of wolf activity in the Białowieża forest Poland. J. 1066 Mammal. 84, 243-253. 1067 208. Thurber, J., Peterson, R.O., Woolington, J.D., Vucetich, J.A., 1992. Coyote 1068 coexistence with wolves on the Kenai Peninsula, Alaska. Can. J. Zool. 70, 2494-2498. 1069 Trewby, I., Wilson, G., Delahay, R., Walker, N., Young, R., Davison, J., Cheeseman, C., 209. 1070 Robertson, P., Gorman, M., McDonald, R., 2008. Experimental evidence of competitive 1071 release in sympatric carnivores. Biol. Lett. 4, 170-172. 1072 210. Tschöpe, O., Wallschläger, D., Burkart, M., Tielbörger, K., 2011. Managing open habitats by wild ungulate browsing and grazing: A case-study in North-Eastern Germany. 1073 1074 Appl. Veg. Sci. 14, 200-209. 1075 211. Valkenburgh, B.V., Hayward, M.W., Ripple, W.J., Meloro, C., Roth, V.L., 2015. The 1076 Impact of Large Terrestrial Carnivores on Pleistocene Ecosystems. P. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA. In 1077 review. 1078 212. Van Dyk, G., Slotow, R., 2003. The effects of fences and lions on the ecology of 1079 African wild dogs reintroduced to Pilanesberg National Park, South Africa. Afr. Zool. 38, 79-1080 94. 1081 213. Van Orsdol, K.G., Hanby, J.P., Bygott, J.D., 1985. Ecological correlates of lion social 1082 organization (Panthera leo). J. Zool. 206, 97-112. Virgos, E., Travaini, A., 2005. Relationship between small-game hunting and 1083 214. 1084 carnivore diversity in central Spain. Biodivers. Conserv. 14, 3475-3486. 1085 215. Wang, B., Yang, X.L., 2015. Seed removal by scatter-hoarding rodents: The effects of 1086 tannin and nutrient concentration. Behav. Processes. 113, 94-98. 1087 216. Whittington, J., St Clair, C.C., Mercer, G., 2005. Spatial responses of wolves to roads 1088 and trails in mountain valleys. Ecol. Appl. 15, 543-553. 1089 217. Willems, E.P., Hill, R.A., 2009. Predator-specific landscapes of fear and resource 1090 distribution: effects on spatial range use. Ecology. 90, 546-555.

Strong, D.R., 1992. Are trophic cascades all wet? Differentiation and donor-control in

1047

202.

1091	218.	Wilmers, C.C., Getz, W.M., 2005. Gray Wolves as Climate Change Buffers in				
1092	Yellowstone. PLOS. Biol. 3, 571-576.					
1093	219.	Wilmers, C.C., Post, E., Peterson, R.O., Vucetich, J.A., 2006. Predator disease out-				
1094	break modulates top-down, bottom-up and climatic effects on herbivore population					
1095	dynamics. Ecol Lett 9, 383-389.					
1096	220.	Winnie, J., 2014. Predation risk, elk, and aspen: reply. Ecology. 95, 2671-2674.				
1097	221.	Winnie, J.A., 2012. Predation risk, elk, and aspen: tests of a behaviorally mediated				
1098	trophic	c cascade in the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem. Ecology. 93, 2600-2614.				
1099	222.	Wirsing, A.J., Cameron, K.E., Heithaus, M.R., 2010. Spatial responses to predators				
1100	vary w	ith prey escape mode. Anim. Behav. 79, 531-537.				
1101	223.	Wolff, J.O., Horn, T.V., 2003. Vigilance and foraging patterns of American elk during				
1102	the rut	t in habitats with and without predators. Can. J. Zool. 81, 266-271.				
1103	224.	Yi, X.F., Wang, Z.Y., 2015. Context-dependent seed dispersal determines acorn				
1104	surviva	al of sympatric oak species. Plant. Ecol. 216, 123-132.				
1105	225.	Zamora, R., Matias, L., 2014. Seed Dispersers, Seed Predators, and Browsers Act				
1106	Synerg	istically as Biotic Filters in a Mosaic Landscape. PLOS. ONE. 9, 8.				
1107						
1108						
1109						
1110						
1111						
1112						
1113						
1114						
1115						
1116						
1117						
1118						
1119						
1120						
1121						
1122						
1123						
1124						
1125						
1126						
1127						
1128						
1129						
1130						
1131						
1132						
1133						
1134						
1135						



#### 1159 Fig.1. Benefits derived from large carnivores could be dependent on human context. As the most 1160 dominant landscape and resource user on the planet, humans have the potential to influence 1161 ecosystems and the organisms that inhabit them. The impacts of humans on other species in a given 1162 context could alter the direction or severity of consumptive and non-consumptive interactions 1163 between species. Humans can affect top down control from large carnivores which can have trickle 1164 down effects through trophic interactions, affecting habitat use and foraging behaviour with 1165 consequences for ecosystem services (solid arrows). These services can in-turn feedback to affect humans (dashed arrows). This figure represents a simplified flow diagram of how context affects the 1166 1167 impacts from large carnivores; additional mechanisms have been excluded for clarity. 1168

- 1169
- 1170
- 1171
- 1172

1173 Table.1. Human impacts and their potential consequences to trophic systems. Both direct influences 1174 and consequent alterations to interspecific interactions can affect ecological processes. The positive 1175 (+), negative (-) or neutral (=) impacts of human interventions on a guild of organisms are likely to 1176 vary dramatically and will be dependent on context. Human interactions with apex predators can 1177 alter mesopredator release (MR), large herbivore release (LHR), predation (P), competition (C), food 1178 availability (F), seed predation (SP) and seed dispersal (SD). Negative human influences on large 1179 carnivores can release those species they suppress. This could in turn have cascading effects, 1180 potentially increasing ( $\uparrow$ ) or decreasing ( $\downarrow$ ) pressure on other species further down the food chain.

1181	

Human-wildlife	Large	Large	Mesopredators	Small	Vegetation
interaction	Carnivores	herbivores		herbivores	
Hunting Large	- (↑ P)	- († P of	$+(\downarrow C)$	- († P, MR)	- († P, LHR)
Carnivores		young, MR)	- (↓ consistency		- (↓ SD, MR)
		+ (adults $\downarrow$ P)	of F, scavenging)		$+(\downarrow SP)$
Hunting large	- (↓ F)	- (↑ P)	- (↓ F,	- († P, MR)	- (↓ SD, MR)
herbivores			scavenging &	$+(\downarrow P, \downarrow C)$	- († SP, MR)
			young		$+(\downarrow P)$
			herbivores)		+ († SD)
			$+(\downarrow C)$		$+(\downarrow SP)$
Alien predators	- ( ↑ C)	- (↑ P)	- (↑ C)	- († P, MR)	- († P, LHR)
	=	=	=		$-(\downarrow SD, MR)$
		$+(\downarrow P)$	$+(\downarrow C)$	$+(\downarrow P, \downarrow C)$	- (↑ SP, MR)
					=
					$+(\downarrow P)$
					+(  SD) +(  SD)
Alion	(  F)	$(\uparrow C)$	$(\uparrow C)$	$(\uparrow C)$	$(\uparrow \mathbf{D})$
Allen	-(↓F)	-( C)	-( C)	-( C)	(  P)
nerbivores	_ + (↑ F)	- + (  P)	- +( C)	$-$ + ( $\perp$ P)	$-(\downarrow SD, MR)$ -( $\uparrow SP MR$ )
	( 1)	· (↓ I )	$+(\uparrow F)$	· (↓ I )	- († 51', WIK) -
			1 (  1)		- + (  P)
					$+(\uparrow SD)$
					$+(\downarrow SP)$
Food	+ (↑ F)	- (↑ P)	- (↑ C)	- († P, MR)	- (↓ SD, MR)
provisioning		=	$+(\uparrow F)$	+ (↑ F)	- († SP, MR)
(predators)		$+(\downarrow P)$	$+(\downarrow C)$	$+(\downarrow P)$	$+(\downarrow P)$
(preducors)					+ († SD)
					$+(\downarrow SP)$
Food	+ († F)	+ (↑ F)	- († C)	- († P)	- († P)
Provisioning			+ († F)	$+(\downarrow P)$	- (↓ SD)
(herbivores)				+ (↑ F)	- († SP)
					=
					$+(\downarrow P)$
					+(  SD)
Habitat laga					$+(\downarrow Sr)$
	-	-	-	-	-
Habitat	-	- + (  P)	-	- (↑ P_MP)	- (↑ P)
iragmentation		$+(\downarrow 1)$	$+(\downarrow C)$	-( 1, W(X)) + ( P)	$-( \mathbf{I})$
				· (↓ · )	- († SP)
					$+(\uparrow SD)$
					$+(\downarrow SP)$
Disturbance	-	-	-	-	- (↑ P)
(risk)	+ († F)	- († P)	- († C)	- († P)	- (↓ SĎ)
(~-)		$+(\downarrow P)$	$+(\downarrow C)$	$+(\downarrow P)$	- († SP)
		·			=
					$+(\downarrow P)$
					+ (↑ SD)
					$+(\downarrow SP)$

1182