

Ecography

**ECOG-04635**

Cunningham, C. X., Johnson, C. N., Hollings, T., Kreger, K. and Jones, M. E. 2019. Trophic rewilding establishes a landscape of fear: Tasmanian devil introduction increases risk-sensitive foraging in a key prey species. – *Ecography* doi: 10.1111/ecog.04635

**Supplementary material**

## Appendix 1

Trophic rewilding establishes a landscape of fear: Tasmanian devil introduction increases risk-sensitive foraging in a key prey species

Table A1. Model outputs from LMM analysis of the number of sultanas remaining in a food patch in the mBACI GUD experiment. The purpose of this table is to show the models that were omitted from model comparison because they contained “pretending variables” (Anderson 2007). When a pretending variable was identified, we excluded it from model comparison in the main text of the paper. Here, “pretending variables” are shown in bold and denoted with a ‘\*’. The table shows the model rank based on change in AICc ( $\Delta$ AICc) from the top model, model weights and model coefficient estimates (s.e.) for each predictor variable. We present models within 7  $\Delta$ AICc.

Model rank	Log Likelihood	$\Delta$ AICc	weight	df	Intercept	Period (after)	Region (north-east)	Period * (after:NE)	Position (risky)	Period * (after:risky)	Position * (after:risky)	Position * (after:risky)	Period * (after:risky)	Omitted because contains “pretending variable”
1	-3254.16	0.00	0.53	8	42.32 (3.91)	-3.92 (1.42)	-10.67 (5.49)	-6.81 (1.98)						
2	-3254.08	1.89	0.21	9	42.56 (3.96)	-3.92 (1.42)	-10.66 (5.49)	-6.81 (1.98)	<b>-0.49</b> <b>(1.23)*</b>					YES
3	-3253.56	2.92	0.12	10	42.63 (3.95)	-3.03 (1.67)	-10.66 (5.48)	-6.83 (1.98)	<b>-0.70</b> <b>(1.25)*</b>	<b>-1.78*</b> <b>(1.77)</b>				YES
4	-3254.08	3.94	0.07	10	42.61 (4.02)	-3.92 (1.42)	-10.74 (5.64)	-6.81 (1.92)	<b>-0.58</b> <b>(1.84)*</b>		<b>0.15</b> <b>(2.48)*</b>			YES
5	-3253.56	4.97	0.04	11	42.55 (4.01)	-3.01 (1.68)	-10.52 (5.63)	-6.83 (1.98)	<b>-0.55</b> <b>(1.84)*</b>	<b>-1.81*</b> <b>(1.80)</b>	<b>-0.28</b> <b>(2.51)*</b>			YES
Null	-3286.25	58.08	0.00	5	37.98 (2.84)									

Table A2. Model outputs from LMM analysis of the number of sultanas remaining in a food patch in the ‘after’ period. The purpose of this table is to show the models that were omitted from model comparison because they contained “pretending variables” (Anderson 2007). When a pretending variable was identified, we excluded it from model comparison and Table 2 in the main text of the paper. Here, “pretending variables” are shown in bold and denoted with a ‘\*’. The table shows the model rank based on change in AICc ( $\Delta$ AICc) from the top model, model weights and model coefficient estimates (s.e.) for each predictor variable. We present models within 7  $\Delta$ AICc. Models worse than the null are not shown.

Model rank	Log Likelihood	$\Delta$ AICc	weight	df	Intercept	Devil detections per transect	Position	Devil detections * Position	Omitted because contains “pretending variable”
1	-1398.38	0.00	0.46	6	24.96 (3.65)	0.69 (0.22)			
2	-1397.67	0.68	0.33	7	25.84 (3.69)	0.69 (0.22)	<b>Risky: -2.07 (1.73)*</b>		YES
3	-1397.45	2.34	0.14	8	26.48 (3.82)	0.64 (0.23)	<b>Risky: -3.43 (2.67)*</b>	<b>0.11 (0.17)*</b>	YES
Null	-1401.77	4.72	0.04	5	33.98 (3.30)				

#### Reference list

Anderson, D. R. 2007. Model based inference in the life sciences: a primer on evidence. - Springer Science & Business Media.