Keystone individuals – linking predator traits to community ecology
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Individual behavioral plasticity enables animals to adjust to different scenarios. Yet, personality traits limit this flexibility, leading to consistent interindividual differences in behavior. These individual behavioral traits have the potential to govern community interactions, although testing this is difficult in complex natural systems. For large predators who often exert strong effects on ecosystem functioning, this behavioral diversity may be especially important and lead to individualized ecosystem roles. We present a framework for quantifying individual behavioral plasticity and personality traits of large wild predators, revealing the extent to which certain natural behaviors are governed by these latent traits. The outcomes will reveal how the innate characteristics of wildlife can scale up to affect community interactions.

Animal behavioral diversity and community ecology

Animal personality (see Glossary) research has grown enormously over the previous two decades, with efforts focused on elucidating the mechanisms by which consistent individual behavioral differences arise. Specific personality traits (e.g., boldness and aggressiveness) affect life history characteristics, the distribution of individuals over landscapes, social dynamics, and transmission of information or infectious disease within groups [1–4]. The ecosystem-level consequences of variation in these traits may be especially pronounced for Earth’s megabiota, which often disproportionately impact landscapes and ecosystems [5]. Among these species, large predators can regulate prey populations and smaller competitors, limit the spread of diseases, induce risk effects, and provide nutrients and energy from carrion [6]. Predators that alter prey density or induce fear, can affect herbivore distributions (i.e., landscapes of fear), leading to cascading effects for plants and numerous smaller organisms [7,8]. The strength of these interactions are highly context dependent within and across ecosystems [9,10]. We argue that within-species behavioral diversity, in the form of personality traits, should be considered among these contexts.

While research on wild predators has investigated behavioral repeatability (personality in its broadest sense), specific traits should be considered latent characteristics (e.g., derived from gene–environment interactions) [11]. Combinations and degrees of traits will then have behavioral consequences and drive ecosystem role diversity. Here we present a framework for how researchers can quantify independent personality traits and individual behavioral plasticity and use derived estimates to examine individualization to ecological roles of wild predators. We then present examples of hypothesized pathways by which individual traits can govern community interactions and how identification of these traits may help us better understand and predict individual responses to environmental change.

Highlights

Animal personality traits and individual behavioral plasticity can lead to individual differences in ecosystem roles and biotic interactions.

The ecosystem-level consequences of individual variation are likely particularly important for large, apex predators who can strongly influence community interactions, yet are understudied.

Human activities may favor certain traits within populations and the displacement or loss of certain phenotypes may alter the structure of food webs and reduce ecosystem resilience.

We provide a framework for identifying these traits and individual plasticity in wild predators. The outcomes should allow for an exploration of how behavioral diversity can translate to individualized ecosystem roles.
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A framework for identifying the individual behavioral traits of predators

Although personality has been explored in wild and captive predators \cite{12,13}, no research has so far used the full array of validity tests required to infer specific and independent personality traits \cite{14}. This oversight is coupled with a trend for research to label any behavior exhibiting repeatability as personality generally, and to speculate on which traits these behaviors are linked to. For example, in brown bears (Ursus actos), daily displacement has been used as an indicator for exploration, while diurnality and selection for roads and open habitats have been used as indicators for boldness \cite{15}. Similarly, selection of roads and human infrastructure has been used as a proxy for boldness in dispersing grey wolves (Canis lupis) \cite{16}. This approach can be misleading as repeatability is calculated over time domains that make it challenging for researchers to know what ecological scenarios underpin these behaviors.

For a behavior to be considered a reliable indicator for a latent personality trait, it must exhibit both among-individual variation (i.e., repeatability) and within-individual consistency (i.e., low individual plasticity and high predictability). Crucially, the behavior must also exhibit: (i) ecological validity, (ii) convergent validity with at least one other distinct and repeatable behavior, and (iii) discriminant validity with the remaining behaviors under investigation \cite{17}. In this context, a personality trait has downstream effects on behavior (i.e., behaviors are symptoms of traits). Importantly, a behavior may be repeatable without being a valid proxy for a latent personality trait, and therefore validity testing is required to identify distinct personality traits \cite{17}. In this approach, ecologically valid experiments are used to control the ecological scenarios underpinning behavioral responses; thus, covariation (or lack of) between individual behaviors (recorded from different tests) represents an unambiguous assessment of the presence/absence of specific traits \cite{17}.

Research aiming to link information about personality traits to natural patterns of behavior typically use a two-step approach in which individual variation in experimental responses is linked to variation in natural behavioral patterns \cite{18}. The errors associated with these behaviors is typically lost when datasets are combined for analysis, potentially yielding misleading results \cite{19}. Later, we present a framework that combines ecological (i.e., variance partitioning) \cite{20} and psychological (i.e., validity testing) \cite{17} approaches to determine whether specific behaviors reflect situational (or plastic) responses to external stimuli or latent personality traits. Our framework retains the error related to experimentally elicited and natural behaviors, allowing exploration of the individual covariances of these behaviors. The outputs can be used to develop a mechanistic understanding of how innate attributes combine to govern individualization to animals’ ecosystem roles.

Defining personality traits

In behavioral ecology, five main personality traits have been presented: boldness, exploration, activity, sociability, and aggression (Table 1) \cite{1}; however, operationally defining certain traits and designing ecologically valid tests for these traits has been challenging \cite{17}. Boldness has been defined as the propensity to take risks, excluding novel scenarios \cite{1}, or, conversely, interpreted as the propensity to take risks, especially in novel situations \cite{21}; yet, responses to novel foods have also been considered to represent a neophilia trait \cite{22}. Flight initiation distance (FID) methods have also been used as a proxy for boldness \cite{23,24}, but given that many species now encounter humans on a consistent basis, approaches by humans may instead be an ecologically valid measure of a distinct human-tolerance trait \cite{25}. Similarly, open-field tests are used to measure exploration; however, the context of whether exposure to the novel environment is forced (Table 1) determines whether the test is more likely to measure risk taking versus exploration \cite{17}. We solve these issues in our framework by presenting...
Table 1. Tests and measures for quantifying distinct personality traits in wild terrestrial predators. Also included is a summary of ethical and methodological considerations, including how certain tests can measure or confound with other tests unless designed robustly.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experimental/field tests</th>
<th>Behavioral measures</th>
<th>Important considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Risk taking</strong> [1]</td>
<td>Trapability: number of times captured per temporal period (e.g., month).</td>
<td>Ethical: trapping exclusively for these purposes may be considered unethical, especially if also released into an enclosure. Efficacy: many species/individuals may be trap shy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Emergence</strong></td>
<td>Entry decision: test must be free, and to resume previous behaviors.</td>
<td>Ethical: trapping exclusively for these purposes may be considered unethical, especially if also released into an enclosure. Efficacy: many species/individuals may be trap shy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Novel object</strong> [22]</td>
<td>Time spent in the arena, distance travelled, time spent moving and inspecting (e.g., sniffing) walls or objects within the arena.</td>
<td>Ethical: trapping exclusively for these purposes may be considered unethical, especially if also released into an enclosure. Efficacy: many species/individuals may be trap shy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Novel sound</strong> [22]</td>
<td>Vision: many predators lack trichromatic color vision.</td>
<td>Ethical: trapping exclusively for these purposes may be considered unethical, especially if also released into an enclosure. Efficacy: many species/individuals may be trap shy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neophilia</strong> [22]</td>
<td>Ethical: provisioning food may be considered unethical or risks future conflict with humans. Vital that animals do not learn to associate humans with food.</td>
<td>Ethical: trapping exclusively for these purposes may be considered unethical, especially if also released into an enclosure. Efficacy: many species/individuals may be trap shy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Novel object: latency to and time spent interacting with the stimulus.</td>
<td>Ethical: trapping exclusively for these purposes may be considered unethical, especially if also released into an enclosure. Efficacy: many species/individuals may be trap shy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Novel sound: time spent investigating the area (i.e., sound).</td>
<td>Ethical: trapping exclusively for these purposes may be considered unethical, especially if also released into an enclosure. Efficacy: many species/individuals may be trap shy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exploration</strong> [17]</td>
<td>Scent-marking responses: scent stations must be cleaned and refreshed regularly to avoid biases.</td>
<td>Ethical: trapping exclusively for these purposes may be considered unethical, especially if also released into an enclosure. Efficacy: many species/individuals may be trap shy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neophobia</strong> [22]</td>
<td>Time spent investigating the area (i.e., sound).</td>
<td>Ethical: trapping exclusively for these purposes may be considered unethical, especially if also released into an enclosure. Efficacy: many species/individuals may be trap shy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Novel object</strong> [22]</td>
<td>Ethical: trapping exclusively for these purposes may be considered unethical, especially if also released into an enclosure. Efficacy: many species/individuals may be trap shy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Novel sound</strong> [22]</td>
<td>Ethical: provisioning food may be considered unethical or risks future conflict with humans. Vital that animals do not learn to associate humans with food.</td>
<td>Ethical: trapping exclusively for these purposes may be considered unethical, especially if also released into an enclosure. Efficacy: many species/individuals may be trap shy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neophilia</strong> [22]</td>
<td>Ethical: provisioning food may be considered unethical or risks future conflict with humans. Vital that animals do not learn to associate humans with food.</td>
<td>Ethical: trapping exclusively for these purposes may be considered unethical, especially if also released into an enclosure. Efficacy: many species/individuals may be trap shy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Punishment</strong> [22]</td>
<td>Ethical: provisioning food may be considered unethical or risks future conflict with humans. Vital that animals do not learn to associate humans with food.</td>
<td>Ethical: trapping exclusively for these purposes may be considered unethical, especially if also released into an enclosure. Efficacy: many species/individuals may be trap shy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued on next page)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1. (continued)</th>
<th>Behavioral measures</th>
<th>Important considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Experimental/field tests</strong></td>
<td><strong>Behavioral measures</strong></td>
<td><strong>Important considerations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>human scents to novel environment materials/objects (e.g., cleaning and wearing coveralls, face masks, and gloves). Conflation: risk taking, neophilia, or activity. Adaptation to social species: attributes of the social environment are likely important to consider (e.g., the sequence of individuals entering a new environment).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Activity</strong> [1]</td>
<td>Time spent moving or distance covered.</td>
<td>Familiarity: an experimental test for ‘activity’ likely requires captive animals exploring familiar enclosures [55]; it may be challenging to recreate this stimulus in natural settings. Thus, remotely sensed or observation data may be more effective in wild individuals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Human tolerance</strong> [25]</td>
<td>FID and encounters: flight time/distance and latency to return or to resume previous behaviors. Human scents: avoidance of the area and time spent interacting with the scented substrate.</td>
<td>Safety: for some species, populations, or individuals FID approaches on foot will not be safe. Tangential approaches may offer a viable alternative where direct approaches are not feasible. Encountering stimuli: these tests must be free. Conflation: risk-taking or aggression. Ecological validity: although FIDs can also be conducted with vehicles, animals may not associate the vehicle with humans specifically. As such, a vehicle FID may be a better measure for risk taking. However, the two methods may exhibit shared-method variance. Adaptation to social species: these methods have been used on social animals [30]. Individuals of social groups should be measured in (relative) isolation, with contextual factors such as distance to conspecifics and whether they flee first accounted for.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sociability</strong> [64]</td>
<td>Mirror; time spent inspecting (e.g., sniffing) mirror without showing any aggression [62]. Encounters: flight time/distance and latency to return or to resume previous behaviors. Conspecific scents: avoidance of the area, latency to and time spent interacting with the scented substrate.</td>
<td>Injury: mirror must be able to withstand attacks, for example, acrylic. Inappropriate for aerial predators or where smaller birds may collide with surface. Encountering stimuli: these tests must be free. Scent-marking responses: see risk taking. Conflation: aggression and risk taking (e.g., the animal may hold its ground and vocalize).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Field mirror</strong></td>
<td>Mirror; time spent inspecting a mirror [60]. Encounter simulation: the animal is exposed to audio playbacks of unfamiliar conspecific calls [60] or unfamiliar conspecific scents.</td>
<td>Mirror; time spent inspecting (e.g., sniffing) mirror without showing any aggression [62]. Encounters: flight time/distance and latency to return or to resume previous behaviors. Conspecific scents: avoidance of the area, latency to and time spent interacting with the scented substrate.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
operational definitions focused on specific behaviors and contexts (see Glossary and Table 1). Importantly, we divide the popular boldness trait into risk taking, neophilia, and human tolerance, with the remaining traits defined such that they are clearly distinct.

Designing ecologically valid methods

Ecologically valid experiments offer the greatest scope for controlling scenarios and testing animal responses across a range of realistic conditions, and are the most powerful option for inference [13]. Undertaking an entirely experimental approach may be unrealistic or disruptive for some wildlife, but there are several ways of designing ecologically valid tests (Table 1). We offer suggestions (see Figure I in Box 1) for collecting observational data (e.g., direct observations, camera traps, dietary data, and GPS/drone data) and organizing into temporal periods (e.g., blocks) that mimic the trial number structure of repeated experiments, thus allowing for validity testing (Box 1) – with measurement-error models used to retain the error within each

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experimental/field tests</th>
<th>Behavioral measures</th>
<th>Important considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aggression [1]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field mirror: described earlier. Encounter simulation: described earlier.</td>
<td>Mirror: latency to attack or number of attacks (e.g., swiping) [65]. Encounters: number of aggressive behaviors (e.g., vocalizations, threatening gestures). Conspecific scents: latency to and time spent interacting with the scented substrate.</td>
<td>Injury: see sociability. Encountering stimuli: see sociability. Scent-marking responses: see risk taking. Conflict: sociability and risk taking. Adaptation to social species: see sociability.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Table 1. (continued) |
|----------------------|-------------------|
| **Experimental/field tests** | **Behavioral measures** | **Important considerations** |
| Aggression [1] | Field mirror: described earlier. Encounter simulation: described earlier. | Mirror: latency to attack or number of attacks (e.g., swiping) [65]. Encounters: number of aggressive behaviors (e.g., vocalizations, threatening gestures). Conspecific scents: latency to and time spent interacting with the scented substrate. |

Integrating variance portioning and validity testing

First, for each natural and experimentally elicited behavior, a univariate double-hierarchical model (DHGLM) should be implemented that includes a random intercept for individual identity, with intraindividual residual variance (i.e., predictability) and correlation components also defined [18,20]. DHGLMs concerning natural behaviors (Figure I) also require a measurement-error component if averages are used (e.g., averaging daily travel distance per week/month). All-important confounding variables (i.e., alternative hypotheses) should be included as random terms or as fixed effects, and as slopes over individual identity (i.e., reaction norm slopes). Alternative hypotheses and model structures should be devised using an information-theoretic approach [51], thus ensuring that the variance partitioning components of repeatability, reaction norm slopes, predictability, and the correlation between individual intercepts and their reaction norm slopes [18] are all estimated with the least bias [52]. Second, the same model structures used in the univariate DHGLMs should be implemented as bivariate models for validity testing between behaviors [18,19,52], allowing the variance components to be estimated according to the covariance between both behaviors.

Sampling requirements

To accurately estimate all of the variance components, a study with ≥50 individuals would require four samples per individual in each ecological scenario [20]. Given that predator populations are often widely dispersed, a study of 15 or 20 individuals would require at least 18 and 12 samples (respectively) per individual for each experiment/behavior. If multiple random terms (e.g., for among-habitat or -experimental design effects) and reaction norm slopes are required, then individual replicates may need to increase by a factor of two per additional term. We recommend therefore that datasets and analyses are simulated before data collection to determine sampling requirements. Some process of identifying the most parsimonious model or the model with the greatest predictive precision may be required during the final analysis to minimize over-fitting issues (e.g., stacking of predictive distributions and assessing $R^2$ values).

Quantifying individuals according to personality traits and plasticity

Each DHGLM will calculate the difference between the predicted mean population-level response (for the set of fixed effects) and the predicted responses for each individual. These individual-specific intercepts (i.e., conditional modes or best linear unbiased predictors) infer the extent to which each individual differs from the population mean, and thus, represent individual positions on particular personality trait continua [19]. Similarly, individual-level estimates for reaction norm slopes represent each individual’s relative plasticity across the gradient of interest.
temporal period. For each ecologically valid behavioral measure, researchers must carefully record data on confounding variables (i.e., alternative hypotheses). Examples include methodological (e.g., observer effects, familiarity with experiment, scents from humans/other wildlife), abiotic (e.g., weather and seasonality), ecological scenarios (e.g., prey density, competitor presence, and kill size), and individual phenotypic confounds (e.g., reproductive status, age, sex, and body size). Deciding whether and how to center these variables is vital to ensuring models have meaningful values for zero [20].

A combined approach for identifying personality traits and plasticity
We propose that researchers initially perform variance partitioning [18] on natural and experimentally elicited behaviors (Box 1). Any behaviors exhibiting repeatability and within-individual consistencies (i.e., relatively flat reaction norm slopes and high predictability) can then be taken forward for validity testing to infer personality traits. Validity testing using multivariate models ensures that individual variances are brought forward through every level of analysis [26]. Validity testing therefore requires at least two distinct behavioral measures – one of which should be derived experimentally – for each personality trait under investigation; otherwise, it is unclear whether certain behaviors are narrowly applicable to specific scenarios [17]. This distinguishes validity testing from behavioral syndromes (which considers only correlated suites of behavior), allowing
researchers to identify specific personality traits governing behavioral patterns. If all the experiments designed to test a specific trait fail to elicit repeatability and within-individual consistency, then validity testing is not needed, and researchers can reject the hypothesis that a certain trait is present.

Labeling behaviors and traits
We recommend that the traits we define (Table 1) are initially used to design a range of ecologically valid tests, but the final labeling of traits is only done once results are known. For instance, neophilia and exploration may be best described as neophobia and avoidance if a study group/population typically avoid novel objects or environments (but among-individual variation remains). If researchers cannot achieve robust sample sizes (e.g., low density populations) then identifying distinct traits may be out of reach. However, our framework still allows for within- and among-individual variation to be quantified in a single behavior (Box 1) and model-derived individual estimates used in subsequent ecological analyses (Box 2). This will still offer insights into how among-individual variation in a single behavior (i.e., behavior type) may contribute to varied ecosystem roles, but will not yield a mechanistic understanding of how innate characteristics combine to create heterogeneity in individual roles. Note, however, that failure to sample individuals across a full range of conditions can artificially inflate repeatability – known as pseudo-repeatability [20]. The accuracy of repeatability estimates also depends on the total sample size (number of individuals × number of repeats) and the extent of repeatability. For example, low repeatability values (~0.1) require ≥100 individuals with ≥4 repeats [20]. As a result, even in its most general sense, personality inference still requires robust sampling designs.

Box 2. Using personality findings to understand individual ecosystem roles

Individual-level predictors in ecological analyses
It is vital that the error associated with conditional modes or individual-reaction norm slopes is carried forward when investigating the correlations between individual behavioral traits and biotic interactions; to achieve this, we again recommend measurement-error models. These individual-specific estimates (and errors) can be used as covariates (i.e., population-level effects) in models exploring interindividual variation in carrion subsidies, habitat selection, prey landscapes of fear, or intraguild competition, or used as node-level attributes (i.e., phenotypic traits) in ecological networks [53]. Such analyses could reveal how innate characteristics can have downstream consequences on ecosystems or help predict how heterogeneous individuals respond to environmental change.

Phenotypic clustering
Animals with particular traits may cluster non-randomly across landscapes. Western bluebirds (Sialia mexicana) have been shown to sort into distinct breeding habitats based on individual aggressiveness [3]. Even within a habituated social group, chacma baboons’ positions in proximity and contact networks are affected by human presence according to each individual’s level of human tolerance [19]. The same principal may apply to animals across much broader spatial scales, resulting in humans redistributing key biotic interactions. For example, brown bears (Ursus arctos) show evidence of personality (in its broadest sense) [15], with interindividual differences in their movement patterns. While brown bears are considered dietary generalists, certain individuals will specialize, sometimes occupying distinctly herbivorous or carnivorous trophic positions within the same habitat [54], which we hypothesize are partly underpinned by specific personality traits. Individual brown bears can also respond in divergent ways to human presence where some mothers with cubs will use humans as a shield to avoid infanticide [55]. This human-caused redistribution may similarly occur for individuals depending on their specific personality traits, independent of reproductive status (Figure 1). It is therefore possible that human presence may redistribute bear patterns of seed dispersal [56] or predation. Once researchers have identified the traits present in their study population, mapping individuals’ ranges or occurrence distributions should reveal spatial patterns of phenotypic clustering – particularly if trapping uses methods unlikely to select for particular traits (see Table 1 in main text).

Applications to science communication
Finally, researchers might label trends graphically instead of conducting further statistical analysis (e.g., color coding individuals according to phenotypes) – such an approach should enable numerous opportunities for science communication. By emphasizing that these animals are individuals with different preferences and stories, researchers may help gain enthusiasm for conservation plans that allow behavioral heterogeneity to be protected.
Sacrificing testing for one or more personality traits (Table 1) may unintentionally reduce the certainty that the remaining traits are fully distinct. We recommend attempting to identify the full array of hypothesized personality traits in a single, consolidated framework. Although it could be argued that such an approach increases the odds of producing a ‘jangle’ fallacy (i.e., different trait labels actually measure the same trait) [17], running validity tests between every combination of behaviors (except for those with shared-method variance or that fail to exhibit repeatability, relatively flat slopes, and predictability) will ensure against this (i.e., a fully crossed design). Outcomes can then guide labeling decisions. For example, if behaviors used to measure neophilia covary with the behaviors used to measure the remaining hypothetical traits, researchers could reasonably argue evidence for a single boldness trait [21].

**Personality traits as drivers of ecosystem role diversity**

Species functional traits can shape their biotic interactions [27,28] and we argue that latent personality traits should drive consistent variation in species interactions [29], but predictions about
how they will govern community interactions are specific to the trait composition within each population or species (Figure 1). Certain trait combinations should produce individuals who exert stronger effects on interacting species. For example, individual predators who are highly risk taking may more regularly hunt prey larger than themselves [30,31]. This carnion can serve as a critical source of energy and nutrients to smaller organisms [32–34] and rare or endangered scavenger species (e.g., *Puma concolor* providing for Andean condors, *Vultur gryphus* [34–36]).

The effect of individual traits for this interaction is likely more pronounced in solitary species as social groups will consume more of a kill [32,37]. Yet even within solitary species, the tendency to share kills [37,38] should be connected to specific traits (e.g., sociability or aggressiveness), indirectly affecting scavengers/decomposers. As carcass size and human presence affect scavenger abundance [39], their distributions could track those of predators with specific traits, especially in anthropogenic landscapes (e.g., risk taking or human tolerant). Certain individuals should then play a disproportionate role in creating bio-geochemical hotspots where nutrients and moisture added to soil benefit plants and soil communities [33]. Considering highly

---

**Figure 1.** Hypothesized effects of potential personality traits on specific ecological roles. Along with more commonly considered individual traits (e.g., body size and reproductive status), specific personality traits should govern individual behavior, including interactions with other species. Listed here are a few example hypotheses to guide future research. Traits such as neophilia-neophobia could drive interindividual patterns of prey selection in a changing environment [66]. Risk taking could affect individual willingness to hunt large, or especially dangerous prey and (along with aggression and sociability, among others) result in substantial differences in individual carrion networks. Traits governing predator behavior may also affect the strength of fear effects. In addition, the traits of one species may interact with another in dynamic ways. For example, the traits of individual prey or the composition of personality traits found in a prey social group may affect their responses to predation risk [67]. This should similarly be true for competing predators (e.g., spotted hyena; *Crocuta crocuta*) show individual differences in response to risks from lions (*Panthera leo*) [68]. When and where human tolerance is found to be a personality trait, this will affect the nature and strength of biotic interactions within shared landscapes. Individual differences in human tolerance could result in the redistribution of certain phenotypes, but nonrandom spatial patterning (clustering or avoidance of similar phenotypes) may also happen naturally, leading to variation in where key ecosystem roles take place (see Box 2 in the main text). See [36,48].
connected or ecosystem engineering species are often termed keystones, we argue that certain individuals within a species can similarly produce outsized ecosystem effects (Figure 1).

The composition and spatial patterning of personality traits found in a predator population may further amplify or attenuate ecosystem-level effects and may be particularly consequential for predator–prey interactions. For example, in aquatic mesocosms, the composition traits can determine if predators induce density-mediated trophic cascades [4]. Prey selection may also be tied to personality and has been linked with beaver (Castor canadensis) predation by wolves (although not to specific traits) [40]. Similarly, some pumas select beavers more than expected [41], which could also be underpinned by personality. As beaver predation patterns can shape wetland distributions [42], it is possible that predator personalities have a major impact on landscape structure and human-centered ecosystem services [40]. When predators specialize on certain prey, regardless of availability, this can also negatively affect endangered prey viability [43]. In these cases, a predator’s unwillingness to hunt different prey may be underpinned by neophobia or a lack of plasticity, rendering individuals particularly consequential for conservation.

The fear that predators induce in their prey can be affected by species-level traits, such as hunting mode [3,10]. Ambush predators that consistently hunt from certain locations or microhabitats tend to induce stronger landscapes of fear than coursing predators that chase prey across great distances [9,10,44,45]. Yet, within a single species, individual behavioral traits could also affect prey fear. Within a single predator species, highly active, explorative, or plastic individuals may be less consistent in their hunting habitat selection, generating fewer reliable cues that allow prey to avoid risky places. The converse might also be true for individuals who tend towards the opposite extremes with less explorative or active individuals inducing stronger fear responses and spatial avoidance (Figure 1).

Concluding remarks

Individual behavioral traits can govern ecological roles [4,14,40,46,47], but extending this research to megafauna inhabiting complex natural systems is a challenge. We have provided a framework for how researchers might tackle questions on large terrestrial predators, but these experimental and observational methods should be adaptable to a variety of taxa and systems. These ideas may help us understand how communities evolve in response to both global change – and conservation efforts. In Europe and North America, apex predators are recolonizing areas of their former ranges and dispersers who survive in new locations may tend towards particular traits or greater plasticity [48]. At present, we know little about whether this is actually the case, or if dispersal distance is more strongly linked with environmental and morphological/physiological factors. Researchers, wildlife managers, and the public, are also quick to label problem individuals as bold [48], despite often lacking the evidence to do so. Yet, plastic individuals may opportunistically feed on domestic animals or anthropogenic foods, while others may overcome their personality traits (e.g., risk averse or human intolerant) to avoid starvation. Incorrectly labeling these individuals could therefore misguide management plans (e.g., targeted culling) (see Outstanding questions).

When apex predators decline due to anthropogenic pressures [6], generalists (e.g., coyotes, Canis latrans) that typically occupy middle trophic positions may take larger prey [49], becoming apex predators sensu lato. As human tolerance as a personality trait may also exist on an independent axis, tolerant individuals subject to human habituation (e.g., suburban dwellers) may adopt an apex role as intolerants are filtered out (Box 2). Thus, even where humans and predators coexist, filtering for specific traits (via habitat selection and/or biased mortality) may be an unappreciated way in which we are redistributing community interactions (Box 2). Limiting these effects within more sparsely populated areas may be possible by allowing wildlife enough
space to roam (e.g., periodically shutting down sections of protected areas from tourists [50]) and minimizing human activities within corridors between larger protected areas, allowing a greater diversity of phenotypes to move across large landscapes.
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