



Only the largest terrestrial Carnivores increase their dietary breadth with increasing prey richness

Journal:	<i>Mammal Review</i>
Manuscript ID	MAMMAL-19-38.R2
Manuscript Type:	Review
Please provide one keyword (or phrase) describing the taxon or taxa covered by the study (e.g. Carnivores, Rodents, rats, <i>Rattus rattus</i> , livestock, bats, wolves and prey, etc.):	Carnivores
Please provide one keyword (or phrase) on the geographical area covered by the study (e.g. global, Europe, British Isles, N America, Northern Hemisphere, etc.):	global
Keywords :	Canidae, large carnivores, Felidae, interspecific competition, food habits
Subject Areas (select one):	Foraging/diet
Mammalian Orders (select all that apply):	Carnivora

Title: Only the largest terrestrial Carnivores increase their dietary breadth with increasing prey richness

Authors: Francesco Ferretti¹, Sandro Lovari^{1,2}, Mauro Lucherini³, Matt Hayward⁴, Philip A. Stephens⁵

Addresses: ¹Research Unit of Behavioural Ecology, Ethology and Wildlife Management, Department of Life Sciences, University of Siena, Via P.A. Mattioli 4, 53100, Siena, Italy;

²Maremma Natural History Museum, Strada Corsini 5, 58100, Grosseto, Italy;

³Grupo de Ecología Comportamental de Mamíferos, Laboratorio de Fisiología Animal, INBIOSUR (Instituto de Investigaciones Biológicas y Biomédicas del Sur), Universidad Nacional del Sur - CONICET, San Juan 671, 8000, Bahía Blanca, Argentina;

⁴Conservation Biology Research Group, School of Environmental and Life Sciences, University of Newcastle, Callaghan, NSW 2308 Australia; and Centre for Invasion Biology, University of Pretoria, South Africa X0001;

⁵Conservation Ecology Group, Department of Biosciences, Durham University, South Road, Durham DH1 3LE, UK.

Corresponding author: Francesco Ferretti, Research Unit of Behavioural Ecology, Ethology and Wildlife Management, Department of Life Sciences, University of Siena, Via P.A. Mattioli 4, 53100, Siena, Italy. Email: francescoferretti82@gmail.com

Acknowledgements

We are grateful to M. Guerisoli and M. Franchini for helping to build the list of puma diet publications. C. Chierchia and A.V.S. Ferretti kindly helped with the preparation of Supplementary Materials. F. Ferretti was supported through a EU-COFUND Marie Curie Senior Research Fellowship provided by the Durham University's Institute of Advanced Studies, during a 2-month stay in Durham. We thank four anonymous reviewers for comments to an earlier draft.

1 **Title:** Only the largest terrestrial Carnivores increase their dietary breadth with increasing prey
2 richness

3 **Article type:** Review

4 **Abstract (maximum 300 words)**

- 5 1. Animals should adapt their foraging habits, changing their diet breadth in response to variation
6 in richness and availability of food resources. Understanding how species modify their diet
7 breadth according to variation in resource richness would help to predict their responses to
8 environmental changes that alter prey communities.
- 9 2. We evaluated relationships between diet breadth of large terrestrial carnivores and local
10 richness of large prey. We tested alternative predictions suggested by ecological and
11 evolutionary theories: with growing prey richness, species could (*i*) show a more diverse diet,
12 thus broadening their diet breadth, or (*ii*) narrow their diet breadth, indicating specialisation on
13 a smaller number of prey.
- 14 3. We collated data from 505 studies of the diets of 12 species of large terrestrial mammalian
15 carnivores to model relationships between two indices of dietary breadth and local prey
16 richness.
- 17 4. For the majority of species, we found no evidence for narrowing diet breadth (i.e., increased
18 specialisation) with growing prey richness. Although snow leopard and dhole appeared to use a
19 lower number of large prey species with growing prey richness, larger sample sizes are needed
20 to support this result.
- 21 5. With growing prey richness, the 5 largest carnivores (tiger, lion, spotted hyaena, jaguar, puma),
22 plus grey wolf and Eurasian lynx (which are usually top predators in the areas from which data
23 were obtained) showed broader diet breadth and/or used a greater number of large prey species
24 (i.e., increased generalism).
- 25 6. Dominant carnivores should encounter little competition in expanding their diet breadth with
26 growing prey richness; conversely, the dietary niche of subordinate large carnivores would be

27 limited by competition with larger, dominant predators. Over evolutionary time, resource
28 partitioning would be more important in shaping the dietary niche of smaller, inferior
29 competitors than those of dominant ones.

30

31

32 **Key-words:** Canidae; food habits; large carnivores; Felidae; interspecific competition; predator-
33 prey relationships.

34 **Running head:** Diet breadth of large terrestrial carnivores

35 **Word count:** 7875

For Review Only

36 **Introduction**

37 Variation in richness and availability of food resources is expected to affect foraging habits and diet
38 composition of species (e.g., Jarman 1974; Macdonald 1983; Hofmann 1989), in turn influencing
39 their diet breadth (e.g., Birkhofer & Wolters 2012; Forister et al. 2015; Creel et al. 2018).

40 Environmental changes and anthropogenic alterations of natural communities have profound
41 ecological consequences (e.g., Walther et al. 2002, 2009), often influencing the richness and
42 availability of resources available to foragers. The extent to which species modify their diet
43 according to variation in food availability is influenced by anatomical, physiological and
44 behavioural traits, as well as ecological determinants (e.g., Hofmann 1989; Forister et al. 2015;
45 Creel et al. 2018). Understanding whether and how species modify their foraging habits according
46 to variation in food resources should help to predict their responses and ability to adapt to the
47 effects of environmental changes (Forister et al. 2015).

48 Large terrestrial carnivores play fundamental roles in ecosystems and are ecologically,
49 culturally and economically important worldwide (Ripple et al. 2014). Changes in the abundance of
50 large terrestrial carnivores can trigger cascading effects with impacts on lower trophic levels (e.g.,
51 Hebblewhite et al. 2005; Estes et al. 2011; Ripple et al. 2014). Additionally, many are threatened
52 with extinction (Macdonald et al. 2010). Usually, they depend on medium-large terrestrial
53 vertebrates for prey (Carbone et al. 1999, 2007), and this dependence tends to increase with
54 carnivore body size (Carbone et al. 2010). Their food habits – and, thus, their diet breadth – are
55 expected to be strongly influenced by variation in the richness of large prey (see also Estes et al.
56 2011; Hatton et al. 2015; Creel et al. 2018).

57 Ecological and evolutionary theories, as well as empirical studies, invite opposing
58 expectations about the dietary response of foragers to changing richness of their food resources.
59 When a greater diversity of resources is available, foragers may respond by expanding their dietary
60 breadth (Birkhofer & Wolters 2012). However, we might expect to observe a more diverse
61 community of herbivores, which are prey to carnivores, in nutrient-rich areas (e.g. Danell et al.

62 1996; Prins & Olff 2002). In richer environments, optimal foraging theory predicts that species
63 should become increasingly specialised (MacArthur & Pianka 1966; Charnov 1976), narrowing
64 their niches to concentrate on the most profitable resources. Thus, when the richness of food
65 resources is greater, we would expect a narrower diet breadth (MacArthur & Pianka 1966; Schoener
66 1971; Forister et al. 2015).

67 Variations in prey communities can be triggered by natural or anthropogenic drivers (e.g.,
68 Sinclair et al. 2003; Wegge et al. 2009; Creel et al. 2018). Poaching, intensive hunting and/or
69 habitat manipulation can reduce prey abundance and diversity, posing significant threats to
70 carnivore populations, as well as affecting their food habits (e.g. Estes et al. 2011; Sandom et al.
71 2017; Creel et al. 2018). Additionally, environmental/climatic changes can influence species'
72 distributions (e.g. Walther et al. 2002, 2009), which is expected to trigger a re-arrangement of
73 communities, in the medium-to-long term. Natural or human-driven variations in prey communities
74 influence food ecology of carnivores (e.g., Meriggi & Lovari 1996; Bagchi & Mishra 2006;
75 Khorozyan et al. 2015; Creel et al. 2018; Khan et al. 2018). Thus, assessing whether and how the
76 diet breadth of large terrestrial carnivores varies with changing prey diversity has important
77 theoretical and practical implications. Despite this, a global evaluation of how the diet breadth of
78 large carnivores varies with prey richness is lacking.

79 We reviewed information on the food habits of large terrestrial carnivores to evaluate intra-
80 specific variation in diet breadth in relation to prey richness. In particular, we assessed support for
81 the following alternative predictions: (i) with increasing prey richness, carnivores use a larger
82 spectrum of prey, thus showing a broader diet breadth; or (ii) with increasing prey richness,
83 carnivores tend to specialise on the most profitable prey, thus showing a narrower diet breadth.
84 Body size of carnivores influences their dependence on large prey (Carbone et al. 2010). From that,
85 we would expect that (iii) the strength of the relationships between dietary breadth and richness of
86 large prey increases with carnivore body size.

87

88 **Methods**

89

90 *Study species and definitions*

91 We focused on large terrestrial carnivores (Mammalia: Carnivora), with a diet mainly based on
92 large terrestrial vertebrate prey. In particular, we included carnivores heavier than 14.5 kg (mean
93 body mass), the body weight threshold suggested for carnivores to switch to an obligate carnivorous
94 diet based on large prey (Carbone et al. 2007), excluding Ursidae, which typically have diets
95 dominated by non-vertebrate foods. Considering mean adult body masses taken from the PanTheria
96 database (Jones et al. 2009), 15 carnivore species were selected initially: tiger *Panthera tigris* (for
97 body mass, see Table 2), lion *Panthera leo*, jaguar *Panthera onca*, spotted hyaena *Crocuta crocuta*,
98 puma *Puma concolor*, leopard *Panthera pardus*, cheetah *Acinonyx jubatus*, brown hyaena *Hyaena*
99 *bruna*, striped hyaena *Hyaena hyaena*, snow leopard *Panthera uncia*, grey wolf *Canis lupus*,
100 African wild dog *Lycaon pictus*, Eurasian lynx *Lynx lynx*, dhole *Cuon alpinus* and clouded leopard
101 *Neofelis nebulosa*. Among them, the brown hyaena (43.0 kg) and the striped hyaena (35.1 kg) were
102 not considered because they are mainly scavengers (e.g., Kruuk 1976; Owens & Owens 1978; Stein
103 et al. 2013; Yarnell et al. 2013), with food habits dependent on carrion left by other carnivores.
104 Additionally, the clouded leopard (14.9 kg) was excluded because of the very limited number of
105 studies on its food habits (Rabinowitz et al. 1987; Grassman et al. 2005). Thus, we based our review
106 on 12 species.

107 Large terrestrial carnivores rely mainly on large terrestrial prey (Carbone et al. 2007). So,
108 we considered the richness of large terrestrial vertebrate prey (hereafter "large prey") that we
109 defined as heavier than 10 kg, following Carbone et al. (2007). Livestock types are often
110 inconsistently reported across studies, being frequently pooled in a single 'livestock' category. To
111 ensure a consistent treatment across studies, all livestock types were pooled into a single category of
112 large prey. In some cases, several species of prey were reported in the literature as a cumulative
113 prey category (e.g. 'deer', 'peccaries', or 'duikers'): in these cases, we considered the cumulative prey

114 category as a single 'species'. Wild prey smaller than 10 kg were pooled together into a single
115 'Other' category.

116

117 *Literature review*

118 We searched ISI Web of Science and GoogleScholar with combinations of keywords that included
119 the common or scientific name of the focal carnivore species, and either 'diet', 'food habit', 'prey
120 use', 'prey selection' or 'predation'. We considered only documents published in English, up to
121 January 2019. In particular, we considered peer reviewed scientific papers, books, PhD/MSc theses
122 and conference proceedings. We also considered literature cited in papers found through this search,
123 to locate potential papers not detected in the first step. Studies were included only when both the
124 carnivore and prey communities were described. For each study, we defined the spectrum of
125 available potential large prey by considering information reported in primary sources. In some cases
126 - especially in prey-rich areas, such as African national parks - the description of the prey
127 community could be incomplete in primary articles. Therefore, we evaluated other official sources
128 (e.g., other contemporary papers or official check-lists) to assess the number of potential prey
129 species. Very large/mega-herbivores may not be prey for some carnivores (e.g., elephants
130 *Loxodonta africana*, for African wild dogs). Thus, for each carnivore we only considered those
131 species that have been reported - or known from literature – to be preyed on by that carnivore as
132 potential large prey (see Appendix S1 for a list of excluded prey species for each carnivore). We
133 only considered studies based on analyses of scat contents or kills. If a study reported both scats and
134 kills, we only used results obtained through the method based on the greatest sample size.

135 Several indicators can be used to quantify food habits of carnivores (e.g., absolute
136 occurrence, relative occurrence, volumetric estimates, biomass estimates; Kruuk & Parish 1981;
137 Ciucci et al. 1996; Chakrabarti et al. 2016). Among them, absolute/relative occurrences are the most
138 widely used methods and can be employed to evaluate dietary breadth (see below). Additionally,
139 besides uncertainties affecting the calculation of biomass consumed from scats (cf. Chakrabarti et

140 al. 2016; Khorozyan et al. 2017; Lumetsberger et al. 2017), it is usually impossible to know (i) the
141 age class and sex that was preyed upon; (ii) whether other carnivores also fed on the carcass; or (iii)
142 whether an individual fed alone or with conspecifics (e.g., a pair, a pack or a female with pups/cubs;
143 Bocci et al. 2017; Khan et al. 2018). Thus, to ensure consistent treatment across studies and species,
144 we considered studies: (i) which included absolute occurrences of given prey species in the diet,
145 i.e., the ratio of the total number of occurrences of that prey over the total number of scats/kills
146 analysed; (ii) for which absolute occurrence could be derived from relative occurrences (the ratio of
147 the total number of occurrences of that prey over the total number of prey items) reported in the
148 study; or (iii) reporting relative occurrences.

149 We defined as "study" an account of food habits of a carnivore species in a given study area.
150 We selected an initial total of 505 studies (out of 351 sources) and compiled a dataset including the
151 following information: paper title, year of publication, author(s), journal (if peer-reviewed), study
152 area, study period (years/months), carnivore focal species, sample type (scats or kills), sample size
153 (i.e., number of analysed scats or kills), absolute occurrence (or relative, if the absolute figure was
154 not provided) of each prey reported in the primary source.

155

156 *Data analyses*

157 We (i) pooled together all livestock types and summed up their occurrences; and (ii) pooled
158 together all smaller prey into the 'Other' category, and summed up their occurrences. For each
159 predator, multiple studies conducted in the same study area were pooled (i.e., absolute occurrences
160 of each prey, as well as sample sizes, were summed up across studies), to avoid pseudoreplication
161 of data obtained in the same study areas. Although changes in prey communities may occur
162 between different periods, the number of available prey species – which is the predictor used in the
163 analyses – is most unlikely to vary across several studies conducted in the same study area;
164 consequently, pooling should not affect our conclusions. Only studies conducted with the same
165 method (scats or kills) were pooled: in cases where the two methods had been used at different

166 times in the same area, only results obtained through the method based on the higher number of
167 observations were considered. When necessary, we added additional prey species available in the
168 study area, but not reported in the paper(s), and assigned them a '0' occurrence ($n = 81$ studies, after
169 pooling). The list of studies selected for the analyses ($N = 415$) is reported in Appendix S2. A
170 summary of the number of studies considered per species and sample type, before/after study
171 filtering/pooling, is shown in Table 1.

172 We calculated relative occurrences (i.e., the relative use) of each prey by dividing their
173 absolute occurrence by the total number of prey items, which is necessary to calculate diet breadth
174 indices (see below). For each carnivore species, we considered two indices of diet breadth. First, we
175 considered the total diet breadth, inclusive of all prey. To estimate total diet breadth, we considered
176 the Levins index (Levins 1968) as: $B = 1/\sum p_j^2$, where p_j is the proportion of items in the diet that
177 belong to the food category j . For this index, the 'Other' category was included in the calculation of
178 the overall dietary breadth. Large carnivores mainly depend on large prey for feeding and survival
179 (Carbone et al. 1999, 2007; see Introduction). Thus, we evaluated whether variation in the richness
180 of the guild of large prey would influence the use of large prey, prompting consideration of a
181 second, additional index focused on large prey only. Specifically, we determined the number of
182 frequently used resources (Krebs 1999) restricted to large prey showing a relative occurrence in
183 scats of at least 5% (this second index is the "Large Prey Index") (Krebs 1999). The Levins index
184 and the Large Prey index can vary from 0 to the maximum number of available prey (with a
185 maximum of 20 for Large Prey index, which is theoretically possible if 20 prey are used, each with
186 a frequency of 5%). For both indices, increasing values indicate increasing dietary breadth. The
187 Standardised Levins index is frequently used to quantify diet breadth (Colwell & Futuyma 1971;
188 Hurlbert 1978; Krebs 1999). The calculation of this index includes both the proportional use of
189 resources and the number of available potential resources (Colwell & Futuyma 1971; Hurlbert
190 1978; Krebs 1999). For this index, values are expected to be influenced by the number of potential
191 resources available (i.e., resource states) and, thus, it is unsuitable for comparisons between

192 populations using different resource matrices (Colwell & Futuyma 1971). Since our major focus
193 was the assessment of variations of dietary niche in relation to variations in prey richness, we did
194 not use the Standardised Levins index.

195 We used linear models to evaluate relationships between dietary breadth and richness of
196 large prey. For both indices, the following model was used for each species:

197
198 $\log(\text{Diet breadth index}) \sim \log(\text{N available large prey}) + \text{Sample type}$

199
200 To account for the greater reliability of studies based on larger samples, we weighted by sample
201 size [using “weights = sqrt(sample size)” in the model declaration]. To account for studies where no
202 large prey showed a frequency of use greater than 5%, we used a $\log(x+1)$ transformation for the
203 Large Prey Index (where x represents this index for any given species in a given study).

204 All models were weighted by square root of sample size (i.e., N scats or kills analysed in each
205 study) because variance typically declines linearly with that measure.

206 To evaluate whether the relationship between diet breadth and prey richness was affected by
207 carnivore body mass, we considered the model coefficients for the relationships between prey
208 richness and each dietary breadth index. Specifically, for both indices, we evaluated the following
209 model:

210
211 $\text{Model coefficient} \sim \log(\text{body mass})$

212
213 Relationships were considered as statistically supported if the 0.95 confidence intervals of
214 coefficients did not include ‘0’. Analyses were conducted through the RStudio version 1.1.447
215 software (R Core Team 2018).

216

217 **Results**

218 The Levins index (i.e., the total diet breadth) increased with growing prey richness for 6 carnivores
219 (lion, jaguar, spotted hyaena, puma, wolf and Eurasian lynx). Although the relationship between
220 this index and prey richness was negative for only two species, no association was supported for the
221 other 6 carnivores (Table 2; Fig. 1).

222 The Large Prey index (i.e., the diet breadth limited to the use of large prey) increased with prey
223 richness for 7 carnivores, including the five largest species considered (tiger, lion, jaguar, spotted
224 hyaena and puma), as well as the wolf and Eurasian lynx (Table 2; Fig. 2). This index showed a
225 decrease with growing prey richness for the dhole and the snow leopard, although 0.95 confidence
226 intervals were close to zero (Table 1).

227 We observed that the prey richness-dietary breadth relationship tended to increase with body mass,
228 but 0.95 confidence intervals always included zero (Table 3; Fig. 3). The fits, model coefficients
229 and 0.95 confidence intervals for linear models of both indices and predictors are shown in
230 Appendix S3.

231

232 **Discussion**

233 We assembled a large data set to relate the diet breadth of all large terrestrial mammalian carnivores
234 to the richness of their prey communities. In spite of the heterogeneity of sources, ecosystems and
235 researchers, our results support the existence of relationships between body size, dominance in
236 guilds and niche-partitioning. In particular, our results strongly suggest that the five largest
237 carnivores in the world, as well as the wolf and the Eurasian lynx, use a greater number of large
238 prey species with growing prey richness (our prediction *i*). Furthermore, our findings identify
239 directions for future research into the potential for large carnivores to adapt their foraging behaviour
240 in the face of changing prey communities. We discuss our findings in relation to those two broad
241 issues.

242

243 *Diet breadth, niche partitioning and body mass*

244 Optimal foraging theory suggests that, with growing environmental productivity, species will
245 specialise on the most profitable food resources, narrowing their diet breadth (MacArthur & Pianka
246 1966; Charnov 1976). As opposed to totally indiscriminate predation, prey selection has been
247 reported for large carnivores and it can be influenced by several factors, such as prey abundance,
248 accessibility and/or vulnerability, as well as body size and anti-predator behaviour (e.g., Karanth &
249 Sunquist 1995; Hayward & Kerley 2005; Jędrzejewski et al. 2012; Lovari et al. 2015). We found
250 that most large carnivores do not reduce niche breadth when the richness of large prey increases.
251 The Levins index and the Large Prey index provide different information. The Levins index refers
252 to the whole dietary breadth, i.e., including all potential prey, whereas our estimate of Large Prey
253 index is specifically relevant to prey heavier than 10 kg, i.e., the most substantial prey available to
254 large carnivores (Carbone et al. 2007, 2010). In addition, the Levins index accounts for evenness of
255 prey consumption. None of our focal carnivore species showed a decrease of diet breadth, as
256 indexed by the Levins index, with the increase of large prey richness. We suggest that our results do
257 not provide support to our prediction *ii* (i.e., a narrowing of diet breadth with increasing prey
258 richness), which would have been expected under an 'optimal foraging' scenario (MacArthur &
259 Pianka 1966; Charnov 1976).

260 A major caveat to our interpretation is that richness may represent an array of suitable or
261 unsuitable prey with varying levels of population abundance across studies. Prey numerical or
262 biomass densities affect food habits of carnivores (e.g., Karanth & Sunquist 1995; Hayward &
263 Kerley 2005; Jędrzejewski et al. 2012; Lovari et al. 2015). Ecological factors such as predation,
264 interspecific competition, climate or human-driven factors such as poaching, over-hunting and/or
265 habitat manipulation may influence prey populations differently across studies (e.g., Karanth &
266 Sunquist 1995; Arsenault & Owen-Smith 2002; Sinclair et al. 2003; Owen-Smith 2008; Ferretti et
267 al. 2015; Sandom et al. 2017), which may lead to non-linear relationships between prey richness
268 and density. Environmental productivity, which may influence herbivore diversity (Danell et al.

269 1996; Prins and Olf 2002), is not always associated with prey density or biomass (e.g., if one or
270 more prey are rare). Productive environments may have more finely-partitioned niches, i.e., so that
271 individuals in any given niche are no more abundant than they would be in environments of lower
272 productivity. Moreover, productive environments could allow the persistence of species that are
273 more easily preyed on (by allowing them to have higher reproductive rates that offset the mortality
274 caused by predation). Additionally, within the same prey species, individuals belonging to different
275 age/weight classes can also show different vulnerability to predation (e.g., Kruuk and Turner 1967;
276 Fuller 1989; Foster et al. 2010), implying that they may be considered as different 'resource states'
277 (Krebs 1999). However, data on use and availability of different age/weight classes is seldom
278 available, and the use by predators of individuals belonging to different age classes can be
279 particularly difficult to assess in the field, especially for studies based on scat analyses.

280 Studies relating diet breadth and prey density across areas with different prey richness are
281 desirable. Densities of all potential large prey species should be needed to evaluate the relationships
282 between diet breadth, prey density and prey richness. Unfortunately, estimates of the densities for
283 all potential prey species - especially for rare ones - are sparse and heterogeneous across studies. It
284 is seldom possible to describe the whole prey spectrum and define actual prey availability,
285 preventing us from accounting for that in our analyses. Nevertheless, a positive relationship
286 between productivity and herbivore abundance/biomass has been reported at local (Coe et al. 1976;
287 Danell et al. 1996) and continental scales (Pettorelli et al. 2009, but see Santini et al. 2018), which
288 would support our conclusions. Additionally, prey diversity has been shown to be a fundamental
289 determinant of food habits, potentially more than prey density (Service et al. 2019). Our review
290 represents a first test of the relationships between diet breadth and prey richness for an important
291 group of large mammals. Further work is necessary to explore relationships between environmental
292 productivity, prey density, prey diversity and carnivore food habits and diet breadth, especially in
293 the light of globally increasing anthropogenic pressure and its potential effects on prey communities
294 (Sandom et al. 2017).

295 Inferences from analyses of Levins index were largely confirmed by restricting the analysis
296 to the use of large prey. Potential exceptions were the snow leopard and dhole, for which the
297 number of Large Prey index seemed to decrease with increasing richness of large prey. This finding
298 may indicate that these carnivores increase specialisation with growing prey richness. However,
299 caution is required in the interpretation of these results, because of the relatively small sample size
300 and because of the width of confidence intervals of estimated coefficients, which were very close to
301 including values of zero. The snow leopard is a solitary carnivore, adapted to hardly accessible
302 habitats with low productivity and steep, rocky terrain where prey density is typically low
303 (McCarthy et al. 2017). Over evolutionary time, the presence of potential, superior competitors such
304 as the wolf (Bocci et al. 2017), leopard (Lovari et al. 2013a) and tiger (Wang & Macdonald 2009),
305 may have forced this felid to “marginal” areas hardly accessible to competitors, and to specialise on
306 prey living in those areas (Lovari et al. 2013b; Lovari & Mishra 2016). This specialisation may be
307 associated to higher selectivity in prey-rich areas where, presumably, competitors are present; in
308 turn, that would favour coexistence with other large predators. However, not surprisingly especially
309 earlier studies on this large cat were based on a relatively small number of samples (10 out of 22
310 studies included less than 50 scats: Schaller 1977; Schaller et al. 1988a-b; Bagchi and Mishra 2006;
311 Wegge et al. 2012), suggesting that more data are needed to support our results. The dhole usually
312 coexists with larger predators such as the leopard and the tiger (e.g., Karanth & Sunquist 1995;
313 Andheria et al. 2006; Wang & Macdonald 2009) but has extensive overall in dietary preferences
314 with these two species (Hayward et al. 2014). Our analyses show that the tiger increases its use of
315 large ungulates in prey-rich communities. These large cats are dominant over dhole and can kill
316 them (Schaller 1967; Johnsingh 1992). Thus, dhole may be expected to limit the risk of encounters
317 with dominant competitors by selecting different prey, thus increasing their specialisation, which
318 would ultimately favour interspecific coexistence (Karanth & Sunquist 1995). If so, the reduction in
319 the number of large prey used with growing prey richness would be a result of a greater
320 specialisation triggered by prey partitioning with larger, superior competitors.

321 No linear association was supported between carnivore mean body mass and the diet
322 breadth-prey richness relationship, thus not supporting our prediction (*iii*). This result suggests that,
323 among large carnivores, body size *per se* was not the main determinant of the increase of diet
324 breadth with growing prey richness. Thus, other factors could be influential (e.g., carnivore
325 gregariousness, carnivore/prey habitat use, and prey abundance). Nevertheless, four out of the five
326 largest carnivore species showed an increase of dietary breadth (as estimated by the Levins index)
327 and all five showed an increase of the Large Prey index with growing prey richness. For the tiger,
328 results were inconsistent between indices but the sign of both estimated relationship was positive.
329 Apart from these five species, the wolf showed an increase of diet breadth with growing prey
330 richness: this result could be easily explained considering the behaviour and ecology of this
331 predator, which is gregarious, very adaptable, and often the top-predator in the areas where it lives
332 (Mech 1970; Mech & Boitani 2004). The Eurasian lynx also showed an increase of diet breadth and
333 the Large Prey index with growing richness of large prey. The Eurasian lynx was often the top
334 predator in the study areas included in this review (65% of 17 studies). However, we recommend
335 caution in interpreting the results for this species, because (*i*) they are based on a sample of 17
336 studies, (*ii*) the range of available large prey was only one-to-five, and (*iii*) for values of one, two
337 and three large prey available, only one, three and one study were found, respectively.

338

339 *Evolutionary implications and future research directions*

340 Interactions between carnivores are largely shaped by behavioural interference, escalating up to the
341 killing of smaller species by larger competitors, and affecting behaviour, distribution and/or
342 numbers of inferior competitors (Palomares & Caro 1999; Linnell & Strand 2000; Donadio &
343 Buskirk 2006). Interspecific dietary overlap is expected to increase the probability of interspecific
344 encounters, thus promoting the occurrence of interspecific killing (Palomares & Caro 1999;
345 Donadio & Buskirk 2006). Our results strongly suggest that top predators use a greater number of
346 large prey with growing prey richness. These carnivores are expected to encounter little competition

347 in selecting areas with high prey density, whereas movements, activity, space or prey of sub-
348 dominant carnivores are expected to be influenced by those of larger, dominant ones (e.g., Schaller
349 1967, 1972; Durant 1998; Vanak et al. 2013). Apex predators seem to take advantage of growing
350 prey richness by increasing their realised diet breadth by taking both larger and smaller prey
351 (Gittleman 1985; Radloff and do Toit 2004), behaving as generalists, with different degrees of
352 intensity.

353 The other carnivores we studied showed relatively stable diet breadths with increasing prey
354 richness, with diet breadth possibly even decreasing for snow leopards and dhole. Interspecific
355 competition may strongly affect carnivore guilds (Palomares & Caro 1999, Linnell & Strand 2000).
356 Over evolutionary time, inferior competitors are expected to have developed behavioural tactics to
357 limit encounters with superior ones, involving food habits, space/habitat use and/or temporal
358 activity patterns (e.g., Mills & Biggs 1993; Durant 1998; Karanth & Sunquist 2000; Odden et al.
359 2010; Vanak et al. 2013). For example, subordinate carnivores may be forced to select marginal
360 areas with relatively low densities of top-predators, in spite of the local low density of prey (e.g.,
361 African wild dog: Mills & Gorman 1997; cheetah: Durant 1998; leopard: Odden et al. 2010), or
362 show morphological/behavioural adaptations to capture rapidly consumable prey, maximising the
363 amount of meat that they can consume before kleptoparasites arrive (cheetah: Hayward et al. 2006).
364 Accordingly, our results show that subordinate large carnivores did not increase their diet breadth
365 with growing prey richness, suggesting a role of larger competitors in limiting that increase. Loss of
366 large prey, e.g. through poaching, over-hunting or habitat manipulation, is a major threat to the
367 conservation of large carnivores (e.g., Carbone et al. 2010; Estes et al. 2011; Ripple et al. 2014;
368 Sandom et al. 2017). Prey depletion may lead top predators to increase the use of secondary prey,
369 which would further increase "niche suppression" of subordinate carnivores (Creel et al. 2018). If
370 so, subordinate carnivores may be affected not only by the loss of their main prey, but also by that
371 of prey preferred by dominant, apex predators. Further work is required to integrate information on
372 prey diversity, prey abundance (where available), presence/numbers of competitors, spatially

373 explicit proxies for environmental productivity (Pettoirelli et al. 2009) and carnivore diet breadth.
374 Moreover, our results suggest that different carnivores tend to be found in areas showing different
375 ranges of prey richness. Future research should evaluate whether results observed at the intra-
376 specific level are confirmed at the inter-specific one, i.e. whether carnivores living in prey-rich
377 areas tend to take advantage of this richness through a broader diet breadth or rather being more
378 selective, thus showing a narrower diet breadth.

379 We conclude that (i) there is no evidence that large carnivores increase their selectivity with
380 growing large prey richness except, possibly, the snow leopard and the dhole; (ii) the largest and
381 most dominant carnivores increase their dietary breadth with growing prey richness; and (iii) the
382 dietary breadth of subordinate large carnivores appears to be limited by interspecific competition
383 with dominant predators. Consequently, the realised dietary niche of sub-dominant carnivores may
384 tend to show considerable "conservatism" (Wiens and Graham 2005). If so, we suggest that
385 resource partitioning would be more important in shaping the dietary niches of smaller, inferior
386 competitors than those of dominant, superior ones.

387

388 **References**

- 389 Andheria AP, Karanth KU & Kumar NS (2007) Diet and prey profiles of three sympatric large
390 carnivores in Bandipur Tiger Reserve, India. *Journal of Zoology* 273: 169–175.
- 391 Angerbjörn A, Eide NE, Dalén L, Elmhagen B, Hellström P, Ims RA, Killengreen S, Landa A,
392 Meijer T, Mela M, Niemimaa J, Norén K, Tannerfeldt M, Yoccoz NG, Henttonen H (2013)
393 Carnivore conservation in practice: replicated management actions on a large spatial scale.
394 *Journal of Applied Ecology* 50: 59-67.
- 395 Arsenault R, Owen-Smith N (2002) Facilitation versus competition in grazing herbivore
396 assemblages. *Oikos* 97:313–318.
- 397 Bagchi S, Mishra C (2006) Living with large carnivores: predation on livestock by the snow leopard
398 (*Uncia uncia*). *Journal of Zoology* 268:217–224

- 399 Birkhofer K, Wolters V (2012) The global relationship between climate, net primary production and
400 the diet of spiders. *Global Ecology and Biogeography* 21: 100-108.
- 401 Bocci A, Lovari S, Zafar Khan M, Mori E (2018) Sympatric snow leopards and Tibetan wolves:
402 coexistence of large carnivores with human-driven potential competition. *European Journal*
403 *of Wildlife Research* 63:92.
- 404 Buisson L, Blanc L, Grenouillet G (2008) Modelling stream fish species distribution in a river
405 network: the relative effects of temperature versus physical factors. *Ecology of Freshwater*
406 *Fish* 17: 244–257.
- 407 Carbone C, Mace GM, Roberts SC, Macdonald DW (1999) Energetic constraints on the diet of
408 terrestrial carnivores. *Nature* 402:442.
- 409 Carbone C, Teacher A, Rowcliffe JM (2007) The costs of carnivory. *PLoS Biology* 5:e22. [https](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.0050022)
410 [://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.0050022](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.0050022)
- 411 Carbone C, Pettorelli N, Stephens PA (2010) The bigger they come, the harder they fall: body size
412 and prey abundance influence predator-prey ratios. *Biology Letters* 7:312-315.
- 413 Chakrabarti S, Jhala YV, Dutta S, Qureshi Q, Kadivar RF, Rana VJ (2016) Adding constraints to
414 predation through allometric relation of scats to consumption. *Journal of Animal Ecology*
415 85:660–670.
- 416 Charnov EL (1976) Optimal foraging, the Marginal Value Theorem. *Theoretical Population*
417 *Biology* 9: 129-136.
- 418 Ciucci P, Boitani L, Pelliccioni ER, Rocco M, Guy I (1996) A comparison of scat-analysis methods
419 to assess the diet of the wolf *Canis lupus*. *Wildlife Biology* 2: 37-48.
- 420 Coe MJ, Cumming DH, Phillipson J (1976) Biomass and production of large African herbivores in
421 relation to rainfall and primary production. *Oecologia* 22:341–354.
- 422 Colwell RK, Futuyma DJ (1971) On the measurement of niche breadth and overlap. *Ecology* 52:
423 567–576.

- 424 Creel S, Matandiko W, Schuette P, Rosenblatt E, Sanguinetti C, Banda K, Vinks M, Becker M
425 (2018) Changes in African large carnivore diets over the past half-century reveal the loss of
426 large prey. *Journal of Applied Ecology* DOI: 10.1111/1365-2664.13227
- 427 Danell K, Lundberg P, Niemela P (1996) Species richness in mammalian herbivores patterns in the
428 boreal zone. *Ecography* 19:404-409.
- 429 Donadio E, Buskirk SW (2006) Diet, morphology and interspecific killing in Carnivora. *American*
430 *Naturalist* 167:524–536.
- 431 Durant SM (1998) Competition refuges and coexistence: an example from Serengeti carnivores.
432 *Journal of Animal Ecology* 67: 370–386.
- 433 Estes J, Terborgh J, Brashares JS, Power ME, Berger J, Bond W, Carpenter SR, Essington TE, Holt
434 RD, Jackson JB, Marquis RJ, Oksanen T, Paine RT, Pickett EK, Ripple WJ, Sandin SA,
435 Scheffer M, Schoener W, Shurin JB, Sinclair ARE, Soulé ME, Virtanen R, Wardle DA (2011)
436 Trophic downgrading of Planet Earth. *Science* 333: 301-306.
- 437 Ferretti F, Corazza M, Campana I, Pietrocini V, Brunetti C, Scornavacca D, Lovari S (2015)
438 Competition between wild herbivores: reintroduced red deer and Apennine chamois.
439 *Behavioral Ecology* 26: 550-559.
- 440 Forister M L, Novotny V, Panorska AK, Baje L, Basset Y, Butterill PT, Cizek L, Coley PD, Dem F,
441 Diniz IR, Drozd P, Fox M, Glassmire A, Hazen R, Hrcek J, Jahner JP, Kama O, Kozubowski
442 TJ, Kursar TA, Lewis OT, Lill J, Marquis RJ, Miller SE, Morais HC, Murakami M, Nickel H,
443 Pardikes N, Ricklefs RE, Singer MS, Smilanich AM, Stireman JO, Villamarín-Cortez S,
444 Vodka S, Volf M, Wagner DL, Walla T, Weiblen GD, Dyer LA (2015) The global
445 distribution of diet breadth in insect herbivores. *Proceedings of the National Academy of*
446 *Sciences* doi: 10.1073/pnas.142304211
- 447 Foster RG, Harmsen BJ, Valdes B, Pomilla C, Doncaster CP (2010) Food habits of sympatric
448 jaguars and pumas across a gradient of human disturbance. *Journal of Zoology* 280:309-318.

- 449 Fuller TK (1989) Population Dynamics of Wolves in North-Central Minnesota. *Wildlife*
450 *Monographs* 105:3-41.
- 451 Gittleman JL (1985) Carnivore body size: ecological and taxonomic correlates. *Oecologia* 67:540-
452 554.
- 453 Grassman LI, Tewes ME, Silvy NJ, Kreetiyutanot K (2005) Ecology of three sympatric felids in a
454 mixed evergreen forest in North-Central Thailand. *Journal of Mammalogy* 86:29-38.
- 455 Hatton IA, McCann KS, Fryxell JM, Davies TJ, Smerlak M, Sinclair ARE, Loreau M (2015) The
456 predator-prey power law: biomass scaling across terrestrial and aquatic biomes. *Science* 349
457 (6252), aac6284 DOI: 10.1126/science.aac6284
- 458 Hayward MW, Hofmeyr M, O'Brien J, Kerley GIH (2006). Prey preferences of the cheetah
459 *Acinonyx jubatus*: morphological limitations or the need to capture rapidly consumable prey
460 before kleptoparasites arrive? *Journal of Zoology* 270: 615-627. doi: DOI: 10.1111/j.
- 461 Hayward MW, Kerley GIH (2005) Prey preferences of the lion (*Panthera leo*). *Journal of Zoology*
462 267:309-322.
- 463 Hayward MW, Lyngdoh S, Habib B (2014). Diet and prey preferences of dholes (*Cuon alpinus*):
464 dietary competition within Asia's apex predator guild. *Journal of Zoology* 294:255-266.
- 465 Hebblewhite M, White CA, Nietvelt CG, McKenzie JA, Hurd TE, Fryxell JM, Bayley SE, Paquet P
466 (2005) Human activity mediates a trophic cascade caused by wolves. *Ecology* 86:2135–2144
- 467 Hofmann RR (1989) Evolutionary steps of ecophysiological adaptation and diversification of
468 ruminants: a comparative view of their digestive system. *Oecologia* 78:443–457.
- 469 Hurlbert SH (1978) The measurement of niche overlap and some relatives. *Ecology* 59:67-77.
- 470 Jarman PJ (1974) The social organisation of antelope in relation to their ecology. *Behaviour*
471 48:215-267.
- 472 Jędrzejewski W, Jędrzejewska B, Okarma H, Schmidt K, Zub K, Musiani M (2000) Prey selection
473 and predation by wolves in Białowieża Primeval Forest, Poland. *Journal of Mammalogy*
474 81:197–212

- 475 Johnsingh AJT (1992) Prey selection in three large sympatric carnivores in Bandipur. *Mammalia*
476 56:517-526.
- 477 Jones KE, Bielby J, Cardillo M, Fritz SA, O'Dell J, Orme CDL, Safi K, Sechrest W, Boakes EH,
478 Carbone C, Connolly C, Cutts MJ, Foster JK, Grenyer R, Habib M, Plaster CA, Price SA,
479 Rigby EA, Rist J, Teacher A, Bininda-Emonds ORP, Gittleman JL, Mace GM, Purvis A
480 (2009) PanTHERIA: a species-level database of life history, ecology, and geography of extant
481 and recently extinct mammals. *Ecology* 90:2648.
- 482 Karanth KU, Sunquist ME (1995) Prey selection by tiger, leopard and dhole in tropical forests.
483 *Journal of Animal Ecology* 64: 439–450.
- 484 Karanth KU, Sunquist ME (2000) Behavioural correlates of predation by tiger (*Panthera tigris*),
485 leopard (*Panthera pardus*) and dhole (*Cuon alpinus*) in Nagarahole, India. *Journal of Zoology*
486 250: 255–265.
- 487 Khan U, Lovari S, Ali Shah S, Ferretti F (2018) Predator, prey and humans in a mountainous area:
488 loss of biological diversity leads to trouble. *Biodiversity and Conservation* 27: 2795-2813.
- 489 Khorozyan I, Ghoddousi A, Soofi M, Waltert M (2015) Big cats kill more livestock when wild prey
490 reaches a minimum threshold. *Biological Conservation* 192:268–275,
- 491 Khorozyan I, Lumetsberger T, Ghoddousi A, Soofi M, Waltert M (2017) Global patterns in biomass
492 models describing prey consumption by big cats. *Mammal Review* 47:124-132.
- 493 Krebs CJ (1999) Ecological methodology. Addison Wesley Longman, Boston
- 494 Kruuk H (1976) Feeding and social behaviour of the striped hyaena (*Hyaena vulgaris* Desmarest).
495 *East African Wildlife Journal* 14:91–111.
- 496 Kruuk H, Parish R (1981) Feeding specialization of the European badger *Meles meles* in Scotland.
497 *Journal of Animal Ecology* 50:773–788
- 498 Kruuk H, Turner M (1967) Comparative notes on predation by lion, leopard, cheetah and wild dog
499 in the Serengeti area East Africa. *Mammalia* 3:1-27.
- 500 Levins R (1968) Evolution in changing environments. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

- 501 Linnell JDC, Strand O (2000) Interference interactions, co-existence and conservation of
502 mammalian carnivores. *Diversity and Distributions* 6: 169–176.
- 503 Lovari S, Mishra C (2016) Living on the edge: depletion of wild prey and survival of the snow
504 leopard. In: McCarthy T, Mallon D (eds) Snow leopards. Elsevier, pp 69-76.
- 505 Lovari S, Minder I, Ferretti F, Mucci N, Randi E, Pellizzi B (2013a) Common and snow leopards
506 share prey, but not habitats: competition avoidance by large predators? *Journal of Zoology*
507 291: 127–135.
- 508 Lovari S, Ventimiglia M, Minder I (2013b) Food habits of two leopard species, competition,
509 climate change and upper treeline: a way to the decrease of an endangered species? *Ethology*
510 *Ecology and Evolution* 25: 305–318.
- 511 Lovari S, Pokheral CP, Jnawali SR, Fusani L, Ferretti F (2015) Coexistence of the tiger and the
512 common leopard in a prey-rich area: the role of prey partitioning. *Journal of Zoology* 295:
513 122-131.
- 514 Lumetsberger T, Ghoddousi A, Appel A, Khorozyan I, Walter M, Kiffner C (2017) Re-evaluating
515 models for estimating prey consumption by leopards. *Journal of Zoology* 203:201–210
- 516 MacArthur RH, Pianka ER (1966) On optimal use of a patchy environment. *The American*
517 *Naturalist* 100: 603-699.
- 518 Macdonald D (1983) The ecology of carnivore social behaviour. *Nature* 301:379-384.
- 519 Macdonald DW, Loveridge AJ, Nowell K (2010) *Dramatis personae*: an introduction to wild felids.
520 In Biology and conservation of wild felids. (eds. D.W. Macdonald & A. J. Loveridge), pp.
521 563–584. Oxford University Press, Oxford, UK.
- 522 McCarthy T, Mallon D, Jackson R, Zahler P, McCarthy K (2017) *Panthera uncia*. The IUCN Red
523 List of Threatened Species 2017: e.T22732A50664030.
524 <http://dx.doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.2017-2.RLTS.T22732A50664030.en>. Downloaded on 16
525 February 2019.

- 526 Mech LD, Boitani L (2003) Wolves: behaviour, ecology and conservation. The University of
527 Chicago Press, Chicago
- 528 Mech LD, Peterson RO (2003) Wolf-prey relations. In: Mech LD, Boitani L (eds) Wolves:
529 behaviour, ecology and conservation. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, pp 131–157
- 530 Meriggi A, Lovari S (1996) A review of wolf predation in southern Europe: does the wolf prefer
531 wild prey to livestock? *Journal of Applied Ecology* 33:1561–1571
- 532 Mills MGL, Biggs HC (1993) Prey apportionment and related ecological relationships between
533 large carnivores in Kruger National Park. *Symposium of the Zoological Society of London*
534 65:253-268.
- 535 Mills MGL, Gorman ML (1997) Factors affecting the density and distribution of wild dogs in the
536 Kruger National Park. *Conservation Biology* 11:1397-1406.
- 537 Odden M, Wegge P, Fredriksen T (2010) Do tigers displace leopards? If so, why? *Ecological*
538 *Research* 25: 875–881.
- 539 Olff H, Ritchie ME, Prins HHT (2002) Global environmental controls of diversity in large
540 herbivores. *Nature* 415: 901-904.
- 541 Owens MJ, Owens DD (1978) Feeding ecology and its influence on social organization in brown
542 hyenas (*Hyaena brunnea*, Thunberg) of the Central Kalahari Desert. *East African Wildlife*
543 *Journal* 16:113-135.
- 544 Owen-Smith N (2008) Changing vulnerability to predation related to season and sex in an African
545 ungulate assemblage. *Oikos* 117:602-610.
- 546 Palomares F, Caro TM (1999) Interspecific killing among mammalian carnivores. *American*
547 *Naturalist* 153: 492–508.
- 548 Pettorelli N, Bro-Jørgensen J, Durant SM, Blackburn T, Carbone C (2009) Energy availability and
549 density estimates in African ungulates. *American Naturalist* 173: 698-704.
- 550 R Core Team (2018). R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for
551 Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. URL <https://www.R-project.org/>.

- 552 Rabinowitz A, Andau P, Chai PPK (1987) The clouded leopard in Malaysian Borneo. *Oryx* 21:
553 107-111
- 554 Radloff FGT, du Toit JT (2004) Large predators and their prey in a southern African savanna: a
555 predator's size determines its prey size range. *Journal of Animal Ecology* 73:410-423.
- 556 Ripple WJ, Estes JA, Beschta RL, Wilmers CC, Ritchie EG, Hebblewhite M, Berger J, Elmhagen
557 B, Letnic M, Nelson MP, Schmitz OJ, Smith DW, Wallach AD, Wirsing AJ (2014) Status and
558 ecological effects of the World's largest carnivores. *Science* [https://doi.org/10.1126/scien](https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1241484)
559 [ce.1241484](https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1241484)
- 560 Sandom CJ, Williams J, Burnham D, Dickman AJ, Hinks AE, Macdonald EA, Macdonald DW
561 (2017) Deconstructed cat communities: quantifying the threat to felids from prey defaunation.
562 *Diversity and Distributions* 2017:1-13 DOI: 10.1111/ddi.12558
- 563 Santini L, Isaac NJB, Maiorano L, Ficetola GF, Huijbregts MAJ, Carbone C, Thuiller W (2018)
564 Global drivers of population density in terrestrial vertebrates. *Global Ecology and*
565 *Biogeography* 27:968-979.
- 566 Schaller GB (1967) The deer and the tiger. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- 567 Schaller GB (1972) The Serengeti lion: a study of predator/prey relations. Chicago: University of
568 Chicago Press.
- 569 Schaller GB (1977) Mountain monarchs: wild sheep and goats of the Himalaya. University of
570 Chicago Press, Chicago, USA.
- 571 Schaller GB, Hong L, Talipu, Junrang R, Mingjiang Q (1988a) The snow leopard in Xinjiang,
572 China. *Oryx* 22:197-204.
- 573 Schaller GB, Junrang R, Mingjiang Q (1988b) Status of the snow leopard *Panthera uncia* in
574 Qinghai and Gansu Provinces, China. *Biological Conservation* 45:179-194.
- 575 Schoener TW (1971) Theory of feeding strategies. *Annual Reviews of Ecology and Systematics*
576 2:369-404.

- 577 Service CN, Bateman AW, Adams MS, Artelle KA, Reimchen TE, Paquet PC, Darimont CT (2019)
578 Salmonid species diversity predicts salmon consumption by terrestrial wildlife. *Journal of*
579 *Animal Ecology* 88:392-404.
- 580 Sinclair ARE, Mduma S, Brashares JS (2003) Patterns of predation in diverse predator-prey system.
581 *Nature* 425:288–290
- 582 Stein AB, Fuller TK, Marker LL (2013) Brown hyaena feeding ecology on Namibian farmlands.
583 *South African Journal of Wildlife Research* 43:27-32.
- 584 Vanak AT, Fortin D, Thaker M, Ogden M, Owen C, Greatwood S, Slotow R (2013) Moving to stay
585 in place: behavioral mechanisms for coexistence of African large carnivores. *Ecology* 94:
586 2619–2631.
- 587 Walther GR, Post E, Convy P *et al.* (2002) Ecological responses to recent climate change. *Nature*
588 416:389-395.
- 589 Walther GR, Roques A, *et al* (2009) Alien species in a warmer world: risks and opportunities.
590 *Trends in Ecology and Evolution* 24:686-693.
- 591 Wang SW, Macdonald DW (2009) Feeding habits and niche partitioning in a predator guild
592 composed of tigers, leopards and dholes in a temperate ecosystem in central Bhutan. *Journal*
593 *of Zoology* 277:275-283.
- 594 Wegge P, Odden M, Pokharel CP, Storaas T (2009) Predator-prey relationships and responses of
595 ungulates and their predators to the establishment of protected areas: a case study of tigers,
596 leopards and their prey in Bardia National Park, Nepal. *Biological Conservation* 142:189-202.
- 597 Wegge P, Shrestha R, Flagstad Ø (2012) Snow leopard *Panthera uncia* predation on livestock and
598 wild prey in a mountain valley in northern Nepal: implications for conservation management.
599 *Wildlife Biology* 18:131-141.
- 600 Wiens JJ, Graham C (2005) Niche conservatism: integrating evolution, ecology, and conservation
601 biology. *Annual Review of Ecology, Evolution and Systematics* 36:519-539.

602 Yarnell RW, Phipps WL, Burgess LP, Ellis JA, Harrison SWR, Dell S, MacTavish D, MacTavish
603 LM, Scott DM (2013) The influence of large predators on the feeding ecology of two African
604 mesocarnivores: the black-backed jackal and the brown hyaena. *South African Journal of*
605 *Wildlife Research* 43:155-166.

For Review Only

607 **Table 1.** Number of studies per species of large terrestrial carnivores (ordered by increasing body
 608 weight) and sample type.

Species	Body mass (kg)	Before			After		
		filtering/pooling			filtering/pooling		
		Kills	Scats	Total	Kills	Scats	Total
Dhole	15.8	1	19	20	0	14	14
Eurasian lynx	19.3	13	7	20	11	6	17
African wild dog	22.0	21	1	22	16	0	16
Wolf	31.8	10	86	96	8	81	89
Snow leopard	32.5	0	24	24	0	22	22
Cheetah	50.6	21	3	24	14	3	17
Leopard	52.4	20	71	91	13	62	75
Puma	54.0	20	47	67	19	40	59
Spotted hyaena	63.3	10	17	27	7	16	23
Jaguar	83.9	2	25	27	1	22	23
Lion	158.6	39	9	48	29	6	35
Tiger	161.9	2	37	39	0	25	25
TOTAL		159	346	505	118	297	415

609

611 **Table 2.** Model coefficients (and 0.95 confidence intervals, CIs) for relationships between indices
 612 of diet breadth and number of available large prey for large terrestrial carnivores. In bold, supported
 613 relationships (with confidence intervals not including zero).

614

Species	Diet breadth-prey richness relationships			
	Levins		Large Prey index	
	<i>B</i>	CI _s	<i>B</i>	CI _s
Dhole	-0.214	±0.468	-0.413	±0.396
Eurasian lynx	0.465	±0.358	0.465	±0.407
African wild dog	-0.223	±0.614	0.180	±0.339
Wolf	0.367	±0.125	0.447	±0.098
Snow leopard	0.007	±0.222	-0.194	±0.180
Cheetah	0.443	±0.688	0.370	±0.486
Leopard	0.149	±0.162	0.117	±0.146
Puma	0.279	±0.213	0.319	±0.204
Spotted hyaena	0.505	±0.221	0.381	±0.122
Jaguar	0.520	±0.312	0.386	±0.263
Lion	0.467	±0.195	0.240	±0.158
Tiger	0.150	±0.310	0.276	±0.187

615

617 **Table 3.** Effects of carnivore body mass on the relationships between diet breadth of large
 618 terrestrial carnivores and prey richness. Model coefficients (B), their standard errors (SE) and 0.95
 619 confidence intervals (CIs), as well as R^2 value of models, are shown.

620

Index	Predictor	B	S.E.	0.95 CIs		R^2
Levins	Intercept	-1.790	0.975	-2.963	1.383	0.108
	Log(body mass)	0.228	0.208	-0.235	0.692	
Large Prey index	Intercept	-1.181	1.119	-3.674	1.312	0.135
	Log(body mass)	0.298	0.239	-0.234	0.830	

621

623 **Figure legends**

624 **Fig. 1** Relationship between the total diet breadth of large carnivores (Levins index) and the Number of
625 species of potential large vertebrate prey available (Prey richness). Fitted relationships and relevant 0.95
626 confidence intervals are shown for supported relationships, i.e. those with confidence intervals not including
627 '0' values (see Methods for explanations). Red: studies based on kills; black: studies based on scats.

628 **Fig. 2** Fitted relationship between the dietary breadth of large carnivores (Large Prey index, i.e. the number
629 of frequently used large vertebrate prey) and the Number of species of potential large vertebrate prey
630 available. Fitted relationships and relevant 0.95 confidence intervals are shown for supported relationships,
631 i.e. those with confidence intervals not including '0' values (see Methods for explanations). Red: studies
632 based on kills; black: studies based on scats.

633 **Fig. 3** Estimated coefficients (\pm 0.95 confidence intervals) concerning the relationships between dietary
634 breadth (a: Levins index; b: Large Prey index) and the number of species of potential large vertebrate prey
635 available, for large carnivores, as a function of logged body mass.

Figure 1




Figure 2




Figure 3

