

Ambio

Electronic Supplementary Material

This supplementary material has not been peer reviewed.

Title: Shepherds' local knowledge and scientific data on the scavenging ecosystem service: Insights for conservation

Authors: Zebensui Morales-Reyes, Berta Martín-López, Marcos Moleón, Patricia Mateo-Tomás, Pedro P. Olea, Eneko Arrondo, José A. Donázar, José A. Sánchez-Zapata

This file includes:

Table S1. Species included in the questionnaires in each study area.

Table S2. Overview of the variables and questions included in the questionnaires to investigate shepherds' indigenous and local knowledge.

Table S3. Overview of the variables of scientific knowledge.

Table S4. Analysis of covariance testing the effects of the shepherds' age on the relationships between SK and ILK at the species level in each study area.

Table S5. Analysis of covariance testing the effects of the experience as a shepherd on the relationships between SK and ILK at the species level in each study area.

Table S6. *U* values and *p* value of Mann-Whitney *U* tests of the differences between scientific knowledge and indigenous and local knowledge about detection and consumption times of livestock carcasses by scavengers depending on shepherds' age and experience in each study area.

Appendix S1. Calculation of the biomass consumed by each vertebrate scavenger species in each study area.

Table S1. Species included in the questionnaires in each study area. Vertebrate scavenger species detected in the monitoring of the consumption of carcasses using camera traps and/or other scavenger species breeding in each study area were included.

Scientific name	Common name	Cantabrian Mountains	Baetic Mountains
Birds			
<i>Aegypius monachus</i>	Cinereous vulture	Yes	Yes
<i>Gypaetus barbatus</i>	Bearded vulture	No	Yes
<i>Gyps fulvus</i>	Griffon vulture	Yes	Yes
<i>Neophron percnopterus</i>	Egyptian vulture	Yes	Yes
<i>Aquila chrysaetos</i>	Golden eagle	Yes	Yes
<i>Buteo buteo</i>	Common buzzard	Yes	No
<i>Milvus migrans</i>	Black kite	No	Yes
<i>Milvus milvus</i>	Red kite	Yes	Yes
<i>Corvus corax</i>	Common raven	Yes	Yes
<i>Corvus corone</i>	Carrion crow	Yes	Yes
<i>Garrulus glandarius</i>	Eurasian jay	Yes	No
<i>Pica pica</i>	Common magpie	Yes	Yes
Mammals			
<i>Ursus arctos</i>	Brown bear	Yes	No
<i>Canis lupus</i>	Gray wolf	Yes	No
<i>Vulpes vulpes</i>	Red fox	Yes	Yes
<i>Genetta genetta</i>	Common genet	Yes	No
<i>Martes foina</i> *	Stone marten	Yes	Yes
<i>Martes martes</i> *	Pine marten	Yes	No
<i>Meles meles</i>	Eurasian badger	Yes	No
<i>Sus scrofa</i>	Wild boar	Yes	Yes

* In Cantabrian Mountains, we considered stone marten (*Martes foina*) and pine marten (*M. martes*) together as *Martes spp.* because specific identification was not possible from the pictures at night (n = 1 carcass).

Table S2. Overview of the variables and questions included in the questionnaires to investigate shepherds' indigenous and local knowledge (ILK).

Variable	Description
Species level	
Frequency of occurrence at carcasses ILK	For each species, average frequency of observation by shepherds of such species scavenging at carcasses in each study area, according to the following categories: 0 (never), 1 (less than half the times), 2 (half the times), 3 (more than half the times) and 4 (always). Question: how often do you see each species scavenging at livestock carcasses in your area?
Scavenging service ILK	For each species, percentage of shepherds that considered such species as a provider of the scavenging service (i.e., carcass consumption). Ln (x+1) transformation was applied to avoid heteroscedasticity. Questions: which species scavenge your livestock carcasses? Could you rank each species by its importance in the removal of your livestock carcasses?
Community level	
Detection time ILK	For each livestock carcass, average perception of the time elapsed (in hours) since the carcass became available until the arrival of the first scavenger. Question: how long do scavengers normally take to detect a carcass?
Consumption time ILK	For each livestock carcass, average perception of the time elapsed (in hours) since the carcass became available until it was completely consumed (i.e., only bones, skin and dehydrated meat left; Moleón et al. 2015). Question: how long do scavengers normally take to completely consume a carcass?

Table S3. Overview of the variables of scientific knowledge (SK).

Name of variable	Description
Species level	
Frequency of occurrence at carcasses SK	For each species, average frequency of occurrence of such species feeding on the carcasses within each study area. Variable obtained from camera trap monitoring of carcass consumption (Mateo-Tomás et al. 2015).
Biomass consumed SK	For each species, average percentage of biomass consumed by such species at all the carcasses in each study area. See Appendix S1 for further details. Variable obtained from camera trap monitoring of carcass consumption. Ln (x+1) transformation was applied to avoid heteroscedasticity.
Community level	
Detection time SK	For each experimental carcass, average time elapsed (in hours) since the carcass became available until the arrival of the first scavenger. Variable obtained from camera trap monitoring of carcass consumption.
Consumption time SK	For each experimental carcass, average time elapsed (in hours) since the carcass became available until it was completely consumed (i.e., only bones, skin and dehydrated meat left; Moleón et al. 2015). Variable obtained from camera trap monitoring of carcass consumption.

Table S4. Analysis of covariance testing the effects of the shepherds' age ('born' as covariate) on the relationships between scientific knowledge (i.e., 'frequency of occurrence at carcasses SK' and 'biomass consumed SK') and indigenous and local knowledge (i.e., 'frequency of occurrence at carcasses ILK' and 'scavenging service ILK') at the species level in each study area. Values statistically significant are indicated in bold. Description of the variables is provided in Table S2 and S3. The regression lines are provided in Figs. 4a–b.

Study area	SK-ILK	Analysis of covariance table	DF	Sum	Sq mean	F value	Pr (>F)	
Cantabrian Mountains	Frequency of occurrence at carcasses SK - Frequency of occurrence at carcasses ILK	Frequency of occurrence at carcasses ILK	1	1.425	1.425	16.969	< 0.001	
		Born	2	0.024	0.012	0.142	0.868	
		Frequency of occurrence at carcasses ILK:Born	2	0.123	0.062	0.734	0.485	
		Residuals	46	3.863	0.084			
		Estimated coefficients			Estimate	SE	t value	Pr (> t)
		Intercept		0.235	0.076	3.084	0.003	
		Frequency of occurrence at carcasses ILK		0.225	0.111	2.022	0.049	
		Born \geq 1970		-0.102	0.113	-0.897	0.374	
		Born 1960		-0.018	0.109	-0.162	0.872	
		Frequency of occurrence at carcasses ILK:Born \geq 1970		0.121	0.158	0.762	0.450	
		Frequency of occurrence at carcasses ILK:Born 1960		-0.046	0.137	-0.334	0.740	
		SK-ILK	Analysis of covariance table	DF	Sum	Sq mean	F value	Pr (>F)
	Biomass consumed SK - Scavenging service ILK	Scavenging service ILK	Scavenging service ILK	1	58.325	58.325	242.552	< 0.0001
Born			2	0.092	0.046	0.191	0.827	
Scavenging service ILK:Born			2	0.502	0.251	1.044	0.360	
Residuals			46	11.061	0.240			
		Estimated coefficients		Estimate	SE	t value	Pr (> t)	
		Intercept		0.223	0.145	1.537	0.131	
		Scavenging service ILK		0.690	0.075	9.258	< 0.0001	
	Born \geq 1970		-0.036	0.202	-0.178	0.860		
	Born 1960		0.063	0.206	0.303	0.763		

		Scavenging service ILK:Born \geq 1970		-0.033	0.101	-0.328	0.744
		Scavenging service ILK:Born 1960		-0.136	0.100	-1.358	0.181
	SK-ILK	Analysis of covariance table	DF	Sum	Sq mean	F value	Pr (>F)
Baetic Mountains	Frequency of occurrence at carcasses SK - Frequency of occurrence at carcasses ILK	Frequency of occurrence at carcasses ILK	1	1.712	1.712	24.201	< 0.0001
		Born	2	0.034	0.017	0.241	0.788
		Frequency of occurrence at carcasses ILK:Born	2	0.046	0.023	0.327	0.723
		Residuals	31	2.193	0.071		
		Estimated coefficients		Estimate	SE	t value	Pr (> t)
		Intercept		0.194	0.110	1.759	0.088
		Frequency of occurrence at carcasses ILK		0.109	0.049	2.200	0.035
		Born \geq 1970		-0.139	0.153	-0.904	0.373
		Born 1960		-0.145	0.156	-0.931	0.359
		Frequency of occurrence at carcasses ILK:Born \geq 1970		0.050	0.070	0.717	0.479
	Frequency of occurrence at carcasses ILK:Born 1960		0.048	0.070	0.681	0.501	
	SK-ILK	Analysis of covariance table	DF	Sum	Sq mean	F value	Pr (>F)
	Biomass consumed SK - Scavenging service ILK	Scavenging service ILK	1	21.479	21.479	18.172	< 0.001
		Born	2	0.112	0.056	0.048	0.954
		Scavenging service ILK:Born	2	0.007	0.003	0.003	0.997
		Residuals	31	36.643	1.182		
		Estimated coefficients		Estimate	SE	t value	Pr (> t)
		Intercept		0.026	0.440	0.060	0.953
		Scavenging service ILK		0.427	0.167	2.562	0.016
		Born \geq 1970		-0.100	0.614	-0.163	0.872
		Born 1960		-0.090	0.612	-0.147	0.884
		Scavenging service ILK:Born \geq 1970		-0.018	0.238	-0.075	0.941
	Scavenging service ILK:Born 1960		-0.008	0.241	-0.032	0.975	

Table S5. Analysis of covariance testing the effects of the experience as a shepherd ('experience' as covariate) on the relationships between scientific knowledge (i.e., 'frequency of occurrence at carcasses SK' and 'biomass consumed SK') and indigenous and local knowledge (i.e., 'frequency of occurrence at carcasses ILK' and 'scavenging service ILK') at the species level in each study area. Values statistically significant are indicated in bold. Description of the variables is provided in Table S2 and S3. The regression lines are provided in Figs. 4c–d.

Study area	SK-ILK	Analysis of covariance table	DF	Sum	Sq mean	F value	Pr (>F)
Cantabrian Mountains	Frequency of occurrence at carcasses SK - Frequency of occurrence at carcasses ILK	Frequency of occurrence at carcasses ILK	1	1.477	1.477	17.235	< 0.001
		Experience	2	0.024	0.012	0.139	0.871
		Frequency of occurrence at carcasses ILK:Experience	2	0.042	0.021	0.248	0.782
		Residuals	45	3.855	0.086		
	Estimated coefficients			Estimate	SE	t value	Pr (> t)
	Intercept			0.201	0.081	2.479	0.017
	Frequency of occurrence at carcasses ILK			0.307	0.130	2.352	0.023
	Experience 21-40			-0.033	0.114	-0.288	0.775
	Experience ≥41			0.032	0.114	0.278	0.782
	Frequency of occurrence at carcasses ILK:Experience 21-40			-0.053	0.159	-0.334	0.740
Frequency of occurrence at carcasses ILK:Experience ≥41			-0.109	0.160	-0.683	0.498	
	SK-ILK	Analysis of covariance table	DF	Sum	Sq mean	F value	Pr (>F)
	Biomass consumed SK - Scavenging service ILK	Scavenging service ILK	1	60.495	60.495	305.443	< 0.0001
		Experience	2	0.014	0.007	0.036	0.964
		Scavenging service ILK:Experience	2	0.149	0.074	0.376	0.689
		Residuals	46	9.111	0.198		
	Estimated coefficients			Estimate	SE	t value	Pr (> t)
	Intercept			0.189	0.133	1.425	0.161
	Scavenging service ILK			0.664	0.064	10.419	< 0.0001
	Experience 21-40			0.062	0.184	0.337	0.737
Experience ≥41			0.020	0.187	0.106	0.916	

		Scavenging service ILK:Experience 21-40		-0.063	0.089	-0.707	0.483
		Scavenging service ILK:Experience \geq 41		0.008	0.092	0.084	0.934
	SK-ILK	Analysis of covariance table	DF	Sum	Sq mean	F value	Pr (>F)
Baetic Mountains	Frequency of occurrence at carcasses SK - Frequency of occurrence at carcasses ILK	Frequency of occurrence at carcasses ILK	1	1.971	1.971	30.154	< 0.0001
		Experience	2	0.022	0.011	0.169	0.845
		Frequency of occurrence at carcasses ILK:Experience	2	0.001	0.001	0.009	0.992
		Residuals	32	2.092	0.065		
		Estimated coefficients		Estimate	SE	t value	Pr (> t)
		Intercept		0.088	0.109	0.806	0.426
		Frequency of occurrence at carcasses ILK		0.150	0.049	3.037	0.005
		Experience 21-40		-0.011	0.147	-0.074	0.941
		Experience \geq 41		-0.053	0.155	-0.342	0.735
		Frequency of occurrence at carcasses ILK:Experience 21-40		0.008	0.069	0.123	0.903
		Frequency of occurrence at carcasses ILK:Experience \geq 41		0.002	0.068	0.028	0.978
	SK-ILK	Analysis of covariance table	DF	Sum	Sq mean	F value	Pr (>F)
	Biomass consumed SK- Scavenging service ILK	Scavenging service ILK	1	18.726	18.726	15.067	< 0.001
		Experience	2	0.068	0.034	0.027	0.973
		Scavenging service ILK:Experience	2	0.145	0.073	0.059	0.943
		Residuals	32	39.772	1.243		
		Estimated coefficients		Estimate	SE	t value	Pr (> t)
		Intercept		0.067	0.448	0.149	0.883
		Scavenging service ILK		0.357	0.172	2.081	0.046
		Experience 21-40		-0.124	0.633	-0.196	0.846
		Experience \geq 41		-0.185	0.631	-0.293	0.772
		Scavenging service ILK:Experience 21-40		0.012	0.239	0.052	0.959
		Scavenging service ILK:Experience \geq 41		0.079	0.248	0.319	0.752

Table S6. *U* values and *p* value of Mann-Whitney *U* tests ($\alpha = 0.05$) of the differences between scientific knowledge (SK) and indigenous and local knowledge (ILK) about detection and consumption times of livestock carcasses by scavengers depending on shepherds' age ('born') and experience ('experience') in each study area. Significant differences between SK–ILK within the same study area are indicated in bold. Description of the variables is provided in Table S2 and S3. Mean and SD of detection and consumption times are provided in Figs. 3c–f.

Study area	Born	Variable SK – Variable ILK			
		<i>Detection time SK – Detection time ILK</i>		<i>Consumption time SK – Consumption time ILK</i>	
		<i>U</i>	<i>p value</i>	<i>U</i>	<i>p value</i>
Cantabrian Mountains	≤1950	15.0	0.498	33.0	< 0.001
	1960	7.0	0.149	21.0	0.003
	≥1970	23.0	0.599	22.0	< 0.001
Baetic Mountains	≤1950	9.5	0.011	34.0	0.432
	1960	207.0	0.666	30.0	< 0.0001
	≥1970	175.0	0.204	24.0	< 0.001
	Experience				
Cantabrian Mountains	≤20	20.0	0.650	24.0	< 0.001
	21-40	10.0	0.164	28.0	< 0.0001
	≥41	15.0	0.498	24.0	0.005
Baetic Mountains	≤20	86.0	0.600	34.0	0.063
	21-40	177.0	0.390	19.0	< 0.0001
	≥41	128.5	0.102	35.0	< 0.0001

Appendix S1. Calculation of the biomass consumed (%) by each vertebrate scavenger species in each study area (see Mateo-Tomás et al. 2017 for further details).

First, for each study area (i.e., Cantabrian Mountains and Baetic Mountains), we estimated the carrion consumed by each vertebrate species scavenging at a carcass as:

$$Carrion\ consumed_i = \sum_{j=1}^{days} n_{ij} * DFI_i \quad \text{eq. (1)}$$

where n_{ij} is the abundance of species i recorded scavenging at a carcass (see above) on day j . This value was multiplied by the daily food intake of the species i (i.e., DFI_i) as resulting from the following equation (Crocker et al. 2002):

$$Daily\ Food\ Intake\ (DFI) = \frac{Daily\ Energy\ Expenditure\ (kJ)}{Food\ Energy\ \left(\frac{kJ}{g}\right) * (1 - Moisture) * Assimilation\ Efficiency} \quad \text{eq. (2)}$$

Daily Energy Expenditure has a strong relationship with body weight:

$$\log(Daily\ Energy\ Expenditure) = \log a + b * (\log Body\ weight) \quad \text{eq. (3)}$$

$\log a$ and b are parameters separately obtained from Hudson et al. (2013). Mean body weights for the recorded scavengers were obtained from official databases (i.e., PanTHERIA, HBW Alive; Jones et al. 2009; Del Hoyo et al. 2015). Energy and moisture content for mammal carrion were 22.6 kJ/g and 68.8% respectively (Crocker et al. 2002). Here, we assumed that each individual scavenger arriving at a carcass consumed the daily food intake.

Second, we estimated the percentage of biomass consumed per species i at each carcass c as:

$$Biomass\ consumed_i(\%) = \frac{Carrion\ consumed_{ci} * 100}{\sum_{i=1}^N (Carrion\ consumed_{ci})} \quad \text{eq. (4)}$$

Finally, we calculated the average biomass consumed (%) by each species at all the carcasses within each study area (i.e., the variable ‘biomass consumed SK’; see Table S3).

References

- Crocker, D., A Hart, J. Gurney, and C. McCoy. 2002. *Project PN0908: Methods for estimating daily food intake of wild birds and mammals*. Final report. Central Science Laboratory. UK: DEFRA.
- Del Hoyo, J., A., Elliott, J., Sargatal, D.A., Christie, and E. de Juana. (Eds.). 2015. *Handbook of the Birds of the World Alive*. Barcelona: Lynx Edicions. Retrieved 1 October, 2016, from: <http://www.hbw.com/>
- Hudson, L.N, N.J.B. Isaac, and D.C. Reuman. 2013. The relationship between body mass and field metabolic rate among individual birds and mammals. *Journal of Animal Ecology* 82: 1009–1020. doi: 10.1111/1365-2656.12086
- Jones, K.E., J. Bielby, M. Cardillo, S. A. Fritz, J. O'Dell, C. D. L. Orme, K. Safi, W. Sechrest, et al. 2009. PanTHERIA: a species-level database of life history, ecology, and geography of extant and recently extinct mammals. *Ecology* 90: 2648–2648. doi:10.1890/08-1494.1
- Mateo-Tomás, P., P.P. Olea, M. Moleón, J. Vicente, F. Botella, N. Selva, J. Viñuela, and J.A. Sánchez-Zapata. 2015. From regional to global patterns in vertebrate scavenger communities subsidized by big game hunting. *Diversity and Distributions* 21: 913–924. doi: 10.1111/ddi.12330
- Mateo-Tomás, P., P.P. Olea, M. Moleón, N. Selva, and J.A. Sánchez-Zapata. 2017. Both rare and common species support ecosystem services in scavenger communities. *Global Ecology and Biogeography* 26: 1459-1470. doi: 10.1111/geb.12673
- Moleón, M., J.A. Sánchez-Zapata, E. Sebastián-González, and N. Owen-Smith. 2015. Carcass size shapes the structure and functioning of an African scavenging assemblage. *Oikos* 124: 1391–1403. doi: 10.1111/oik.02222