Supplementary material

High variation in camera trap-model sensitivity for surveying mammal species in northern Australia

Jaime Heiniger[A,B,D] *and Graeme Gillespie*[A,C]

[A]Flora and Fauna Division, Department of Land Resource Management, 25 Chung Wah Terrace, Palmerston, NT 0830, Australia.

[B]School of Biological Sciences, The University of Queensland, St Lucia, Qld 4072, Australia.

[C]School of Biosciences, The University of Melbourne, Parkville, Vic. 3010, Australia.

[D]Corresponding author. Email: j.heiniger@uq.edu.au

Table S1. Model selection results and nightly detection probability for common mammal species recorded during trials on Groote Eylandt

The delta AIC, AIC weight and the number of parameters (K) of each model with an AIC difference of two of less are shown. Model covariates included the presence of bait during each survey day (bait) and camera model (cam), which was either high-sensitivity PC850 or unmodified (HC550 and PC850 combined).

Species	Model	K	Delta AIC	AIC weight	Nightly detection probability	
					High-sensitivity PC850	**Unmodified**
Northern quoll	Null	2	0	0.29	0.323 (±0.03)	
	Cam	3	0.15	0.27	0.36 (±0.04)	0.288 (±0.04)
	Cam + bait	4	0.53	0.23		
	Bait	3	0.68	0.21		
Northern brown bandicoot	Null	2	0	0.37	0.363 (±0.03)	
	Cam	3	0.36	0.31	0.389 (±0.04)	0.304 (±0.05)
	Bait	3	1.36	0.19		
	Cam + bait	4	2.02	0.13		
Common rock rat	Cam	3	0	0.59	0.343 (±0.05)	0.092 (±0.04)
	Cam + bait	4	0.79	0.39		
All species combined	Cam	3	0	0.72	0.593 (±0.03)	0.419 (±0.04)
	Cam + bait	4	1.91	0.28		