10.1071/WR22012

Wildlife Research

Supplementary Material

Monitoring methods influence native predator detectability and inferred occupancy responses to introduced carnivore management

Tim S. Jessop[A,*], *and Graeme R. Gillespie*[B]

[A]Centre For Integrative Ecology, School of Life and Environmental Sciences, Deakin University, Waurn Ponds, Vic. 3216, Australia.

[B]Department of Environment and Natural Resources, Palmerston, NT 0830, Australia.

[*]Correspondence to: Tim S. Jessop Centre For Integrative Ecology, School of Life and Environmental Sciences, Deakin University, Waurn Ponds, Vic. 3216, Australia Email: t.jessop@deakin.edu.au

Supplementary Information

Table S1. Pearson test results for assessing correlations in lace monitor detections among the different successessful monitoring methods used in the study.

	Pearson Correlation	Sig. (2-tailed)	95% Confidence Intervals (2-tailed)[a]	
			Lower	Upper
Box trap - visual	0.189	0.102	-0.038	0.397
Box Trap - mixed visual	-0.061	0.600	-0.283	0.167
Box trap- sandpad	-0.018	0.877	-0.242	0.208
visual - mixed visual	0.041	0.726	-0.186	0.264
visual - sandpad	0.145	0.210	-0.083	0.359
mixed visual - sandpad	-0.012	0.920	-0.236	0.214
a. Estimation is based on Fisher's r-to-z transformation.				