

Wildlife Biology

**WLB-00253**

Riley, M., Soutyrina, S., Miquelle, D., Hayward, G., Goodrich, J. and Buskirk, S. 2017. Comparison of methods for estimating Amur tiger abundance. – Wildlife Biology 2017: wlb.00253

Appendix 1

Table A1. Summary of trap nights (TN), minimum individual Amur tigers identified (min.), estimate of realized population size (R.N) with confidence intervals (95% CI), tiger density (tiger/100km<sup>2</sup>), net capture probability (pdot), z-statistic closure test results (z), state space area, buffer width, and spatial scale of detection function (sigma) for camera trap and scent dog methods. Estimates generated using individual heterogeneity (h2) estimator in secr. Estimates of abundance and density presented here result from pilot data used to compare candidate sampling methods. These estimates should not be referenced as authenticated abundance or density estimates.

	TN		Tigers		pdot	z (p-value)	State-space (km <sup>2</sup> )	Buffer (km)	Sigma (km)
		min.	R.N	tiger/100km <sup>2</sup>					
			(95% CI)	(95% CI)					
<u>Camera trap</u>									
Summer	2318	7	9 (7–18)	0.26 (0.12–0.56)	0.32	0.27 (0.61)	3406	15.0	4.0
Fall	1673	9	11 (9–20)	0.74 (0.38–1.45)	0.34	–2.07 (0.02)	1442	8.8	5.7
Winter	1364	6	11 (7–26)	0.73 (0.31–1.74)	0.44	–2.54 (0.01)	1442	8.8	2.4
Spring	1682	4	4 (4–12)	0.14 (0.05–0.35)	0.32	–2.19 (0.01)	3123	14.0	2.4
<u>Scent dog</u>									
Summer	-	3	3 (1–11)	0.08 (0.02–0.27)	0.34	1.00 (0.84)	3406	15.0	4.0
Winter	-	9	11 (7–28)	0.34 (0.14–0.81)	0.19	0.95,(0.83)	3354	21.3	2.4
Spring	-	1	1 (1–11)	0.05 (0.00–0.24)	0.34	1.69 (0.95)	3123	14.0	2.4