A pathway to recovery: the Critically Endangered Sumatran tiger *Panthera tigris sumatrae* in an 'in danger' UNESCO World Heritage Site

WULAN PUSPARINI, TIMBUL BATUBARA, FAHRUDIN SURAHMAT, ARDIANTIONO
TRI SUGIHARTI, MUHAMMAD MUSLICH, FAHRUL AMAMA
WILLIAM MARTHY ROMBANG and NOVIAR ANDAYANI

TABLE S1 Model selection for single-species occupancy (results for top five models and the constant model, except for the tiger models, in which prey species are included as covariates). The relationship of covariates with the response variable is indicated by + or -.

ID	Model	K	AICc	ΔAICc	<i>w</i> _i (%)			
Muntjac: $\hat{\psi} = 0.98$ (0.08–0.99), $\hat{p} = 0.077$ (0.068–0.085) Detection fit at								
p(+Understorey cover)								
2.1	ψ (+Understorey cover; –Distance to road)	5	4,149.4	0.00	24			
2.2	ψ (+Understorey cover)	4	4,149.5	0.13	23			
2.3	ψ (–Distance to road)	4	4,150.1	0.67	17			
2.4	ψ (+Ruggedness index)	4	4,150.2	0.81	16			
2.5	ψ (+Count of human independent event)	4	4,150.3	0.85	16			
2.6	Constant model	2	4,153.2	3.78	4			
Wild boar: $\hat{\psi} = 0.85 \ (0.67 - 0.94), \hat{p} = 0.043 \ (0.037 - 0.049)$ Detection fit at $p(-\text{Forest})$								
2.7	ψ (–Distance to edge)	4	2,354.3	0.00	48			
2.8	ψ (–Distance to edge; +Distance to village)	5	2,356.4	2.12	17			
2.9	ψ –(Distance to edge; –Distance to road)	5	2,356.6	2.32	15			
2.10	ψ (–Distance to road)	4	2,356.7	2.40	14			
2.11	ψ (–Distance to village)	4	2,358.5	4.22	6			
2.12	Constant model	2	2,370.8	16.54	0			
Sambar: $\hat{\psi} = 0.61$ (0.35–0.82), $\hat{p} = 0.017$ (0.012–0.023) Detection fit at p (+Canopy								

openness)

2.13	ψ (–Slope; +Distance to road)	5	857.1	0.00	32				
2.14	ψ (–Slope)	4	857.8	0.69	23				
2.15	ψ (–Slope; +Distance to road; +Distance to edge)	6	858.4	1.30	17				
2.16	ψ (+Distance to road)	4	858.8	1.67	14				
2.17	ψ (+Distance to edge)	4	858.8	1.67	14				
2.18	Constant model	2	873.2	16.12	0				
Pig-tailed macaque: $\hat{\psi} = 0.89 \ (0.68-0.96), \hat{p} = 0.042 \ (0.035-0.051)$ Detection fit at									
p(-Forest; +Understorey cover)									
2.19	ψ (+Distance to river, +Distance to road)	6	2,475.6	0.00	34				
2.20	ψ (+Distance to road)	5	2,476.0	0.33	29				
2.21	ψ (+Distance to river)	5	2,476.9	1.31	18				
2.22	ψ (+Distance to edge; +Distance to road)	6	2,478.0	2.39	10				
2.23	ψ (+Distance to edge)	5	2,478.7	3.05	7				
2.24	Constant model	2	2,481.3	5.68	2				
Illegal human presence: $\hat{\psi} = 0.38$ (0.23–0.56), $\hat{p} = 0.021$ (0.013–0.035) Detection fit at									
<i>p</i> (+Fo	orest; +Canopy openness; -Understor	ey cov	er)						
2.25	ψ (–Distance to village)	6	623.8	0.00	64				
2.26	ψ (–Distance to village; –Distance to edge)	7	626.1	2.32	20				
2.27	ψ (–Distance to edge)	6	627.6	3.86	9				
2.28	ψ (–Distance to village; –Distance to edge; –Distance to road)	8	628.5	4.77	6				
2.29	ψ (–Distance to road)	6	629.7	5.90	3				
2.30	Constant model	2	745.6	121.82	0				
Tiger: $\hat{\psi} = 0.65 \ (0.45-0.81), \hat{p} = 0.013 \ (0.009-0.017)$									

2.31	Constant model	2	745.6	0.00	24
2.32	ψ (–Distance to river) $p(.)$	3	745.6	0.01	23
2.33	ψ (–Distance to river) p (+Forest)	4	746.5	0.89	15
2.34	ψ (+Understorey cover) p (+Forest)	4	747.2	1.61	11
2.35	ψ (+Sambar) p (+Forest)	4	747.5	1.94	9
2.36	ψ (+Muntjac) p (+Forest)	4	747.7	2.05	8
2.37	ψ (–Pig-tailed macaque) p (+Forest)	4	748.7	3.05	5
2.38	ψ (+Wild pig) p (+Forest)	4	748.7	3.05	5