**Appendix V:**

The conservation research-practice gap: A case study of an endangered bird

Oryx

Cristian Pérez-Granados1,2#, Germán M. López-Iborra1.

1 Ecology Department/IMEM “Ramón Margalef”. Universidad de Alicante, 03080. Alicante. Spain.

2 National Institute for Science and Technology in Wetlands (INAU), Federal University of Mato Grosso (UFMT), Computational Bioacoustics Research Unit (CO.BRA), Cuiabá, Mato Grosso, Brazil.

Corresponding author: E-mail address: cristian.perez@ua.es. Tel: +34 (9659034002555). Fax: +34 (965909873).

**Supporting information**

Supplementary Table 5. Correlation between the two main axes of a PCA performed with reasons declared by managers for implementing a concrete conservation intervention in a region (\* < 0.1; \*\* < 0.05; \*\*\* < 0.001).

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Reason** | **PCA I** | **PCA II** |
| Recommendation of scientists and/or technical staff asked | -0.501 | -0.474 |
| Legal obligation | **0.984\*\*\*** | 0.053 |
| Budget availability | -0.565 | **-0.728\*\*** |
| Review of scientific literature | -0.083 | **0.811\*\*** |
| Proven success in this or other similar species | -0.574 | **0.770\*\*** |
| Own experience with this conservation intervention | -0.350 | **0.893\*\*** |
| Personal belief on that this measure should be effective | **0.638\*** | -0.506 |
| Recommendation of managers of other regions | -0.240 | -0.079 |
| Need for a population index\* | -0.321 | 0.104 |
| Due to population decline\* | -0.468 | -0.007 |
| Variance explained (%) | 45.9 | 27.9 |

Supplementary Table 6. Correlation between the four main axes of a PCA performed with reasons declared by managers for not implementing a concrete conservation intervention in a region (\* < 0.1; \*\* < 0.05; \*\*\* < 0.001).

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Reason** | **PCA Ib** | **PCA IIb** | **PCA IIIb** | **PCA IVb** |
| Insufficient time to design and make a proper planning for this measure | **0.748\*\*** | 0.126 | 0.253 | **0.526\*** |
| Technical difficulties for developing it | -0.385 | 0.391 | -0.494 | **0.500\*** |
| Budget shortage | **0.731\*\*** | -0.079 | 0.415 | -0.260 |
| Technical staff shortage aff shortage | 0.495 | 0.442 | -0.217 | **-0.600\*\*** |
| I have doubts about this conservation measure | 0.340 | -0.482 | **-0.740\*\*** | -0.201 |
| Legal obstacles for its implementation | **-0.950\*\*\*** | -0.060 | 0.207 | -0.143 |
| There are no studies which have proved their efficacy in this or similar species | 0.206 | -0.223 | **-0.558\*** | 0.127 |
| In process | -0.348 | **0.540\*** | -0.180 | -0.360 |
| I do not think that it supposes an improvement on the species’ conservation | -0.238 | 0.131 | -0.411 | 0.261 |
| I think that it is not needed in my region | 0.048 | **-0.911\*\*\*** | -0.030 | -0.030 |
| Lack of knowledge about the existence of this intervention | 0.016 | **-0.860\*\*\*** | -0.011 | 0.072 |
| Elusive | -0.639**\*\*** | -0.282 | 0.417 | -0.149 |
| Variance explained (%) | 33.1 | 16.8 | 15.7 | 12.2 |