**Table S2.** Species investigated with regards to interacting with LGDs, responding to LGDs, or being affected by LGDs, and the direction of any reported effects. Each species is listed along with their status as a target or non-target species and their IUCN Red List status. Where interactions were present, or responses and effects negative or positive, we categorised the species as having been affected by LGDs (Y = yes in “Affected”). In total, we found 83 named species in the 56 publications from the literature search (1970-July 2020), 80 of which were categorised as having been affected by LGDs in at least one publication. The three species that were monitored but categorised as not having been affected by LGDs are highlighted with blue text.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Common name** | **Scientific name** | **IUCN Status** | **Interactions** | **Responses** | **Effects** | **Affected** |
| **Target species** |
| Cheetah | *Acinonyx jubatus* | VU | Killed1, not killed2, non-lethal interactions2 |  | Survival (+ve)1  | Y |
| Coyote | *Canis latrans* | LC | Killed3–5, chased4,6–8 | Spatial (–ve)9 |  | Y |
| Grey wolf | *Canis lupus* | LC | Chased10–16, killed10,16–18, hybridised19,20 | Spatial (–ve)9 |  | Y |
| Dingo | *Canis lupus dingo* | Not listed | Olfactory cues21 | Spatial (N)21,22 |  | Y |
| Black-backed jackal | *Canis mesomelas* | LC | Chased23, killed1,2,23,24, non-lethal interactions2 | Spatial (N)25 | Survival (–ve)1  | Y |
| Caracal | *Caracal caracal* | LC | Killed1,2,23, non-lethal interactions2 |  | Survival (–ve)1 | Y |
| Wolverine | *Gulo gulo* | VU | Chased26 |  |  | Y |
| Brown hyena | *Hyaena brunnea* | NT | Killed2, non-lethal interactions2 | Spatial (+ve)25 |  | Y |
| Kodkod | *Leopardus guigna* | VU | Interacted with27 |  |  | Y |
| Lessor grison | *Lycalopex griseus* | LC | Not interacted with27 |  |  | N |
| Caucasian lynx | *Lynx lynx dinniki* | LC | Killed28 |  |  | Y |
| Bobcat | *Lynx rufus* | LC |  | Spatial (–ve)29 |  | Y |
| American mink | *Neovison vison* | LC | Interacted with27 |  |  | Y |
| Lion | *Panthera leo* | VU | Not killed2, Non-lethal interactions2 |  |  | Y |
| Leopard | *Panthera pardus* | VU | Killed24, not killed1,2, non-lethal interactions2 | Spatial (N)25 | Survival (+ve)1  | Y |
| Chacma baboon | *Papio ursinus* | LC | Killed1,2,24, non-lethal interactions2 |  |  | Y |
| Mountain lion | *Puma concolor* | LC | Interacted with27 |  |  | Y |
| Brown bear | *Ursus arctos* | LC | Chased12,15,30–32 |  |  | Y |
| Red fox | *Vulpes vulpes* | LC | Chased6,14,26,33–35, killed9,15,34–36 | Spatial (–ve)37, temporal (–ve)37 |  | Y |
| **Non-target species** |
| Impala  | *Aepyceros melampus* | LC | Interacted wtih2 |  |  | Y |
| Moose | *Alces alces* | LC | Chased30 |  |  | Y |
| Springbok | *Antidorcas marsupialis* | LC | Consumed38, interacted with2 |  |  | Y |
| Ringtail  | *Bassariscus astutus* | LC |  | Spatial (+ve)29 |  | Y |
| Roe deer | *Capreolus capreolus* | LC | Chased30,35, killed15,35,39 |  |  | Y |
| Red deer | *Cervus elaphus* | LC | Not chased14 | Spatial (–ve)13 |  | Y |
| Civet | *Civettictis civetta* | LC | Killed2, non-lethal interactions2 |  |  | Y |
| Molina's hog-nosed skunk | *Conepatus chinga* | LC | Interacted with27 |  |  | Y |
| Blesbok | *Damaliscus pygargus phillipsi* | LC | Interacted with2 |  |  | Y |
| Opossum | *Didelphis virginiana* | LC | Killed9 |  |  | Y |
| North American porcupine | *Erethizon dorsatum* | LC | Killed3 |  |  | Y |
| Little penguin | *Eudyptula minor* | LC | Killed40 |  |  | Y |
| African wildcat | *Felis silvestris* | LC | Killed1,2, non-lethal interactions2 |  |  | Y |
| Mountain gazelle | *Gazella gazella* | EN |  | Spatial (–ve)41, anti-predator (+ve)41 | Reproduction(–ve)41 | Y |
| Cape porcupine | *Hystrix africaeaustralis* | LC | Consumed38 |  |  | Y |
| Striped polecat | *Ictonyx striatus* | LC | Killed23 |  |  | Y |
| Waterbuck | *Kobus ellipsiprymnus* | LC | Interacted with2 |  |  | Y |
| Norway lemming | *Lemmus lemmus* | LC | Chased30, killed30 |  |  | Y |
| Black-tailed jackrabbit  | *Lepus californicus* | LC | Chased42, killed42 |  |  | Y |
| European hare | *Lepus europaeus* | LC | Chased32,35, not chased14, killed15,26,35, interacted with27 |  |  | Y |
| Mountain hare | *Lepus timidus* | LC | Not chased14 |  |  | N |
| Scrubhare  | *Lepus saxatilis* | LC | Consumed38,43 |  |  | Y |
| Marine otter | *Lontra felina* | EN | Interacted with27 |  |  | Y |
| Southern river otter | *Lontra provocax* | EN | Not interacted with27 |  |  | N |
| Eastern grey kangaroo  | *Macropus giganteus* | LC |  | Spatial (–ve)37, temporal (–ve)37 |  | Y |
| Alpine marmot | *Marmota marmota* | LC | Chased33, killed33,39 |  |  | Y |
| Wild turkey | *Meleagris gallopavo* | LC |  | Unknown if anecdotal reduction in sightings is a spatial response or abundance effect42 | Unknown if anecdotal reduction in sightings is a spatial response or abundance effect42 | Y |
| European badger | *Meles meles* | LC | Killed36 |  |  | Y |
| Honey badger | *Mellivora capensis* | LC | Killed2, non-lethal interactions2 |  |  | Y |
| Striped skunk | *Mephitis mephitis* | LC | Killed9 |  |  | Y |
| Namaqua rock mouse | *Micaelamys namaquensis* | LC | Consumed38 |  |  | Y |
| Meadow vole | *Microtus pennsylvanicus* | LC | Killed44 (stated small mammals killed in 44 , only named in a review by same authors45) | Unknown if anecdotal reduction in sightings is a spatial response or abundance effect45 | Unknown if anecdotal reduction in sightings is a spatial response or abundance effect45 | Y |
| Coypu | *Myocastor coypus* | LC | Interacted with27 |  |  | Y |
| Helmeted guineafowl | *Numida meleagris* | LC | Interacted with2 |  |  | Y |
| Columbian black-tailed deer  | *Odocoileus hemionus columbianus* | LC | Chased42, killed42 |  |  | Y |
| White-tailed deer | *Odocoileus virginianus* | LC | Chased46 | Spatial (–ve)47, temporal (–ve)9 |  | Y |
| Klipspringer | *Oreotragus oreotragus* | LC | Consumed38 |  |  | Y |
| European rabbit | *Oryctolagus cuniculus* | EN | Chased34,35, killed34,35 |  |  | Y |
| Gemsbok | *Oryx gazella* | LC | Killed1 |  |  | Y |
| Bat-eared fox  | *Otocyon megalotis* | LC | Killed1 |  |  | Y |
| Bush vlei rat | *Otomys unisulcatus* | LC | Consumed38 |  |  | Y |
| Bighorn sheep | *Ovis Canadensis* | LC |  | Spatial (–ve)44 |  | Y |
| North American deer mouse | *Peromyscus maniculatus* | LC | Killed44 (stated small mammals killed in44, only named in a review by same authors45) | Unknown if anecdotal reduction in sightings is a spatial response or abundance effect44,45 | Unknown if anecdotal reduction in sightings is a spatial response or abundance effect44,45 | Y |
| Common warthog | *Phacochoerus africanus* | LC | Interacted with2 |  |  | Y |
| Bush pig | *Potamochoerus larvatus* | LC | Interacted with2 |  |  | Y |
| Rock hyrax | *Procavia capensis* | LC | Killed23, consumed38 |  |  | Y |
| Raccoon | *Procyon lotor* | LC | Killed9 | Spatial (+ve)29 |  | Y |
| Southern pudu | *Pudu puda* | NT | Interacted with27 |  |  | Y |
| Reindeer | *Rangifer tarandus* | LC | Chased31 |  |  | Y |
| Steenbok | *Raphicerus campestris* | LC | Consumed38, interacted with2 |  |  | Y |
| Chamois | *Rupicapra rupicapra* | LC | Chased14,33 |  |  | Y |
| Sambar deer | *Rusa unicolor* | VU |  | Spatial (–ve)37, temporal (N)37 |  | Y |
| Common ostrich | *Struthio camelus* | LC | Interacted with2 |  |  | Y |
| Meerkat | *Suricata suricatta* | LC | Consumed38 |  |  | Y |
| Wild boar | *Sus scrofa* | LC | Chased33–35,48, killed32,35 |  |  | Y |
| Common duiker  | *Sylvicapra grimmia* | LC | Killed, consumed38,43 |  |  | Y |
| Western capercaillie | *Tetrao urogallus* | LC | Killed26 |  |  | Y |
| Nyala | *Tragelaphus angasii* | LC | Interacted with2 |  |  | Y |
| Common eland | *Tragelaphus oryx* | LC | Killed1 |  |  | Y |
| Greater kudu | *Tragelaphus strepsiceros* | LC | Killed1, interacted with2 |  |  | Y |
| Bushbuck | *Tragelaphus sylvaticus* | LC | Interacted with2 |  |  | Y |
| Gray fox  | *Urocyon cinereoargenteus* | LC |  | Spatial (–ve)29 |  | Y |
| Common wombat  | *Vombatus ursinus* | LC |  | Spatial (–ve)37 |  | Y |
| Swamp wallaby | *Wallabia bicolor* | LC |  | Spatial (–ve)37, temporal (N)37 |  | Y |

Interactions, responses and effects:

chased – species is chased by LGDs

not chased – species is actively reported not to be chased by LGDs

killed – species is reported to be killed by LGDs

not killed – species is actively reported not to be killed by LGDs

consumed – species remains found in scat of LGDs

interacted – species reported to directly interact with LGDs, but the nature of the interaction (e.g. chasing or killing) not specified

not interacted with – species reported not to directly interact with LGDs

visual, auditory or olfactory cues – species interacts with LGD cues, e.g. barks, scent-marks

hybridised – species bred with LGDs

spatial – no change (N), or species moved away (–ve) or towards (+ve) LGDs

temporal – no change (N), or species changed active time to when LGDs active (+ve) or when LGDs not active (–ve)

anti-predator – no change (N), or species increased (+ve) or decreased (–ve) anti-predator behaviour such as increase in vigilance

survival – no change (N), reduction (–ve) or increase (+ve) in survival

reproduction – no change (N), reduction (–ve) or increase (+ve) in reproductive output
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