Edith Cowan University

Research Online

1-1-2014

A critical review of habitat use by feral cats and key directions for future research and management

Tim S. Doherty
Edith Cowan University, t.doherty@ecu.edu.au

Andrew J. Bengsen

Robert A. Davis
Edith Cowan University, robert.davis@ecu.edu.au

Follow this and additional works at: https://ro.ecu.edu.au/ecuworkspost2013

Part of the Animal Sciences Commons, and the Environmental Monitoring Commons

1 **A critical review of feral cat habitat use and key directions for future research and management**

2

3 Running head: Review of feral cat habitat use

4

5 Tim S Doherty [a] *

6 Andrew J Bengsen [b]

7 Robert A Davis [a]

8

9 [a] School of Natural Sciences, Edith Cowan University, 270 Joondalup Drive, Joondalup, WA 6027 Australia

10 [b] Vertebrate Pest Research Unit, New South Wales Department of Primary Industries, Locked Bag 6006,

11 Orange, NSW 2800 Australia

12 * corresponding author: School of Natural Sciences, Edith Cowan University, 270 Joondalup Drive, Joondalup,

13 WA 6027 Australia, t.doherty@ecu.edu.au, phone: +61 431961310, fax: +61 8 6304 5070

14

15 Key words: feral cat; *Felis catus*; habitat selection; habitat use; home range; introduced predator; invasive

16 predator; management; predator control

17

18   **Abstract**

19   Feral cats (*Felis catus*) have a wide global distribution and cause significant damage to native fauna. Reducing

20   their impacts requires an understanding of how they use habitat and which parts of the landscape should be the

21   focus of management. We reviewed 27 experimental and observational studies conducted around the world over

22   the last 35 years that aimed to examine habitat use by feral and unowned cats. Our aims were to: (1) summarise

23   the current body of literature on habitat use by feral and unowned cats in the context of applicable ecological

24   theory (i.e. habitat selection, foraging theory); (2) develop testable hypotheses to help fill important knowledge

25   gaps in the current body of knowledge on this topic; and (3) build a conceptual framework that will guide the

26   activities of researchers and managers in reducing feral cat impacts. We found that feral cats exploit a diverse

27   range of habitats including arid deserts, shrublands and grasslands, fragmented agricultural landscapes, urban

28   areas, glacial valleys, equatorial to sub-Antarctic islands and a range of forest and woodland types. Factors

29   invoked to explain cat habitat use included prey availability, predation/competition, shelter availability and

30   human resource subsidies, but the strength of evidence used to support these assertions was low, with most

31   studies being observational or correlative. We therefore provide a list of key directions that will assist

32   conservation managers and researchers in better understanding and ameliorating the impact of feral cats at a

33   scale appropriate for useful management and research. Future studies will benefit from employing an

34   experimental approach and collecting data on the relative abundance and activity of prey and other predators.

35   This might include landscape-scale experiments where the densities of predators, prey or competitors are

36   manipulated and then the response in cat habitat use is measured. Effective management of feral cat populations

37   could target high-use areas, such as linear features and structurally complex habitat. Since our review shows

38   often-divergent outcomes in the use of the same habitat components and vegetation types worldwide, local

39   knowledge and active monitoring of management actions is essential when deciding on control programs.

40

41 **Introduction**

42 Invasive mammalian predators have caused or contributed to the decline and extinction of many species

43 worldwide (Salo *et al.* 2007). Examples include the red fox (*Vulpes vulpes*; Johnson 2006), mustelids

44 (Mustelidae ; King and Moody 1982; Salo *et al.* 2010), rats (*Rattus* spp.; Jones *et al.* 2008; Capizzi *et al.* 2014)

45 and the domestic cat (*Felis catus*; Medina *et al.* 2011; Duffy and Capece 2012). Humans have introduced the

46 domestic cat to almost every region of the world and self-sustaining wild populations now exist in a wide

47 variety of landscape types including deserts, forests and tropical to sub-Antarctic islands (Long 2003). Animals

48 in these populations are generally termed 'feral', meaning that they are descended from domesticated ancestors

49 but now exist in a free-living state with no direct dependence on humans. Feral cats are distinguished from

50 'unowned' cats (stray or semi-feral) in that unowned cats remain dependent on humans for at least the incidental

51 provision of resources such as food or shelter.

52

53 Feral cats are almost exclusively carnivorous and generally obtain most of their food resources by hunting live

54 prey (Fitzgerald and Turner 2000). Feral cats are acknowledged as one of the world's worst 100 invasive species

55 (Lowe *et al.* 2000) and are thought to have been an important contributing factor to at least 14% of bird, reptile

56 and mammal extinctions globally (Medina *et al.* 2011) and at least 16 mammal extinctions in Australia (Johnson

57 2006). Predation by feral cats can jeopardise conservation programs aiming to reintroduce native fauna into

58 areas of their former range (Moseby *et al.* 2011; Potts *et al.* 2012), and cats can have non-lethal impacts on

59 susceptible populations through competition, disease transmission, induced predator avoidance behaviour and

60 hybridisation (Daniels *et al.* 2001; Medina *et al.* 2014). Reducing the impacts of feral cats is a priority for

61 conservation managers in Europe (Daniels *et al.* 2001; Sarmento *et al.* 2009), North America (Blancher 2013;

62 Loss *et al.* 2013), Oceania (Medway 2004; Woinarski *et al.* 2011; Garnett *et al.* 2013) and islands worldwide

63 (Keitt *et al.* 2002; Judge *et al.* 2012; Nogales *et al.* 2013).

64

65 Substantial effort has been invested in research and management to mitigate the impacts of feral cats in recent

66 years (e.g. Hess *et al.* 2009; Moseby *et al.* 2009; Luna-Mendoza *et al.* 2011). Cats have been eradicated from

67 105 mostly small islands (IUCN SSC Invasive Species Specialist Group 2012), but unfenced mainland sites

68 generally require sustained control efforts because cats have a high reproductive output and an aptitude for re-

69 invasion (Read and Bowen 2001; Short and Turner 2005). The development of efficient and effective

70 management programs for invasive predators such as feral cats usually requires reliable information about the

71 spatial ecology of the subject species to inform management decisions such as the density at which control

72 devices should be deployed (Goltz *et al.* 2008; Moseby *et al.* 2009) or the geographic scale of control operations

3

73 (Mosnier *et al.* 2008). Information about habitat use is particularly important for maximising the rate at which

74 pest species encounter control devices such as traps or poison baits (Recio *et al.* 2010; Bengsen *et al.* 2012),

75 designing efficient monitoring programs (Pickerell *et al.* 2014), predicting the spatial distribution of an invasive

76 species' impacts (Kliskey and Byrom 2004) or identifying native fauna populations that are most likely to be

77 imperilled by the invader (Gehring and Swihart 2003; Recio *et al.* 2014).

78

79 Given the growing recognition of the impact of feral and unowned cats and developments in the technology

80 available to both monitor and control them (e.g. Algar *et al.* 2007; Recio *et al.* 2010; Bengsen *et al.* 2011), it is

81 timely to review the state of knowledge on the habitat use patterns of cats across their broad global distribution.

82 Here, we review experimental and observational studies conducted around the world over the last 35 years that

83 aimed, at least in part, to examine habitat use by feral and unowned cats. The term 'habitat use', as used here,

84 refers to the habitat components and vegetation types that an animal uses, whereas 'habitat selection' refers to

85 the behavioural process that ultimately produce habitat use patterns, and is usually described as preference or

86 avoidance of different habitat components or vegetation types (Johnson 1980; Hall *et al.* 1997). Our aim here is

87 not to provide strict guidelines for research and management of feral cats because this is not feasible or useful,

88 given their global distribution and the wide range of contexts in which they occur. Rather, we seek to establish a

89 conceptual framework that will guide the activities of researchers and land managers in reducing feral cat

90 impacts at a scale appropriate for useful management and research. Specifically, our aims are to: (1) summarise

91 the current body of literature on habitat use by feral and unowned cats in the context of applicable ecological

92 theory (i.e. habitat selection, foraging theory); (2) develop testable hypotheses to help fill important knowledge

93 gaps in the current body of knowledge on this topic; and (3) build a conceptual framework that will guide the

94 activities of researchers and managers in reducing feral cat impacts. Most of the available literature is on feral

95 cats, rather than unowned cats, so we generally refer to them collectively as feral cats throughout.

96

97 **Methods**

98 We searched Web of Science and Scopus international databases for studies on feral and unowned cat habitat

99 use with combinations of the following keywords: feral cat, *Felis catus*, stray cat, semi-feral, free-living, habitat

100 use, habitat selection, and home range. To these results, we added any additional studies on cat habitat use that

101 we sourced from reference lists, book chapters and publically available theses. After removing duplicates, we

102 also excluded studies that did not include a component on habitat use by *Felis catus,* and studies that did not

103 include feral or unowned cats, resulting in a list of 27 studies published between 1979 and 2014 (Fig. 1).

104

105 The small number of studies available ($n = 27$) meant that a quantitative analysis of observed patterns was not

106 possible. Instead, we examined habitat use within home-ranges and collated information for each study to

107 describe survey methods, observed patterns of irregular habitat use (resulting from apparent habitat preferences

108 or aversions), and any factors that were believed to be responsible for the observed patterns of habitat use. We

109 classified these factors as one or more of the following: none; prey availability; intra-guild

110 predation/competition; shelter availability; or human resource subsidies. We also graded the ability of each

111 study to identify those factors responsible for observed patterns using five levels: (1) supposition – no data or

112 references to support contentions; (2) supposition based on casual observation of apparent coincidence e.g.

113 predators or prey more abundant in one habitat component, but supporting data is not provided; (3) supposition

114 based on casual observation of apparent coincidence and supporting data provided; (4) manipulative study

115 without experimental controls or replicates; (5) manipulative study with experimental controls and replicates.

116

117 To describe broad patterns in cat habitat use we recorded the frequency of studies where cats favoured or

118 avoided the following seven broad habitat components within their home ranges: forest (c. 30-100% tree cover);

119 woodland (c. 10-30%); shrub/heathland; grassland; riparian areas; infrastructure (farm buildings, urban and

120 industrial areas); and agricultural land (fields, pasture, paddocks and crops). We did not include habitat

121 components that fell outside of these groups and were reported in only one or two studies (e.g. mudflats, swales,

122 refuse dumps, dunes) or habitat components that were too broad or ambiguous for classification (e.g. open areas,

123 small and large remnant patches, adjacent slopes, steep slopes). We did not focus on intra-habitat use (e.g.

124 microhabitats) because few studies recorded information at this resolution and we note that it is difficult to

125 collect such fine-scale information for wide-ranging carnivores like feral cats. Some studies qualified for both

126 avoidance and preference of one habitat component (e.g. favoured deciduous forest and avoided pine forest).

127 These frequencies are for comparative purposes only, as we recognise that preference or avoidance of different

128 habitats depends largely on the availability of other habitat components in a study landscape. All favoured or

129 avoided habitat components are listed in Table 1 as they appear in the studies.

130

131 <Fig. 1 here>

132

133 **Results**

134 Of the 27 studies reviewed, 74% were solely on feral cats and 11% were a mixture of feral, unowned and owned

135 (pet) cats. We also included two studies where the group of study animals were a mixture of feral *Felis catus*

136   and the closely related native *F. silvestris*, and two studies that were on unowned cats only. We treated Recio

137   and Seddon (2013) and Recio *et al*. (2014) as a single study because they used the same data set.

138

139   VHF or GPS tracking was used to study cat space use in 70% of studies, with sample sizes ranging from four to

140   32 animals (mean 13.8 ± 1.8 SE). Of the eight studies that did not track individual cats, three used tracking

141   stations with visual or scent-based lures (active tracking stations), whereas the remaining studies used scat

142   counts, visual surveys or passive tracking stations (Table 1). We assume that habitat use patterns identified in

143   these studies represent the results of habitat selection within home ranges.

144

145   *Patterns of habitat use*

146   37% of studies were from Australia, 15% from New Zealand, 22% from the UK and Europe, 15% from the

147   USA and one study each from the Galapagos Islands, Canary Islands and Marion Island (Fig. 1). 22% of studies

148   were conducted on islands and the rest were continental. Nine studies had temperate marine/maritime climates,

149   five were Mediterranean, four were warm/hot summer continental, three each were arid or humid subtropical,

150   two had a steppe climate and one had a tundra (sub-Antarctic) climate (Table 1). Around half of the studies (13)

151   were conducted in a mixed landscape of native vegetation and agricultural land and/or urban areas, and the

152   remainder (14) were conducted solely in vegetated/natural areas (Table 1).

153

154   The habitat components most commonly reported as being favoured by cats were infrastructure (26% of

155   studies), riparian areas (22%), and agricultural land and shrub/heathlands (18.5% each; Fig. 2). The most

156   commonly avoided habitats were agricultural land (26%) and grassland (11%; Fig. 2). Cats used a diverse range

157   of habitats including but not limited to arid deserts, shrublands and grasslands, fragmented agricultural

158   landscapes, glacial valleys, equatorial to sub-Antarctic islands, urban areas and a range of different forest and

159   woodland types (Table 1). Use of linear features such as tree lines and road verges was recorded in four studies,

160   all of which were conducted in mixed agricultural landscapes, and five studies suggested that feral cats exploit

161   different habitat components to meet different activity requirements, such as hunting or resting.

162

163   <Fig. 2 here>

164

165   *Strength of inference*

166   Overall, most studies provided weak or no data to support their perceptions about the factors driving habitat use

167   by cats (78% level 1 or 2; Fig. 3). 19% of studies provided some data to support their inferences (level 3), but

6

168   only one study conducted a manipulative experiment (level 5). 59% of studies posited that prey availability

169   influenced cat habitat use, but only 20% of those studies provided data to support this idea (Fig. 3). 11% of

170   studies suggested that human resource subsidies influenced cat habitat use and 37% suggested that shelter

171   availability influenced habitat use, but only one provided supporting data (Fig. 3). Predation/competition was

172   put forward as a determining factor by 26% of studies, around half of which provided data to support those

173   inferences: three with data on variation in predator abundance or activity among habitat components and one

174   study which undertook a landscape scale manipulative experiment with controls and replicates. Five studies did

175   not make any inferences as to the mechanisms influencing cat habitat use (Fig. 3).

176

177   <Fig. 3 here>

178   <Table 1 here>

179

180   **Discussion**

181   Feral and unowned cats occur in a wide range of biomes and climatic zones, within which individual cats may

182   have access to a limited range of macro-habitat components or vegetation types. It is therefore not possible or

183   useful to make broad generalisations about preferential use or avoidance of specific habitat components.

184   However, the combined results of all studies suggest that feral cats generally favour structurally complex habitat

185   components over simpler ones. For example, most studies showed that cats or their sign were more likely to be

186   recorded in vegetation types characterised by a mixture of plant growth forms close to ground level, such as

187   mixed shrublands and woodlands, than vegetation types characterised by an open or homogenous structure, such

188   as mature pine forests or grasslands (e.g. Horn *et al.* 2011; Bengsen *et al.* 2012). Several studies also found that

189   cats were more likely to be recorded at the edges of vegetation patches, or along linear features such as road

190   verges or creeks that traversed patches, than in the patch interior (e.g. Gehring and Swihart 2003; Graham *et al.*

191   2012; Pastro 2013). Only three studies showed contradictory patterns, in which cats were more likely to be

192   recorded in open country than in structurally complex vegetation. One study in northern Australia found that

193   cats favoured areas characterised by open grass cover and suggested that this was probably due to increased

194   hunting success (McGregor *et al.* 2014). However, that study only considered habitat use by moving cats and

195   discarded data that was deemed to represent cats at rest. A further two studies from Europe found that cats were

196   more likely to be recorded in open country around farm houses that supplied them with food, than in native

197   vegetation (Holmala and Kauhala 2009; Ferreira *et al.* 2011), although one of these did show a preference for

198   patch edges over interior (Ferreira *et al.* 2011).

199

7

200 Most studies made inferences based on four mechanisms hypothesised to influence feral cat habitat use: prey

201 availability; shelter availability; predation/competition; and human resource subsidies. The hypothesised role of

202 prey availability in structuring habitat use is supported by models of predator-prey habitat selection and optimal

203 foraging theory (Pyke 1984; Mitchell and Powell 2004; Börger *et al.* 2008). Flaxman and Lou (2009) posited

204 that predators preferentially use landscape elements associated with either high prey densities ('prey tracking'),

205 or with high densities of the prey's resources ('resource tracking'— an indirect way of identifying where prey

206 will occur). None of the studies experimentally tested these ideas, although one study (Recio and Seddon 2013;

207 Recio et al. 2014) found that feral cat home ranges tended to be concentrated on habitat types characterised by

208 high suitability for rabbits—their key prey species in the area. Intra-guild predation and competition can also

209 play a key role in structuring habitat use across a range of marine and terrestrial taxa (Polis and Holt 1992;

210 Ritchie and Johnson 2009), and this may hold for feral cats where they occur with higher-order predators. For

211 example, Molsher (1999) found that cats increased their use of open grasslands—which were thought to be more

212 profitable foraging areas—after the density of foxes using those areas was reduced. Similarly, in an arid

213 environment, Brawata and Neeman (2011) found that feral cats were more likely to be detected close to artificial

214 watering points at sites where dingoes were subjected to lethal control, than at sites where they were not. Other

215 studies have also found that cats were observed less frequently at sites where larger carnivores were more

216 common (Brook *et al.* 2012; Krauze-Gryz *et al.* 2012; Lazenby and Dickman 2013). Temporal segregation

217 between cats and larger carnivores also suggests that intra-guild predators can influence the activity times of

218 feral cats (Brook *et al.* 2012; Wang and Fisher 2013). The effect of intra-guild predation on habitat use is closely

219 linked with that of shelter availability. Meta-analysis has shown that prey experience less intra-guild predation

220 in more structurally complex habitats (Janssen *et al.* 2007), so shelter availability is likely to play a key role in

221 providing feral cats with protection from larger predators, including humans. However, the cases recorded here

222 of humans influencing cat habitat use were all in a positive direction, since all of those studies contained at least

223 some unowned cats that were potentially fed by humans (Holmala and Kauhala 2009; Ferreira *et al.* 2011;

224 Krauze-Gryz *et al.* 2012). Nonetheless, humans could also be considered an apex predator with potentially

225 prohibitive effects on cat habitat use. Hutchings (2000) discussed the possibility of such an interaction for cats at

226 a municipal refuse site, but no study investigated this in detail. Shelter availability may also provide cats with

227 protection from environmental stressors like inclement weather (Harper 2007). In reviewing their own results

228 and previous studies, Lozano *et al.* (2003) concluded that cats need two specific habitat types: closed habitats

229 for shelter and resting, and open areas for hunting. In that study, the occurrence of 'wild-living' cats (feral *F.*

230 *catus* and native *F. silvestris*) was positively related to scrub-pastureland mosaics and areas with high rabbit

231 abundance, and microhabitats with high shrub cover and shelter availability. Similar inferences were made in

232 four other studies (Genovesi *et al.* 1995; Molsher 1999; Hall *et al.* 2000; Hutchings 2000), and we term this

233 'behaviourally-stratified' habitat use.

234

235 These general patterns of habitat use can be related to the known hunting behaviour of cats. Domestic cats are

236 solitary hunters that rely mainly on sight and sound to detect their prey (Bradshaw 1992). Fitzgerald and Turner

237 (2000) described two primary hunting techniques: 'mobile', whereby the cat moves around an area of habitat

238 seeking out prey, and 'stationary', where the cat waits at a point of interest, such as the entrance to a rabbit

239 burrow, and ambushes its prey upon appearance. These two techniques aren't mutually exclusive and both rely

240 heavily on stealth. The general pattern of feral cats using habitats with a mixture of vegetation cover at ground

241 level is likely to improve hunting success by providing cats with a mixture of both cover and open areas in

242 which they can observe, stalk and then ambush their prey. The 'habitat heterogeneity hypothesis' also predicts

243 that, in many cases, these areas may support a greater diversity and density of potential prey than more

244 homogeneous habitat components (Tews *et al.* 2004). Edge habitats, linear features, and riparian vegetation are

245 similarly likely to improve hunting success. For example, Pastro (2013) found that feral cats were recorded

246 more frequently at the ecotone between burnt and unburnt grasslands than in continuous areas of habitat. In this

247 regard, dense homogeneous habitats where a cat's visual detection ability would be compromised are likely to

248 be unfavourable areas for hunting by feral cats. In contrast, McGregor *et al*. (2014) found that feral cats in

249 tropical savannas actively chose areas with high prey abundance that had been recently burnt or grazed and

250 posited that the reduced vegetation cover improved cats' hunting success. In future, an improved understanding

251 of how feral cat habitat use is influenced by their hunting behaviour could be achieved by undertaking within-

252 habitat analyses of vegetation composition. This might include consideration of patch structure, edge availability

253 and cover continuity.

254

255 The strength of evidence available for factors explaining habitat use was generally low in the studies we

256 examined, with 78% of cases providing little or no data to support their inferences. Most studies examined

257 habitat use using radio-tracking and employed observational or correlative data on other variables to explain

258 these patterns. These types of studies have poor inferential capabilities because they generally involve multiple

259 confounding and interactive explanations for the observed patterns and are hence unable to demonstrate cause

260 and effect. Additionally, few studies acknowledge the limitations of their conclusions. The strongest inferences

261 are gained through 'classical experiments', i.e. those that employ treatment and nil-treatment areas and are

262 replicated and randomised, or other types of experiments that lack either replication or randomisation (Hone

263 2007). Only one study used this kind of approach (Molsher 1999).

9

264

265 *Conceptual model*

266 The low inferential capacity of the studies reviewed here also limits our ability to make generalisations about the

267 mechanisms influencing habitat use by feral cats. However, by drawing on ecological theory and published

268 literature on other medium-sized carnivores, we have been able to propose a conceptual framework for this

269 topic. Such theoretical frameworks have been developed to explain predator-prey habitat use and dynamics

270 (Polis and Holt 1992; Holt and Polis 1997; Heithaus 2001; Rosenheim 2004). For example, game-theoretic

271 models predict that mesopredators should preferentially use habitat that reduces the risk of predation from apex

272 predators, rather than habitat with high prey availability, when dietary overlap between the two predator levels

273 is high and when the apex predators are efficient competitors (Heithaus 2001). Several studies of mammalian

274 predators have reported results consistent with these predictions (Thompson and Gese 2007; Wilson *et al.* 2010),

275 and the same might be expected for feral cats in many situations (e.g. Molsher 1999). However, cats also

276 commonly occur as apex predators, particularly on islands (e.g. Rayner *et al.* 2007), in which case patterns of

277 space use and habitat selection should largely be determined by resource availability (Heithaus 2001). Excluding

278 humans, cats were the top predator in the six island studies reviewed here, and five of those studies asserted that

279 prey and/or shelter availability determined cat habitat use. For example, on Stewart Island in New Zealand,

280 Harper (2007) found that cats preferred to use podocarp-broadleaf forests where shelter from inclement weather

281 was most available, and used the less protective and less preferred sub-alpine shrubland significantly more on

282 dry days compared to wet days.

283

284 We developed a conceptual model to explain patterns in cat habitat use (Fig. 4). The relationships that we

285 discuss here warrant further examination, given the speculative nature of this model and the knowledge gaps

286 that we have previously identified. We propose that ecosystem components that influence habitat use (A in Fig.

287 4: predators, prey, shelter and resource subsidies) are hierarchically structured, with predation/competition

288 exerting the strongest influence, and other factors increasing in importance where predators are absent

289 (Thompson and Gese 2007; Ross *et al.* 2012). We also expect that habitat choices are behaviourally-stratified (B

290 in Fig. 4), with dense habitats used for shelter and more open habitats used for hunting prey (Lozano *et al.*

291 2003). Broad vegetation types or habitat components that are generally favoured (but not exclusively) include

292 infrastructure, riparian areas, shrub/heathland, forests and woodland, while agricultural land is generally

293 avoided, as are grasslands to a lesser extent (but not exclusively, C in Fig. 4).

294

295 <Fig. 4 here>

10

296

297 To aid in validating this model, we developed testable hypotheses for further investigation: (i) higher order

298 predators with a high dietary overlap with feral cats and strong competitive ability will have spatially or

299 temporally prohibitive effects on cat habitat use (Heithaus 2001; Wilson *et al.* 2010; Ross *et al.* 2012); (ii)

300 where higher order predators exclude feral cats from using areas with optimal prey availability, removal of those

301 predators will allow cats to expand their use of optimal prey habitat (Molsher 1999; Prugh *et al.* 2009; Ritchie

302 and Johnson 2009); (iii) prey and/or shelter availability will be the most important factors influencing cat habitat

303 use where higher-order predators are absent (Heithaus 2001).

304

305 *Key directions for future feral cat research and management*

306 Because feral cats occur in a wide range of ecological contexts and show high variability in many population

307 specific traits, including those related to spatial ecology and habitat use, cat management programs should be

308 designed to account for site-specific conditions (Dickman *et al.* 2010; Doherty *et al.* 2015). Future research and

309 management to ameliorate the damage caused by feral cats will benefit from an integrated conceptual

310 framework that facilitates the identification, development and evaluation of site-specific management activities.

311 Consequently, in Table 2 we provide a list of key directions that will assist conservation managers and

312 researchers in better understanding and ameliorating the impact of feral cats at a scale appropriate for useful

313 management and research, and we discuss these in detail below.

314

315 Apex predators may play an important role in structuring habitat use by feral cats in some cases, but additional

316 research is needed to establish how the strength of this mechanism varies across a range of different systems.

317 Interference competition can have spatially or temporally prohibitive effects on habitat use by cats (Molsher

318 1999; Krauze-Gryz *et al.* 2012) and, although untested, larger predators might therefore help exclude feral cats

319 from areas inhabited by threatened prey species. Apex predators are declining across the globe (Ripple *et al.*

320 2014) and loss of top predators can lead to mesopredator release of cats and more intense impacts on native

321 fauna (Crooks and Soulé 1999; Risbey *et al.* 2000), although it is often difficult to clearly attribute causation in

322 mesopredator release studies (Prugh *et al.* 2009; Allen *et al.* 2012). Conservation managers should consider

323 apex predators as a possible tool for ameliorating feral cat impacts (Letnic *et al.* 2012; Ritchie *et al.* 2012), but

324 must also consider potentially conflicting social, economic and other biodiversity conservation concerns

325 (Fleming *et al.* 2012).

326

327 Linear features are used by feral cats in fragmented production landscapes, and cats can benefit from

328 fragmentation when native carnivores do not (Crooks 2002). The use of tree lines, road verges and other

329 corridors suggests that control devices could be deployed in these areas to maximise their encounter rate by cats,

330 and hence maximise the efficacy and efficiency of control or monitoring programs (Bengsen *et al.* 2012).

331 Although, in arid areas where vegetation contrasts are less extreme, roads may be less important (Mahon *et al.*

332 1998; Read and Eldridge 2010). Since our review shows often-divergent outcomes in the use of similar habitat

333 components or vegetation types worldwide, active monitoring and evaluation of expectations is essential for

334 developing effective and efficient control programs. Also, given that prey availability appears to be an important

335 determinant of cat habitat use, incorporating information on spatial and temporal variation in prey availability

336 should benefit control programs (Christensen *et al.* 2013; Recio and Seddon 2013; Recio *et al.* 2014),

337 particularly in situations where cats are the dominant predator.

338

339 Our review has revealed that the standard of evidence available to explain patterns in cat habitat use is generally

340 low. There is a risk that an accumulation of weak evidence will be mistaken for the existence of strong evidence.

341 Given that a sound understanding of the habitat use patterns of feral cats is often an important precursor to

342 effective mitigation of their impacts, and that most of our current understanding is based on observational

343 studies involving multiple confounding and interactive explanations for observed patterns, there is a clear need

344 for more rigorous approaches to future studies. To adequately address the range of possible explanations, future

345 studies should where possible, use rigorous, experimental approaches and ecological theory to develop and test

346 hypotheses regarding predator-prey dynamics and intra-guild interactions. Also, studies should ideally

347 incorporate information on spatial and temporal variation in the activity or abundance of cat prey species and

348 sympatric predators (Dickman 1996) and be conducted over appropriate temporal scales to account for potential

349 biases caused by changes in predator behaviour or prey and shelter availability (Cruz *et al.* 2013). The spatial

350 and temporal scales needed for such experiments make them expensive and logistically difficult (Glen *et al.*

351 2007), although not impossible (e.g. Molsher 1999). Studies should also aim to examine habitat use by feral cats

352 in landscapes such as rainforests, salt marshes and alpine habitats, which are poorly represented in the existing

353 literature. An improved understanding of feral cat habitat use is key to reducing their impact on native species

354 across the globe.

355

356 **Acknowledgements**

360

361 **References**

362 Algar, D., Angus, G. J., Williams, M. R., and Mellican, A. E. (2007). Influence of bait type, weather and prey
363 abundance on bait uptake by feral cats (*Felis catus*) on Peron Peninsula, Western Australia. *Conservation*
364 *Science Western Australia* **6**, 109–149.

365 Allen, B. L., Fleming, P. J. S., Hayward, M., Allen, L. R., Engeman, R. M., Ballard, G., and Leung, L. K. P.
366 (2012). Top-Predators as Biodiversity Regulators: Contemporary Issues Affecting Knowledge and Management
367 of Dingoes in Australia. In 'Biodiversity Enrichment in a Diverse World'. (Ed G. A. Lameed.) pp. 85–132.
368 (InTech.)

369 Bengsen, A. J., Butler, J. A., and Masters, P. (2012). Applying home-range and landscape-use data to design
370 effective feral-cat control programs. *Wildlife Research* **39**, 258–265.

371 Bengsen, A., Butler, J., and Masters, P. (2011). Estimating and indexing feral cat population abundances using
372 camera traps. *Wildlife Research* **38**, 732–739.

373 Blancher, P. (2013). Estimated number of birds killed by house cats (*Felis catus*) in Canada. *Avian*
374 *Conservation and Ecology* **8**, 3.

375 Börger, L., Dalziel, B. D., and Fryxell, J. M. (2008). Are there general mechanisms of animal home range
376 behaviour? A review and prospects for future research. *Ecology Letters* **11**, 637–650.

377 Bradshaw, J. W. S. (1992). 'The behaviour of the domestic cat'. (CAB International: Wallingford.)

378 Brawata, R. L., and Neeman, T. (2011). Is water the key? Dingo management, intraguild interactions and
379 predator distribution around water points in arid Australia. *Wildlife Research* **38**, 426–436.

380 Brook, L. A., Johnson, C. N., and Ritchie, E. G. (2012). Effects of predator control on behaviour of an apex
381 predator and indirect consequences for mesopredator suppression. *Journal of Applied Ecology* **49**, 1278–1286.

382 Capizzi, D., Bertolino, S., and Mortelliti, A. (2014). Rating the rat: global patterns and research priorities in
383 impacts and management of rodent pests. *Mammal Review* **44**, 148–162.

384 Christensen, P. E., Ward, B. G., and Sims, C. (2013). Predicting bait uptake by feral cats, *Felis catus*, in semi-
385 arid environments. *Ecological Management & Restoration* **14**, 47–53.

386 Crooks, K. R. (2002). Relative sensitivities of mammalian carnivores to habitat fragmentation. *Conservation*
387 *Biology* **16**, 488–502.

388 Crooks, K. R., and Soulé, M. E. (1999). Mesopredator release and avifaunal extinctions in a fragmented system.
389 *Nature* **400**, 563–566.

390 Cruz, J., Glen, A. S., and Pech, R. P. (2013). Modelling landscape-level numerical responses of predators to
391 prey: the case of cats and rabbits. *PLoS ONE* **8**, e73544.

392 Daniels, M. J., Beaumont, M. A., Johnson, P. J., Balharry, D., Macdonald, D. W., and Barratt, E. (2001).
393 Ecology and genetics of wild-living cats in the north-east of Scotland and the implications for the conservation
394 of the wildcat. *Journal of Applied Ecology* **38**, 146–161.

395 Dickman, C. R. (1996). 'Overview of the impacts of feral cats on Australian native fauna'. (Australian Nature
396 Conservation Agency: Canberra.)

397 Dickman, C. R., Denny, E., and Buckmaster, A. (2010). 'Identification of sites of high conservation priority
398 impacted by feral cats. Report for the Australian Government Department of the Environment, Water, Heritage

399   and the Arts'. (Australian Government: Canberra).

400   Doherty, T. S., Davis, R. A., van Etten, E. J. B., Algar, D., Collier, N., Dickman, C. R., Edwards, G., Masters,
401   P., Palmer, R., and Robinson, S. (2015). A continental-scale analysis of feral cat diet in Australia. *Journal of*
402   *Biogeography*. doi:10.1111/jbi.12469

403   Duffy, D. C., and Capece, P. (2012). Biology and impacts of Pacific Island invasive species. 7. the domestic cat
404   (*Felis catus*). *Pacific Science* **66**, 173–212.

405   Ferreira, J. P., Leitão, I., Santos-Reis, M., and Revilla, E. (2011). Human-related factors regulate the spatial
406   ecology of domestic cats in sensitive areas for conservation. *PLoS ONE* **6**, e25970.

407   Fitzgerald, B. M., and Turner, D. C. (2000). Hunting behaviour of domestic cats and their impact on prey
408   populations. In 'The domestic cat: the biology of its behaviour'. (Eds D. C. Turner and P. Bateson.) pp. 151–
409   175. (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.)

410   Flaxman, S. M., and Lou, Y. (2009). Tracking prey or tracking the prey's resource? Mechanisms of movement
411   and optimal habitat selection by predators. *Journal of Theoretical Biology* **256**, 187–200.

412   Fleming, P. J. S., Allen, B. L., and Ballard, G.-A. (2012). Seven considerations about dingoes as biodiversity
413   engineers: the socioecological niches of dogs in Australia. *Australian Mammalogy* **34**, 119–131.

414   Garnett, S. T., Franklin, D. C., Ehmke, G., VanDerWal, J. J., Hodgson, L., Pavey, C., Reside, A. E., Welbergen,
415   J. A., Butchart, S., Perkins, G. C., and Williams, S. E. (2013). 'Climate change adaptation strategies for
416   Australian birds'. (National Climate Change Adaptation Research Facility: Gold Coast.)

417   Gehring, T. M., and Swihart, R. K. (2003). Body size, niche breadth, and ecologically scaled responses to
418   habitat fragmentation: mammalian predators in an agricultural landscape. *Biological Conservation* **109**, 283–
419   295.

420   Genovesi, P., Besa, M., and Toso, S. (1995). Ecology of a feral cat *Felis catus* population in an agricultural area
421   of northern Italy. *Wildlife Biology* **1**, 233–237.

422   Glen, A. S., Dickman, C. R., Soulé, M. E., and Mackey, B. G. (2007). Evaluating the role of the dingo as a
423   trophic regulator in Australian ecosystems. *Austral Ecology* **32**, 492–501.

424   Goltz, D. M., Hess, S. C., Brinck, K. W., Danner, R. M., and Banko, P. C. (2008). Home range and movements
425   of feral cats on Mauna Kea, Hawai'i. *Pacific Conservation Biology* **14**, 177–184.

426   Graham, C. A., Maron, M., and McAlpine, C. A. (2012). Influence of landscape structure on invasive predators:
427   feral cats and red foxes in the brigalow landscapes, Queensland, Australia. *Wildlife Research* **39**, 661–676.

428   Hall, L. S., Kasparian, M. A., Van Vuren, D., and Kelt, D. A. (2000). Spatial organization and habitat use of
429   feral cats (*Felis catus* L.) in Mediterranean California. *Mammalia* **64**, 19–28.

430   Hall, L. S., Krausman, P. R., and Morrison, M. L. (1997). The habitat concept and a plea for standard
431   terminology. *Wildlife Society Bulletin* **25**, 173–182.

432   Harper, G. A. (2007). Habitat selection of feral cats (*Felis catus*) on a temperate, forested island. *Austral*
433   *Ecology* **32**, 305–314.

434   Heithaus, M. R. (2001). Habitat selection by predators and prey in communities with asymmetrical intraguild
435   predation. *Oikos* **92**, 542–554.

436   Hess, S. C., Banko, P. C., and Hansen, H. (2009). An adaptive strategy for reducing feral cat predation on
437   endangered Hawaiian birds. *Pacific Conservation Biology* **15**, 56–64.

438   Holmala, K., and Kauhala, K. (2009). Habitat use of medium-sized carnivores in southeast Finland-key habitats
439   for rabies spread? *Annales Zoologici Fennici* **46**, 233–246.

440   Holt, R. D., and Polis, G. A. (1997). A theoretical framework for intraguild predation. *The American Naturalist*
441   **149**, 745–764.

14

442   Hone, J. (2007). 'Wildlife Damage Control'. (CSIRO Publishing: Collingwood.)

443   Horn, J. A., Mateus-Pinilla, N., Warner, R. E., and Heske, E. J. (2011). Home range, habitat use, and activity
444   patterns of free-roaming domestic cats. *The Journal of Wildlife Management* **75**, 1177–1185.

445   Hutchings, S. D. (2000). Ecology of feral cats (*Felis catus*) at a refuse dump in coastal southern Victoria,
446   Australia. PhD thesis, Deakin University, Melbourne.

447   IUCN SSC Invasive Species Specialist Group (2012). Database of Island Invasive Species Eradications. *Island*
448   *Conservation*. Available at: http://eradicationsdb.fos.auckland.ac.nz/.

449   Janssen, A., Sabelis, M. W., Magalhães, S., Montserrat, M., and Van der Hammen, T. (2007). Habitat structure
450   affects intraguild predation. *Ecology* **88**, 2713–2719.

451   Johnson, C. (2006). 'Australia's Mammal Extinctions: A 50 000 year history'. (Cambridge University Press:
452   Melbourne.)

453   Johnson, D. H. (1980). The comparison of usage and availability measurements for evaluating resource
454   preference. *Ecology* **61**, 65–71.

455   Jones, H. P., Tershy, B. R., Zavaleta, E. S., Croll, D. A., Keitt, B. S., Finkelstein, M. E., and Howald, G. R.
456   (2008). Severity of the effects of invasive rats on seabirds: a global review. *Conservation Biology* **22**, 16–26.

457   Judge, S., Lippert, J. S., Misajon, K., Hu, D., and Hess, S. C. (2012). Videographic evidence of endangered
458   species depredation by feral cat. *Pacific Conservation Biology* **18**, 293–296.

459   Keitt, B. S., Wilcox, C., Tershy, B. R., Croll, D. A., and Donlan, C. J. (2002). The effect of feral cats on the
460   population viability of black-vented shearwaters (*Puffinus opisthomelas*) on Natividad Island, Mexico. *Animal*
461   *Conservation* **5**, 217–223.

462   King, C. M., and Moody, J. E. (1982). The biology of the stoat (*Mustela erminea*) in the National Parks of New
463   Zealand I. General introduction. *New Zealand Journal of Zoology* **9**, 49–55.

464   Kliskey, A. D., and Byrom, A. E. (2004). Development of a GIS-based methodology for quantifying predation
465   risk in a spatial context. *Transactions in GIS* **8**, 13–22.

466   Krauze-Gryz, D., Gryz, J. B., Goszczyński, J., Chylarecki, P., and Zmihorski, M. (2012). The good, the bad, and
467   the ugly: space use and intraguild interactions among three opportunistic predators—cat (*Felis catus*), dog
468   (*Canis lupus familiaris*), and red fox (*Vulpes vulpes*)—under human pressure. *Canadian Journal of Zoology* **90**,
469   1402–1413.

470   Lazenby, B. T., and Dickman, C. R. (2013). Patterns of detection and capture are associated with cohabiting
471   predators and prey. *PLoS ONE* **8**, e59846.

472   Letnic, M., Ritchie, E. G., and Dickman, C. R. (2012). Top predators as biodiversity regulators: the dingo *Canis*
473   *lupus dingo* as a case study. *Biological Reviews* **87**, 390–413.

474   Long, J. (2003). 'Introduced Mammals of the World'. (CSIRO PUBLISHING: Collingwood.)

475   Loss, S. R., Will, T., and Marra, P. P. (2013). The impact of free-ranging domestic cats on wildlife of the United
476   States. *Nature Communications* **4**, DOI: 10.1038/ncomms2380.

477   Lowe, S., Browne, M., Boudjelas, S., and De Poorter, M. (2000). '100 of the world's worst invasive alien
478   species. A selection from the Global Invasive Species Specialist Group (ISSG), a specialist group of the Species
479   Survival Commission (SSC) of the World Conservation Union (IUCN)'. (Invasive Species Specialist Group:
480   Auckland.)

481   Lozano, J., Virgós, E., Malo, A. F., Huertas, D. L., and Casanovas, J. G. (2003). Importance of scrub–
482   pastureland mosaics for wild-living cats occurrence in a Mediterranean area: implications for the conservation
483   of the wildcat (*Felis silvestris*). *Biodiversity and Conservation* **12**, 921–935.

484   Luna-Mendoza, L., Barredo-Barberena, J. M., Hernández-Montoya, J. C., Aguirre-Muñoz, A., Méndez-Sánchez,

485 F. A., Ortiz-Alcaraz, A., and Félix-Lizárraga, M. (2011). Planning for the eradication of feral cats on Guadalupe
486 Island, Mexico: home range, diet, and bait acceptance. In 'Island invasives: eradication and management'. (Eds
487 C. R. Veitch, M. N. Clout, and D. R. Towns.) pp. 192–197. (IUCN: Gland.)

488 Mahon, P. S., Banks, P. B., and Dickman, C. R. (1998). Population indices for wild carnivores: A critical study
489 in sand-dune habitat, south-western Queensland. *Wildlife Research* **25**, 11–22.

490 McGregor, H., Legge, S., Jones, M., and Johnson, C. N. (2014). Landscape management of fire and regimes
491 alters the fine-scale habitat utilisation by feral cats. *PLoS ONE* **9**, e109097. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0109097

492 Medina, F. M., Bonnaud, E., Vidal, E., and Nogales, M. (2014). Underlying impacts of invasive cats on islands:
493 not only a question of predation. *Biodiversity and Conservation* **23**, 327–342.

494 Medina, F. M., Bonnaud, E., Vidal, E., Tershy, B. R., Zavaleta, E. S., Josh Donlan, C., Keitt, B. S., Corre, M.,
495 Horwath, S. V., and Nogales, M. (2011). A global review of the impacts of invasive cats on island endangered
496 vertebrates. *Global Change Biology* **17**, 3503–3510.

497 Medway, D. G. (2004). The land bird fauna of Stephens Island, New Zealand in the early 1890s, and the cause
498 of its demise. *Notornis* **51**, 201–211.

499 Mitchell, M. S., and Powell, R. A. (2004). A mechanistic home range model for optimal use of spatially
500 distributed resources. *Ecological Modelling* **177**, 209–232.

501 Molsher, R. (1999). The Ecology of feral cats, *Felis catus*, in open forest in New South Wales: interactions with
502 food resources and foxes. PhD thesis, University of Sydney, Sydney.

503 Moseby, K. E., Read, J. L., Paton, D. C., Copley, P., Hill, B. M., and Crisp, H. A. (2011). Predation determines
504 the outcome of 10 reintroduction attempts in arid South Australia. *Biological Conservation* **144**, 2863–2872.

505 Moseby, K. E., Stott, J., and Crisp, H. (2009). Movement patterns of feral predators in an arid environment –
506 implications for control through poison baiting. *Wildlife Research* **36**, 422–435.

507 Mosnier, A., Boisjoly, D., Courtois, R., and Ouellet, J. P. (2008). Extensive predator space use can limit the
508 efficacy of a control program. *Journal of Wildlife Management* **72**, 483–491.

509 Nogales, M., Vidal, E., Medina, F. M., Bonnaud, E., Tershy, B. R., Campbell, K. J., and Zavaleta, E. S. (2013).
510 Feral cats and biodiversity conservation: the urgent prioritization of island management. *BioScience* **63**, 804–
511 810.

512 Pastro, L. A. (2013). The effects of wildfire on small mammals and lizards in the Simpson Desert, central
513 Australia. PhD thesis, University of Sydney, Sydney.

514 Pickerell, G. A., O'Donnell, C. F., Wilson, D. J., and Seddon, P. J. (2014). How can we detect introduced
515 mammalian predators in non-forest habitats? A comparison of techniques. *New Zealand Journal of Ecology* **38**,
516 86–102.

517 Polis, G. A., and Holt, R. D. (1992). Intraguild predation: the dynamics of complex trophic interactions. *Trends
518 in Ecology & Evolution* **7**, 151–154.

519 Potts, J. M., Buckland, S. T., Thomas, L., and Savage, A. (2012). Estimating abundance of cryptic but trappable
520 animals using trapping point transects: a case study for Key Largo woodrats. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*
521 **3**, 695–703.

522 Prugh, L. R., Stoner, C. J., Epps, C. W., Bean, W. T., Ripple, W. J., Laliberte, A. S., and Brashares, J. S. (2009).
523 The rise of the mesopredator. *BioScience* **59**, 779–791.

524 Pyke, G. H. (1984). Optimal foraging theory: a critical review. *Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics* **15**,
525 523–575.

526 Rayner, M. J., Hauber, M. E., Imber, M. J., Stamp, R. K., and Clout, M. N. (2007). Spatial heterogeneity of
527 mesopredator release within an oceanic island system. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the
528 United States of America* **104**, 20862–20865.

529 Read, J., and Bowen, Z. (2001). Population dynamics, diet and aspects of the biology of feral cats and foxes in
530 arid South Australia. *Wildlife Research* **28**, 195–203.

531 Read, J., and Eldridge, S. (2010). An optimised rapid detection technique for simultaneously monitoring activity
532 of rabbits, cats, foxes and dingoes in the rangelands. *The Rangeland Journal* **32**, 389–394.

533 Recio, M. R., and Seddon, P. J. (2013). Understanding determinants of home range behaviour of feral cats as
534 introduced apex predators in insular ecosystems: a spatial approach. *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology* **67**,
535 1971–1981.

536 Recio, M. R., Mathieu, R., Maloney, R., and Seddon, P. J. (2010). First results of feral cats (*Felis catus*)
537 monitored with GPS collars in New Zealand. *New Zealand Journal of Ecology* **34**, 288–296.

538 Recio, M. R., Mathieu, R., Virgós, E., and Seddon, P. J. (2014). Quantifying fine-scale resource selection by
539 introduced feral cats to complement management decision-making in ecologically sensitive areas. *Biological*
540 *Invasions* **16**, 1915–1927.

541 Ripple, W. J., Estes, J. A., Beschta, R. L., Wilmers, C. C., Ritchie, E. G., Hebblewhite, M., Berger, J.,
542 Elmhagen, B., Letnic, M., Nelson, M. P., Schmitz, O. J., Smith, D. W., Wallach, A. D., and Wirsing, A. J.
543 (2014). Status and ecological effects of the world's largest carnivores. *Science* **343**, 1241484–1241484.

544 Risbey, D. A., Calver, M. C., Short, J., Bradley, J. S., and Wright, I. W. (2000). The impact of cats and foxes on
545 the small vertebrate fauna of Heirisson Prong, Western Australia. II. A field experiment. *Wildlife Research* **27**,
546 223–235.

547 Ritchie, E. G., and Johnson, C. N. (2009). Predator interactions, mesopredator release and biodiversity
548 conservation. *Ecology Letters* **12**, 982–998.

549 Ritchie, E. G., Elmhagen, B., Glen, A. S., Letnic, M., Ludwig, G., and McDonald, R. A. (2012). Ecosystem
550 restoration with teeth: what role for predators? *Trends in Ecology & Evolution* **27**, 265–271.

551 Rosenheim, J. A. (2004). Top predators constrain the habitat selection games played by intermediate predators
552 and their prey. *Israel Journal of Zoology* **50**, 129–138.

553 Ross, S., Munkhtsog, B., and Harris, S. (2012). Determinants of mesocarnivore range use: relative effects of
554 prey and habitat properties on Pallas's cat home-range size. *Journal of Mammalogy* **93**, 1292–1300.

555 Salo, P., Ahola, M. P., and Korpimäki, E. (2010). Habitat-mediated impact of alien mink predation on common
556 frog densities in the outer archipelago of the Baltic Sea. *Oecologia* **163**, 405–413.

557 Salo, P., Korpimaki, E., Banks, P. B., Nordstrom, M., and Dickman, C. R. (2007). Alien predators are more
558 dangerous than native predators to prey populations. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*
559 **274**, 1237–1243.

560 Sarmento, P., Cruz, J., Eira, C., and Fonseca, C. (2009). Spatial colonization by feral domestic cats *Felis catus*
561 of former wildcat *Felis silvestris silvestris* home ranges. *Acta Theriologica* **54**, 31–38.

562 Short, J., and Turner, B. (2005). Control of feral cats for nature conservation. IV. Population dynamics and
563 morphological attributes of feral cats at Shark Bay, Western Australia. *Wildlife Research* **32**, 489–501.

564 Tews, J., Brose, U., Grimm, V., Tielbörger, K., Wichmann, M. C., Schwager, M., and Jeltsch, F. (2004). Animal
565 species diversity driven by habitat heterogeneity/diversity: the importance of keystone structures. *Journal of*
566 *Biogeography* **31**, 79–92.

567 Thompson, C. M., and Gese, E. M. (2007). Food webs and intraguild predation: community interactions of a
568 native mesocarnivore. *Ecology* **88**, 334–346.

569 Wang, Y., and Fisher, D. O. (2013). Dingoes affect activity of feral cats, but do not exclude them from the
570 habitat of an endangered macropod. *Wildlife Research* **39**, 611–620.

571 Wilkerson, M. S., and Wilkerson, M. B. (2010). 'Köppen-Geiger climate classification Google Earth file'.
572 (DePauw University: Greencastle.) Available at: http://koeppen-geiger.vu-wien.ac.at/.

573 Wilson, R. R., Blankenship, T. L., Hooten, M. B., and Shivik, J. A. (2010). Prey-mediated avoidance of an
574 intraguild predator by its intraguild prey. *Oecologia* **164**, 921–929.

575 Woinarski, J. C. Z., Legge, S., Fitzsimons, J. A., Traill, B. J., Burbidge, A. A., Fisher, A., Firth, R. S. C.,
576 Gordon, I. J., Griffiths, A. D., Johnson, C. N., McKenzie, N. L., Palmer, C., Radford, I., Rankmore, B., Ritchie,
577 E. G., Ward, S., and Ziembicki, M. (2011). The disappearing mammal fauna of northern Australia: context,
578 cause, and response. *Conservation Letters* **4**, 192–201.

579

580 Table 1 Summary information for the 27 studies reviewed here on feral and unowned cat (*Felis catus*) habitat use.

581 [a] Climates were categorised according to the Köppen-Geiger classification system (Wilkerson and Wilkerson 2010).

582 [b] GOF = goodness of fit; PCA = principal component analysis.

583 [c] Strength of inference rating: (1) supposition – no data or references to support contentions; (2) supposition based on casual observation of apparent coincidence e.g. predators or prey more

584 abundant in one habitat component, but supporting data is not provided; (3) supposition based on casual observation of apparent coincidence and supporting data provided; (4) manipulative

585 study without experimental controls or replicates; (5) manipulative study with experimental controls and replicates.

586

Study #	First author	Year	Location	Climate [a]	Landscape type	Survey type	Analysis [b]	Favoured habitat	Avoided habitat	Hypothesised structuring factors	Strength of inference for structuring factors [c]
1	McGregor	2014	Central Kimberley, Australia	Steppe	Tropical grasslands	GPS tracking	Discrete choice modelling and multi-model inference	Open areas, edges, recently burnt and/or grazed areas, riparian areas and water.	Higher elevations	Prey Predation/competition	3 2
2	Edwards	2002	Northern Territory, Australia	Desert (arid)	Arid	Passive tracking station	Chi-squared GOF	Mulga woodland	Grasslands	Prey Predation/competition	2 1
3	Mahon	1998	Simpson Desert, Australia	Desert (arid)	Arid	Passive tracking station	Chi-squared GOF	Dune crests	-	None	N/A
4	Moseby	2009	Roxby Downs, Australia	Desert (arid)	Arid	GPS tracking	Compositional analysis	Dunes, creekline	Swales	Prey Shelter	2 2
5	Bengsen	2012	Kangaroo Island, Australia	Mediterranean	Mixed agricultural, island	GPS tracking	Chi-squared GOF	Mixed shrub and woodland, woodlands	Low and medium woodlands, open paddocks	None	N/A
6	Graham	2012	Queensland, Australia	Humid subtropical	Mixed agricultural	Active tracking station	Occupancy	Agricultural land, large remnant edges, roadside verge remnants	Interior of small and large remnant patches	Shelter	2
7	Molsher	1999	Lake Burrendong, Australia	Humid subtropical	Temperate woodlands	VHF tracking	Compositional analysis	Open woodland (landscape scale), grasslands (home range scale)	Mudflats (both scales)	Prey Shelter Predation/competition	2 2 5
8	Buckmaster	2012	Gippsland, Australia	Marine temperate	Tall forest	VHF and GPS tracking	Logistic regression	Creeklines	N/A	Predation/competition	2
9	McTier	2000	French Island, Australia	Marine temperate	Mixed agricultural, island	VHF tracking	Chi-squared	Bushland, roadsides, buildings	Grasslands	Shelter Prey	2 2
10	Hutchings	2000	Angelsea Tip, Australia	Marine temperate	Refuse site, mixed	VHF tracking, spotlighting	Chi-squared	Heathland (day), refuse dump (night)	Heathland (night), refuse dump (day)	Shelter Prey	2 2
11	Recio	2010	Tasman Valley, New Zealand	Maritime temperate	Glacial valley and riverbed	GPS tracking	Compositional analysis and Chi-squared GOF	Mature riverbed	Adjacent slopes	Shelter Prey	1 2
12	Recio	2013 & 2014	Godley Valley, New Zealand	Maritime temperate	Glacial valley and riverbed	GPS tracking	Logistic regression	Shrub and pasture cover, lower elevations, bare ground on slopes	N/A	Prey	3
13	Harper	2007	Stewart Island,	Maritime	Island	VHF tracking	Compositional	Tall podocarp-	Sub-alpine	Shelter	3

19

			New Zealand	temperate			analysis	broadleaf forest	shrubland, alpine heath	Prey	3
14	Alterio	1998	Boulder Beach, New Zealand	Maritime temperate	Coastal, mixed agricultural	VHF tracking	Chi-squared GOF	Ungrazed areas, dunes	Grazed areas, grasslands	Prey	2
15	Hall	2000	California, USA	Mediterranean	Mixed agricultural	VHF tracking	Chi-squared GOF	Riparian, buildings	Annual crops, perennial crops	Shelter / Prey	1 / 1
16	Gehring	2003	Indiana, USA	Hot summer continental	Mixed urban-agricultural	Active tracking station	Logistic regression	Higher canopy cover, lower ground cover, lower diversity of habitat, smaller patch area, greater human development, presence of corridors	Fields	None	N/A
17	Horn	2011	Illinois, USA	Hot summer continental	Mixed urban-agricultural	VHF tracking	Compositional analysis	Grasslands, forests, industrial areas, row crops (summer only)	Row crops (autumn, winter)	Shelter / Prey	2 / 2
18	Gehrt	2013	Chicago, USA	Hot summer continental	Mixed urban-natural	VHF	Euclidean distance-based selection ratios	Urban land	-	Predation/competition	3
19	Medina	2007	Canary Islands, Spain	Mediterranean	Island	Scat survey	Kruskal-Wallis	None	None	Prey	2
20	Ferreira	2011	Portugal	Mediterranean	Mixed agricultural	VHF tracking	Compositional analysis	Farms, areas within 200m of roads, smaller slopes	Steep slopes, areas >200m from roads, native vegetation	Human resource subsidies. / Predation/competition	2 / 3
21	Lozano	2003	Iberian Peninsula	Mediterranean	Mountainous	Scat survey	PCA and regression	High rabbit abundance, scrub-pastureland mosaic, high scrub cover and shelter availability	N/A	Shelter / Prey	2 / 2
22	Daniels	2001	Scotland, UK	Maritime temperate	Highlands	VHF tracking	Compositional analysis	Woodland, stream edge	Pasture, heather	None	N/A
23	Genovesi	1995	Italy	Humid subtropical	Mixed agricultural	VHF tracking	Chi-squared GOF	Arboreal shelter belts, reed thickets, riparian vegetation	Open cultivated fields	None	N/A
24	Krauze-Gryz	2012	Poland	Marine temperate	Mixed agricultural	Active tracking station	Occupancy	Forest	Open areas	Predation/competition / Human resource subsidies.	3 / 2
25	Holmala	2009	Finland	Warm summer continental	Mixed agricultural	VHF tracking	Wilcoxon signed-rank test	Fields, open areas, young and mature deciduous forest	Mature pine and mixed forests	Human resource subsidies	2
26	Konecny	1987	Galapagos Islands, Ecuador	Steppe	Island	VHF tracking	Contingency table	Lava/shrub	-	Prey	2
27	van Aarde	1979	Marion Island, South Africa	Tundra (sub-Antarctic)	Sub-Antarctic island	Observation	t-tests	Coastal habitat types	Barren lava fields	Prey	2

Identification numbers for studies that contained a mix of feral, owned and unowned cats: 15, 23 and 24; a mixture of *F. catus* and *F. silvestris*: 20 and 21; and unowned cats only 16 and 19. All other studies were conducted on feral cats only.

587   Table 2. Key directions for future research and management that aims to understand and ameliorate the impact

588   of feral cats.

Management

- Incorporating information on spatial and temporal variation in prey availability should benefit control programs by enhancing the efficiency and effectiveness of control and monitoring activities.

- Control programs should consider the presence of higher order predators and the effects they may have on habitat use by cats.

- Active monitoring of management actions is essential for the continual improvement of control programs and to ensure that effort is not wasted. Continual improvement may be best achieved by using an adaptive management framework that evaluates assumptions about habitat use by cats and the ability of control activities to impact on the population.

Research

- Should use experimental approaches and ecological theory to develop and test hypotheses regarding predator-prey dynamics and intra-guild interactions.

- The strongest evidence will be gained from replicated landscape-scale experiments where the densities of predators, prey or competitors are manipulated and then the response in cat habitat use is measured.

- As far as possible, studies should:

    - Relate habitat use patterns of cats to variability in the abundance or activity of cat prey species and sympatric predators.

    - Be conducted over temporal scales appropriate to the study's aims.

    - Aim to examine habitat use by feral cats in landscapes that are poorly represented in the existing literature.


589

590

591
592 Figure 1. World map showing the locations of the reviewed studies on feral and unowned cat (*Felis catus*)

593 habitat use. Numbers refer to studies listed in Table 1.

594

595 Figure 2. Frequency of studies where cats favoured (grey bars with + symbol) or avoided (white bars with —

596 symbol) seven broad habitat components: forest, woodland, grassland, shrub/heathland, riparian areas,

597 agricultural land, and infrastructure.

598

Figure 3. Frequency of studies suggesting factors that may explain observed patterns in cat habitat use: level 1 (solid white); level 2 (solid grey); level 3 (diagonal stripe); level 5 (solid black). No studies were classed as level 4.

Figure 4. Conceptual model to describe factors that can potentially influence feral cat habitat use. Ecosystem components that influence habitat use are hierarchical (A), i.e. predators have a stronger influence than prey, but prey increases in importance where predators are absent. Habitat choices are behaviourally-stratified (B) and broad habitat components that cats favour (+) or avoid (-) are nested in the landscape (C). Studies that provide support for or inferences regarding each component are listed using subscripts that correspond to study numbers in Table 1.

23